

**COLOR OF VIOLENCE:
VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN OF
COLOR**

UC SANTA CRUZ, APRIL 28-29, 2000

CONFERENCE SUMMARY

Incite! Women of Color Against Violence
PO BOX 6861
Minneapolis, MN 55406
<incite_national@yahoo.com>

This report is not a complete transcription of all the workshops and plenary sessions. Two sessions (militarism, and violence and the global economy) were not recorded. The recordings of the other sessions were of varying qualities. As a result, some summaries are much longer than others. The talks were also edited for space considerations.

We apologize for any errors in these summaries.

Please do not reproduce without permission from the authors of each talk.

Table of Contents:

1.	Angela Davis Opening Keynote Address	Page 2
2.	Respondents to Angela Davis Keynote	Page 7
3.	First Plenary Session	Page 27
4.	Second Plenary Session	Page 41
5.	Law Enforcement Workshop	Page 61
6.	Colonialism and Violence	Page 70
7.	Challenging the Depoliticization of the Anti-Violence Movement	Page 79
8.	Colonized Bodies of Women of Color	Page 86
9.	Organizing in Communities of Color	Page 91
10.	Religion/Spirituality and Violence	Page 97
11.	Media/Cultural Representations of Violence	Page 101
12.	Racism and Heterosexism	Page 107
13.	Violence and the Global Economy (notes)	Page 114
14.	Haunani Kay Trask Closing Keynote Address	Page 117
15.	Speaker Biographies	Page 124
16.	Ordering information for Incite! Resources	Page 139

ANGELA DAVIS KEYNOTE ADDRESS

I feel extremely honored to have been invited to deliver this keynote address. This conference deserves to be called "historic" on many accounts. It is the first of its kind, and this is precisely the right intellectual season for such a gathering. The breadth and complexity of its concerns show the contradictions and possibilities of this historical moment. And just such a gathering can help us to imagine ways of attending to the ubiquitous violence in the lives of women of color that also radically subvert the institutions and discourses within which we are compelled by necessity to think and work. I predict that this conference will be remembered as a milestone for feminist scholars and activists, marking a new moment in the history of anti-violence scholarship and organizing.

Many years ago when I was a student in San Diego, I was driving down the freeway with a friend when we encountered a black woman wandering along the shoulder. Her story was extremely disturbing. Despite her uncontrollable weeping, we were able to surmise that she had been raped and dumped along the side of the road. After a while, she was able to wave down a police car, thinking that they would help her. However, when the white policeman picked her up, he did not comfort her, but rather seized upon the opportunity to rape her once more. I relate this story not for its sensational value, but for its metaphorical power.

Given the racist and patriarchal patterns of the state, it is difficult to envision the state as the holder of solutions to the problem of violence against women. However, as the anti-violence movement has been institutionalized and professionalized, the state plays an increasingly dominant role in how we conceptualize and create strategies to minimize violence against women.

One of the major tasks of this conference, and of the anti-violence movement as a whole, is to address this contradiction, especially as it presents itself to poor communities of color.

Violence is one of those words that is a powerful ideological conductor, one whose meaning constantly mutates. Before we do anything else, we need to pay tribute to the activists and scholars whose ideological critiques made it possible to apply the category of domestic violence to those concealed layers of aggression systematically directed at women. These acts were for so long relegated to secrecy or, worse, considered normal.

Many of us now take for granted that misogynist violence is a legitimate political issue, but let us remember that a little more than two decades ago, most people considered "domestic violence" to be a private concern and thus not a proper subject of public discourse or political intervention. Only one generation separates us from that era of silence. The first speak-out against rape occurred in the early 1970s, and the first national organization against domestic violence was founded toward the end of that decade.

We have come to recognize the epidemic proportions of violence within intimate relationships and the pervasiveness of date and acquaintance rape, as well as violence within and against same-sex intimacy. But we must also learn how to oppose the racist fixation on people of color as the primary perpetrators of violence, including domestic and sexual violence, and at the same time to

fiercely challenge the real violence that men of color inflict on women. These are precisely the men who are already reviled as the major purveyors of violence in our society: the gang members, the drug-dealers, the drive-by shooters, the burglars and assailants. In short, the criminal is figured as a black or Latino man who must be locked into prison.

One of the major questions facing this conference is how to develop an analysis that furthers neither the conservative project of sequestering millions of men of color in accordance with the contemporary dictates of globalized capital and its prison industrial complex, nor the equally conservative project of abandoning poor women of color to a continuum of violence that extends from the sweatshops through the prisons, to shelters, and into bedrooms at home. How do we develop analyses and organizing strategies against violence against women that acknowledge the race of gender and the gender of race?

Women of color have been active in the anti-violence movement since its beginnings. The first national organization addressing domestic violence was founded in 1978 when the United States Civil Rights Commission Consultation on Battered Women led to the founding of the National Coalition Against Domestic Violence. In 1980, the Washington, D.C. Rape Crisis Center sponsored the First National Conference on Third World Women and Violence. The following year a Women of Color Task Force was created within the National Coalition Against Domestic Violence. To make some historical connections, it is significant that the U.S. Third World Women's Caucus formed that same year within the National Women Studies Association, and the groundbreaking book *This Bridge Called My Back* was first published.

Many of these activists have helped to develop a more complex understanding about the overlapping, cross-cutting, and often contradictory relationships among race, class, gender, and sexuality that militate against a simplistic theory of privatized violence in women's lives. Clearly, the powerful slogan first initiated by the feminist movement--"the personal is political"--is far more complicated than it appears to be. The early feminist argument that violence against women is not inherently private, but has been privatized by the gendered structures of the state, the economy, and the family has had a powerful impact on public consciousness.

Yet, the effort to incorporate an analysis that does not reify gender has not been so successful. The argument that sexual and domestic violence is the structural foundation of male dominance sometimes leads to a hierarchical notion that genital mutilation in Africa and *sati*, or wife-burning, in India are the most dreadful and extreme forms of the same violence against women which can be discovered in less appalling manifestations in Western cultures.

Other analyses emphasize a greater incidence of misogynist violence in poor communities and communities of color, without necessarily acknowledging the greater extent of police surveillance in these communities--directly and through social service agencies. In other words, precisely because the primary strategies for addressing violence against women rely on the state and on constructing gendered assaults on women as "crimes," the criminalization process further bolsters the racism of the courts and prisons. Those institutions, in turn, further contribute to violence against women.

On the one hand, we should applaud the courageous efforts of the many activists who are responsible for a new popular consciousness of violence against women, for a range of legal remedies, and for a network of shelters, crisis centers, and other sites where survivors are able to find support. But on the other hand, uncritical reliance on the government has resulted in serious contradictions. I suggest that we focus our thinking on this contradiction: Can a state that is thoroughly infused with racism, male dominance, class-bias, and homophobia and that constructs itself in and through violence act to minimize violence in the lives of women? Should we rely on the state as the answer to the problem of violence against women.

The soon-to-be-released video by Nicole Cusino (assisted by Ruth Gilmore) on California prison expansion and its economic impact on rural and urban communities includes a poignant scene in which Vanessa Gomez describes how the deployment of police and court anti-violence strategies put her husband away under the three strikes law. She describes a verbal altercation between herself and her husband, who was angry with her for not cutting up liver for their dog's meal, since, she said, it was her turn to cut the liver.

According to her account, she insisted that she would prepare the dog's food, but he said no, he was already doing it. She says that she grabbed him and, in trying to take the knife away from him, seriously cut her fingers. In the hospital, the incident was reported to the police. Despite the fact that Ms. Gomez contested the prosecutor's versions of the events, her husband was convicted of assault. Because of two previous convictions as a juvenile, he received a sentence, which he is presently serving, of 25 years to life.

I relate this incident because it so plainly shows the facility with which the state can assimilate our opposition to gender domination into projects of racial--which also means gender--domination.

Gina Dent has observed that one of the most important accomplishments of this conference is to foreground Native American women within the category "women of color." As Kimberle Crenshaw's germinal study on violence against women suggests, the situation of Native American women shows that we must also include within our analytical framework the persisting colonial domination of indigenous nations and national formations within and outside the presumed territorial boundaries of the U.S. The U.S. colonial state's racist, sexist, and homophobic brutality in dealing with Native Americans once again shows the futility of relying upon the juridical or legislative processes of the state to resolve these problems.

How then can one expect the state to solve the problem of violence against women, when it constantly recapitulates its own history of colonialism, racism, and war? How can we ask the state to intervene when, in fact, its armed forces have always practiced rape and battery against "enemy" women? In fact, sexual and intimate violence against women has been a central military tactic of war and domination. The approach of the neoliberal state is to incorporate women into these agencies of violence--to integrate the armed forces, to integrate the police.

How do we deal with the police killing of Amadou Diallo, whose wallet was putatively misapprehended as a gun--or Tanya Haggerty in Chicago, whose cell phone was the potential

weapon that allowed police to justify her killing? By hiring more women as police officers? Does the argument that women are victimized by violence render them inefficient agents of violence? Does giving women greater access to official violence help to minimize informal violence? Even if this were the case, would we want to embrace this as a solution? Are women essentially immune from the forms of adaptation to violence that are so foundational to police and military culture?

Carol Burke, a civilian teaching in the U.S. Naval Academy, argues that "sodomasochistic cadence calls have increased since women entered the brigade of midshipmen in 1976." She quotes military songs that are so cruelly pornographic that I would feel uncomfortable quoting them in public, but let me give one comparatively less offensive example:

The ugliest girl I ever did see
Was beatin' her face against a tree
I picked her up; I punched her twice.
She said, "Oh Middy, you're much too nice.

If we concede that something about the training structures and the operations they are expected to carry out makes the men (and perhaps also women) in these institutions more likely to engage in violence within their intimate relationships, why then is it so difficult to develop an analysis of violence against women that takes the violence of the state into account?

The major strategy relied on by the women's anti-violence movement of criminalizing violence against women will not put an end to violence against women--just as imprisonment has not put an end to "crime" in general.

I should say that this is one of the most vexing issues confronting feminists today. On the one hand, it is necessary to create legal remedies for women who are survivors of violence. But on the other hand, when the remedies rely on punishment within institutions that further promote violence--against women and men, how do we work with this contradiction? How do we avoid the assumption that previously "private" modes of violence can only be rendered public within the context of the state's apparatus of violence?

It is significant that the 1994 Violence Against Women Act was passed by Congress as Title IV of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994--the Crime Bill. This bill attempted to address violence against women within domestic contexts, but at the same time it facilitated the incarceration of more women--through three strikes and other provisions. The growth of police forces provided for by the Crime Bill will certainly increase the numbers of people subject to the brutality of police violence.

Prisons are violent institutions. Like the military, they render women vulnerable in an even more systematic way to the forms of violence they may have experienced in their homes and in their communities. Women's prison experiences point to a continuum of violence at the intersection of racism, patriarchy, and state power.

A Human Rights Watch report entitled "All Too Familiar: Sexual Abuse of Women in U.S. Prisons" says: "Our findings indicate that being a woman prisoner in U.S. state prisons can be a terrifying experience. If you are sexually abused, you cannot escape from your abuser. Grievance or investigatory procedures, where they exist, are often ineffectual, and correctional employees continue to engage in abuse because they believe they will rarely be held accountable, administratively or criminally. Few people outside the prison walls know what is going on or care if they do know. Fewer still do anything to address the problem."

Recently, 31 women filed a class action law suit against the Michigan Department of Corrections, charging that the department failed to prevent sexual violence and abuse by guards and civilian staff. These women have been subjected to serious retaliations, including being raped again!

At Valley State Prison in California, the chief medical officer told Ted Koppel on national television that he and his staff routinely subjected women to pelvic examinations, even if they just had colds, because "these women have been imprisoned for a long time and have no male contact, and so they actually enjoy these pelvic examinations." Koppel sent the tape of this interview to the prison and the guy was dismissed. But this is just the tip of the iceberg. The fact that he felt able to say this on national television gives you a sense of how horrendous things must be behind walls.

There are no easy solutions to all the issues I have raised and that so many of you are working on. But what is clear is that we need to come together to work toward a far more nuanced framework and strategy than the anti-violence movement has ever yet been able to elaborate.

We want to continue to contest the privatization of violence against women. But we also must challenge the tendency to depoliticize this violence as a strategy for achieving its deprivatization. We want to repoliticize the issue, not to discard legal remedies and services--many more of these are needed--but rather to recontextualize it. We need to fight for temporary and long-term solutions to violence and simultaneously think about and link global capitalism, global colonialism, racism, and patriarchy--all the forces that shape violence against women of color. Can we, for example, link a strong demand for remedies for women of color who are targets of rape and domestic violence with a strategy that calls for the abolition of the prison system?

I conclude by asking you to support the organization that is going to emerge out of this conference. Such an organization of women of color against violence is badly needed to connect, advance, and organize our analytic and organizing efforts. We hope that this organization will act as a catalyst to keep us thinking and moving together in the future.

RESPONDENTS TO ANGELA DAVIS'S ADDRESS

Urvashi Vaid

I want to talk basically about two sets of things. First, I want to share with you some observations and analysis from my vantage point as an organizer who has worked in the grassroots gay, lesbian, bisexual and transgender movement for the past 20 years. And then I want to talk about some other observations about the movement that we are all part of together, to end violence against women, and violence against women of color.

So I want to put on the table for you first, some of the realities facing lesbians, bisexual women and transgender women of color, and some of the challenges that we face inside the GLBT movement, and the violence against women movement, as we undertake work on homophobia, and racism, and sexism and class, in all its complexities. Second, I want to raise some of the practical difficulties in broadening the violence against movement to adopt an intersectional politic, and third, I want to talk about the importance of grassroots political organizing in any effort to challenge violence against women of color.

There are indeed data to be found about lesbians, bi, trans women of color. But they're sparse, they're incomplete, and what we know is just the tip of the iceberg. There is a tremendous need for more research and more gathering of information on us. All data about lesbian, bisexual, transgender women are likely to seriously underreport our problems, not only because the service agencies that collect these data are not necessarily plugged into networks of lesbians and of women of color and communities of color, but also, because of the lack of the research that's been done on lesbians of color. One of the reasons for the lack of research is because of the reluctance on the part of many of us to access service agencies, police and other interventions, a hesitation rooted in years of bad experiences and low expectations among other things. But the information that does exist reveals several truths. There is indeed a continuum of violence in the lives of lesbian, bi and trans women of color. I want to talk to you about three kinds of data, data on our lifetime experiences of violence in the lives of lesbians of color, data on same gender domestic violence among women, and data on hate or bias motivated violence against women, and what they tell us.

Now surveys of samples of lesbians that have gathered information about women of color reveal high incidences of lifetime experiences of violence in our lives from childhood to old age directed against us by a wide range of different kinds of people and institutions with which we interact. The 1991 Michigan Lesbian Health Survey of 1,681 women revealed that 43% had experienced sexual assault. Twenty five percent had no health care providers; 12.3% had no insurance. A 1993 survey of 483 lesbians and bisexual women in San Francisco, of whom 11% were African-American women, 11% Latina, 9% API, reported that 40% of them all had experienced childhood sexual abuse.

Data on the experience of violence in the lives of lesbian, bisexual, transgendered youth, gathered by youth service agencies, are also quite stark. They demonstrate widespread evidence of family violence, and we know the high incidence of suicide attempts, and self inflicted violence. In addition, significant data exists on the incidence of violence and harassment against people who are perceived to be GLBT in schools and high schools. From Massachusetts to the

state of Washington there are reports that document that playgrounds, elementary school yards, high school playgrounds are just as hostile places as they were when I was growing up.

What's interesting about all of this information is that ant-GLBT right wing today, that is represented in the so-called ex-Gay movement, has really made use of this of data. One of the things it is arguing is that it is because of the high lifetime experiences of violence in the lives of lesbian and bisexual women, that we are lesbians. It is saying that this violence has helped produce us as lesbians. Therapy and prayer can change us to not be afraid of men, and to accept our true heterosexuality. You know what's curious about this? The GLBT movement has no counter-spin. We don't have a theory about what the high levels of violence in the lives of lesbians and bisexual and transgender women mean. And you know why we don't have a theory? Because the mainstream of the GLBT movement today is not feminist.

In the 1998 report on GLBT domestic violence that was produced by the National Coalition of Anti-Violence Programs, about 30 agencies that participated in producing this report documented 2,574 cases of domestic violence involving same gender, same sex couples. 2,500 cases were reported by about 30 agencies. Forty-eight percent of these cases involved women. Three percent involved male to female transgender women and one percent involved female to male transgendered. Overall, 52% of the reported cases of same gender violence against lesbians involved white women, 23% involved Latina, 14% African American, 4% API and less than one percent Native American.

Perhaps most alarming to me was a statistic that was buried in the report. The New York City GLBT anti-violence project found that 80% of those who reported same sex domestic violence to them reported a history of prior incidence of violence. It is not isolated; it is a pattern. It is pervasive, and it is in our relationships. And the problem of same gender sexual assault, as many of you know, still remains a deeply closeted and under-addressed problem. Stories tell us this problem is out there, but deep shame and lack of acknowledgment render it invisible.

The final kind of data that I want to put on the table is hate violence, or violence motivated by bias or prejudice. As recently as 1982 there was very little information, and the problem of anti-GLBT hate crimes was seen as a problem arising out of a victim's behavior, and not from bias of the perpetrator or from social conditions. Indeed, while we've changed some of this perception, the response to Matthew Shepard's death a couple of years ago revealed that victims are still blamed for somehow bringing these attacks on themselves.

The 1999 report on anti-lesbian, gay, transgendered, and bisexual violence, that's also produced by the National Coalition of Anti-violence programs, reveals very high incidences of bias crimes. Overall in this country, crimes motivated by prejudice, based on a person's actual or perceived sexual orientation, constitutes the third largest category of hate crimes. And that's according to the FBI statistics, which are drastically low in undercounting a lot of these incidences. What we're talking about with all these statistics are stories that you know better than I. They're stories of real life women experiencing everything from assault to murder, to robbery, to intimidation, verbal harassment, and physical violence because they are perceived to be, suspected of being, or known to be lesbians, bisexual or transgender women.

So let us reflect for a moment on the GLBT anti-violence movement, and the way that we work

on violence. And, I want to share with you some thoughts that tie into one of the things that Angela was saying. Clearly, the advocates within the GLBT anti-violence movement have, like the women's movement, over relied on strategies that involved law enforcement, police intervention and judicial avenues. And we have a very under-whelming set of options that we've proposed that have to do with education or prevention strategies.

Really its been women of color in the queer movement who have challenged the movements uncritical call for increased criminalization as its chief remedy for dealing with hate crimes. And the truth is, that our movement has very answers to the problem of violence beyond remedies that rely on courts. It is clear to me that because homophobia and heterosexism are so entrenched in the cultural systems that we encounter, in addition to legislative and legal remedies, we have got to turn our attention to religion, schools and workplaces as sites for organizing, education and intervention. I don't know exactly what those projects and programs would look like. But part of the broadening of our work to get to the roots of the problem has to go beyond penalties and Hate Crimes Bills, but has to get into the production of violence in family, in religion, and its nurturance in schools that tolerate violent behavior and hate.

Another problem in the queer movement is that the mainstream of the queer movement operates as if there is a universal lesbian, bisexual or transgendered female experience. The anti-violence agenda in our movement is not defined in very specific reference to the varied experience of violence that women and men of color have, that GLBT immigrants have, that prisoners who are queer might have, or poor people might have. We do not explore the intersectional forms of violence that we face in religious institutions, in the media, etc. The anti-violence movement really doesn't think of itself as having to challenge all the forms of violence we face. Also, we concentrate on addressing violence primarily through providing services rather than through political mobilization. I hope we can change these tendencies for the betterment of all of our movements.

A positive development within the GLBT movement that I want to share with you is the development of a left-wing through progressive, multi-racial groups such as the Audre Lorde Project, among others. Part of the reason we have that progressive wing is because of several decades of leadership by progressive lesbians of color such as Barbara Smith, Carmen Vasquez, Deborah Johnson, and many others. The GLBT movement is not a reactionary monolith; there are real institutions, individuals, grassroots organizations, and networks that are really there waiting to be connected into a strong progressive front.

So what does challenging violence against women require? I think it requires the need to overcome homophobia and heterosexism in the women's movement. It requires political organizing to complement the service work that we have so brilliantly created. We can do it in a complementary manner. And any movement needs to deal with women's multiple identities, our racial, ethnic, cultural, sexual, gender, age, economic classes. To do so is difficult. To add an analysis of homophobia and heterosexism to the work of violence against women does make an already difficult task a little bit harder. But it is clearly critical for violence against women organizations to examine how our programs and services affect and impact lesbians, bisexual women and transgender women of color. Unfortunately, the mainstream domestic violence movement's response to same gender violence is still very uneven. Programs serving lesbians in battering situations are still not institutionalized everywhere that services are provided. We can

change this.

In getting ready for this talk I talked to friends, primarily dykes, who work in the anti-violence movement, and I was shocked to find that they said that the anti-violence movement was not a friendly place to be out as a lesbian. Why is it that a movement that has been built and strengthened and sustained by leadership of lesbian and bisexual women, many of whom are lesbians of color, perceived to be an unfriendly place for us to be out? I think we need to ask ourselves questions like, why are lesbians who are not in the closet in most part of our lives feeling constrained to be out in their work in the women's movement? Why is that? Why are lesbians deprioritizing our own lives, needs and perspectives?

To develop a more politicized violence against women movement, a movement that fights for women of color, requires us to reinvigorate grassroots organizing that can augment the crisis intervention and service models that we are currently deploying. We need this movement because our culture is one that accepts violence against women as inevitable. It's the kind of tolerance and accommodation to violence, the ordinariness of it that I think needs to be challenged, and can be challenged only by organizing. We need real gutsy advocacy to challenge and nail politicians and religious leaders and schools and colleges, in shopping malls and every other goddamn institution that isn't doing anything about violence against women.

The goal of organizing in part is to educate and raise visibility, in order to change public opinion. I think we ought to think about reviving media zaps, boycotts, or direct actions against sexist corporations. I think we have to think about creating directing action groups like Act Up, that are focused around violence against women, and violence against women of color. I think we have to systematically target, harass, badger, motivate, plead with, and our mainstream people of color organizations, like conservative immigrant south Asian groups, to be involved in efforts to end violence and abuse that women face in our families. That's the kind of organizing that is being done, and I think needs to be strengthened.

We clearly have to target the political process, to promote additional measures that can help the service providers. How are we going to get more funding? By organizing and pushing. It is not going to just happen on its own, and nothing has happened on its own. It happened because of our organizing.

Audre Lorde wrote 'I know the boundaries of my nation lie within myself'. These are words that every woman of color at this conference can take to heart. This line means a lot to me, and embodies the truth that nations are made up of bodies, that bodies harbor our imaginations and our aspirations, and the boundaries of what is possible are limited only by our imaginations. There is great promise and hope in Audre's lines. But to fulfil the promise of social change, to transform our nation, we must, as women of color, believe in our power, and really assert it.

Kata Issari

As an Iranian American, we love to tell stories. I'm going to start out by telling you a story about an experience that I had about four years ago in 1996, at a national conference on sexual assault held in South Carolina. At that conference, somewhere early in the conference I gave a talk in which I identified as an Iranian lesbian survivor of violence. I nearly frightened the state

attorney general and local city council person off the stage that they were sitting next to me at the time. Many of the women who were in the room left the room as I was speaking. Because of lesbian visibility in the conference, the conference organizers risked their funding, and many of the domestic violence and sexual assault programs that were connected to that conference in that state were afraid about the funding consequences for them.

The day after this experience happened, I was walking along the beach and I was enjoying watching a lot of dolphins playing in the water. Near where I was walking there were a few children playing and diving in the surf, and their father watching them on the sand. And, just as I was about to pass them a woman came running down the beach screaming at the top of her lungs, "Sharks, sharks, there's sharks in the water! Get those children out; they're going to be attacked!" I looked at the father of the children and we looked out, and sure enough some of the dolphins had come very close to shore, and were very close to the children. But they weren't sharks, and the children were not in any harm. What that experience brought up for me, given that it coincided with the other experience is, who are our enemies, and who are our allies? How do we identify them? Are we able to identify them?

Like that woman on the beach, I believe that we have become confused in this work about our allies, and I wonder if we have become our own worst enemies. I wonder if we are afraid of what only seems dangerous to the untrained eye. We have accomplished a lot in the 30 years of doing this work. We have laws addressing both domestic and sexual violence, we have sexual harassment policies in most workplaces, we have shelters and transition houses, we have the Violence Against Women Act, we have campus programs, we have coordinated community response about domestic violence on military bases all over the world, we have publications and accreditation standards, we have training for police and medical personnel. We are talking about these issues in schools, in colleges, in the media, on television and movies.

But I have to say, although we have accomplished a lot, I wonder how far we've come. Have we made a movement, or have we lost our way? I believe that we have lost our way. I believe that we have changed from a social change movement to a network of service providers. I believe that feminism has become a dirty and unspoken word in our work. We have let ourselves become shaped and defined by funding streams and professional standards. We focus on victim services and not survivors healing and empowerment. We do anger management, instead of holding batterers accountable for behavior change. We do treatment instead of accountability with rapists. We allow legal systems to arrest and convict women as batterers when they strike out in their own defense. We have allowed sexual harassment to become so institutionalized and formulaic in the workplace that when a survivor does not portray herself as the 'good victim' she is not believed or supported.

We have defined our leaders, and sometimes our workers so narrowly, in terms of education and skill and class and age and sexual orientation, that we have deprived ourselves of very important voices, including the young voices of our future leaders. We have forgotten how to hold our leaders accountable. We've compartmentalized our responses to women of color, working women, immigrant women, lesbians, women with disabilities, and others who experience more than one form of violence, in more than one part of their lives and communities. We have over simplified and dichotomized our analysis so now we have good victim – bad perpetrator; heterosexual -- lesbian; professional -- grass roots, sexual assault or domestic violence.

We have been so focused on treatment modalities and therapeutic responses that we have forgotten how to let the voices of survivors lead us. We have allowed sexual assault and domestic violence to be so separate from each other and so separated from all other crucial anti-oppression work that we have forgotten how to look critically at ourselves, and have let racism, homophobia, ant-Semitism, divide us. So we've accomplished a lot, but I think it's at a very high cost.

The phrases that we used to say in the early days of this movement, and still do, by any means necessary, never another battered woman, a world free from sexual assault or rape. I fear that those words have led us to colluding with the very institutions that we have set out to change. Those institutions have changed some. I don't want to minimize this accomplishment, but it has been at a very high cost. Because I believe that in their changing, they have changed us more, to be more like them, than how we were, or how we should be. (Applause).

A phrase I learned when I was little in another context, was to hate evil with a perfect hatred. I challenge all of us here to hate the violence and oppression with perfect hatred. To see it for what it is, but not to participate in it. To demand that individuals, institutions, communities, sexual assault and domestic violence groups do better, and to find ways to do this work without selling out. Really the question for us isn't to mainstream or not to mainstream, but its how to withstand the mainstream, with a grassroots social change anti-oppression analysis, which is at the heart and focus of our work.

To the white women who do this work, I challenge you to acknowledge women of color, to support us, and make room for us. Women of color, as we've heard tonight, have always been in this work. We have often led it, we have often defined it, and you would not be here tonight, 30 years later, without us. So, I challenge you to not trivialize and demean us, and I challenge you to respect us and allow us our time together.

To the women of color that are doing this work, and this may be the hardest part for me to say, I challenge you to look at how we have allowed our differences to divide us, and to hold us back. I believe, and I believe this with all my being, that women of color, doing anti-violence work, are the hope for the world. We have a unique ability and position to understand the intersectionality of the issues that have, in so many ways, corrupted the world that we live in. Yet, too often we exclude one another by virtue of our fear and ignorance. Too often we perpetuate the invisibility of our sisters and brothers; too often we are uncomfortable with lesbians, gay men and transgender people who are doing this work. Too often we oversimplify the issues that face women of color and our communities. Too often I don't hear about Arab and Iranian and West Asian women acknowledged in the course of this work. Too often I hear Asian Pacific Islander as a clump, instead of acknowledging the different nations that are a part of that part of the world -- Tongan, Samoan, Hawai'ian, etc. Too often we look outside of our women of color communities for help instead of looking at ourselves.

To all of us, I challenge us to change how we conceptualize and implement this work. And I challenge you to do that, and challenge myself to do that, beyond this conference. In closing I want to say that I believe that we can do it. It's a rather dismal perception of where we are right now, but I think that it's a realistic one. But some of what we have accomplished, although maybe it has not moved us as far as we would have liked it to, is remarkable. Who would have

thought 30 years ago that we would have a Violence Against Women Act? Who would have thought even two years ago, that we would have had a Color of Violence Conference that would have over 1,000 participants, with many more people turned away? We are creative, capable, vital, smart, powerful people, and I believe that we can find a way to do our differently.

And I also want to end with some words by Audre Lorde, with that challenge for all of us. In several different places she has written, 'We have the right and responsibility to recognize each other without fear'. She says, 'When I speak of change I do not mean a simple switch of positions, or a temporary lessening of tensions, nor the ability to smile or feel good. I am speaking of a basic and radical alteration in those assumptions underlying our lives. Survival is not an academic skill. It is learning how to take our differences and make them strengths'

Gail Small

I'm from the Northern Cheyenne Nation, up in Lame Deer, Montana. My Cheyenne name is Head Chief Woman, a very old name in my tribe. I actually have two names. That name was given to me about ten years ago. I have another name meaning, Woman Standing in the Timber. Our identity as Indian women is very grounded in the land. We can't separate ourselves from that. I think in that sense we're very unique. Others often overlook our contribution to the struggle of maintaining this land. I think it is very important that we never forget that each specific tribe has ancient ties to the land in which they continue to live and reside. It is a very difficult burden that they carry. You are born into a struggle. You really have no option of not being in a struggle. I've never really had a choice of going out and being some very wealthy corporate lawyer. I knew I was going to be fighting for my land, because that's all we've ever known. So I think that we look at violence in a very broad perspective.

My perspective on violence against women and against children basically incorporates the whole perspective of colonization, of our people and our homeland. And I look at it as never, ever, being at peace, never finding peace and tranquility. Ever since the wars began for our homeland, we've been at war. You learned, I think, very limited in your history books in this country about what we've suffered. The oral stories that we know are much more barbaric, like the Sand Creek massacre, where the stories in our tribe tell how they cut off the vaginas and the breasts of our women, and they put them on their saddle horns, and let them dry as decorations. They cut the babies out of pregnant grandmothers stomachs, I mean its very barbaric. I don't know how you can ever say it was civilized people who came to create a society here.

That is the violence that we grew up with in war. It is the violence that our grandmothers survived. They were raped by these soldiers, and that's why many of our people look different. Some of them look Chinese because a lot of the Chinese came through our land when they were building the railroads. A lot of our people look African American, because they had Buffalo Soldiers that came through our lands. So you look at all the different races that we are, much of it is because we were victims of war. And war creates a history that makes us very angry, and we rage. I go around raging. Where is tranquility? I don't see it happening in my lifetime. I have a beautiful home, but I never get to appreciate it because we're constantly fighting. That's the struggle that we're in.

My mother says that we're so angry because my reservation, our homeland of 500,000 acres, is

very beautiful, but we're being surrounded by the largest coal strip mine in the United States. Huge coal fired power plants send electricity out here to the west coast and raw coal into the Minneapolis area. But we're surrounded by huge coal strip mines and railroads power plants, and now there is a big methane gas boom. Our water table has dropped 200 feet in the last three years. So we're fighting this big battle.

And in terms of looking out at the violence that you see among our own people -- the sexual abuse of our children, the violence against our women, even the jealousy among us as sisters -- there is a phrase in the Cheyenne language that translates into saying that we're eating each other up. And that's the real battle that I look at when I look at violence against ourselves. Because the struggle comes home at some point. It hits you in your family. I've had many of my family imprisoned, some of them still in prison right now, because of the Major Crimes Act. The Major Crimes Act targets Indian people because they call us a federal reservation; we are targeted people. It is very important that you understand the federal-state relationship to Native people. I believe in reassessing the whole situation confronting us as Native people; we need to reassess what is our relationship, as the Native people of this land, to the United States government.

Yes, we know they are very strong. We know militarily how powerful they are, but in my tribe, when we're facing a real tough time, whatever the issue may be, some elder always gets up, and he or she will tell a story. There's a couple of stories that always give me a lot of strength. You know the women of my tribe were warriors, very strong warrior women. There's the Battle of the Rosebud, right before the Custer battle, when the Cheyenne allied with the Sioux and Arapaho Nations, and we were with Crazy Horse. It was right near where I live now. A young woman was in battle, and she saw her brother go down on the battlefield, they were fighting the cavalry, General Miles' cavalry at the time. She ran into battle on her horse, and she swooped down and she picked up her brother and ran right through the battle. And they call that, in our tribe, the battle where the girl saved her brother. People always say in my tribe when we're facing, like a big coal strip mine fight, or we're in Federal court or some thing, they always get up and tell us the story of our history, our war. And they say not many people in this country can say they defeated the United States in military battle, but we did. And the story goes, that blood is in your veins, you carry that blood. And you carry that struggle. And you go into that struggle with a strong heart.

So that's the struggle we're born into. It's a very tough time that we're still waging. And I look at the kind of work that my small organization has done. Probably some of the hardest work has been dealing with the oppression that has been pushed on our children. Looking at the sexual abuse of our children in these Christian boarding schools was some of the toughest work I ever did. We drafted a tribal sexual assault law to deal with the issue. It is like a cancer. When they were sent to these Christian boarding schools, they were sexually molested by priests and by nuns, and they came home, and the cancer spread. It grew to the point where we had to deal with it; it was a very taboo subject. We went to every village (we have five villages on my reservation), and we drafted a tribal sexual assault law. And it was probably some of the hardest, most threatening work that we as Cheyenne women did. We had our tribal government pass a tribal sexual assault law. And it's very important to look at tribal government, because as quasi-sovereign governments, as we're known in this country, we have the inherent authority to legislate among ourselves within our homelands. And that's important because we can deal with a lot of the issues that are much more difficult to address in cities because you don't have the

control of the governance. But its also like what Angela said, where do you go for remedies? And are there any models out there that are working? We looked at therapeutic care. We looked at the needs of, not only the children, but those that were within our tribe that are perpetuating these crimes against our children and against our women. And we looked at the need to try to bring them back within the circle. And a key component of that was grief, dealing with the grief of the beauty, the innocence, that we have lost as a people, even among our children. A part of that grief was beginning a healing process, a healing process that has to begin with rebuilding the tribe itself. Rebuilding a tribe that basically is within the belly of the monster, as they say. And dealing with all of the anger and the constant fight and the prioritization of how to survive.

For example, outside my office, there's an old man who lives there. He has an outdoor toilet. And he's got no indoor plumbing. Where we live its 40 degrees below zero in the winter, freezing cold. When people come to visit, I always take them outside and say, look at that toilet. Do you realize that you are sitting now in the wealthiest county in the state of Montana, and we don't even have indoor plumbing and we don't have paved roads. We just got a high school that opening this year, after fighting for 35 years for our own high school, against the state of Montana. The enormity of our struggle is overwhelming. What you prioritize often becomes the real issue. The priority for us has been the homeland. You protect the homeland. Whatever money you get in you put it into fighting for this land. Whatever you have left will deal with some of these other internal issues. But that's the enormity of the struggle that we as Native women wage, and its very hard. But I long for the time when the Cheyenne are going to find peace. When we won't be surrounded by the coal strip mining, the threats to our land, our air and our water will have left. Our young people will be free and innocent. But we'll have leaders like we had in the battle of the Rosebud when the girl came down and picked up her brother and ran out with him.

So there's a proverb I want to end with. It's a Cheyenne proverb. It's a really beautiful proverb. Its like a song. And it says, 'When the hearts of the women are on the ground, then it is finished, no matter how strong the warriors'.

Lourdes Lugo

I want to thank the organizers of the event for inviting me here because, its really rare to be invited to talk about Puerto Rico, because somehow Puerto Rico has been taken out of the fucking world. Its amazing. In the name of the Commonwealth of the United States over Puerto Rico. Everybody forgot that we're still a colonial possession. It is going to be 107 years and we're still a colonial possession, and somehow everybody forgot, from left to right, that this fact has to be dealt with.

I think that tonight all of us have a monumental task before us. I think that if you leave here without an agenda you were in the wrong place, and you weren't paying attention. I know that many of us have our agenda set up for us, of course, those of us who belong to a nation, we know what we need to do, and we've been doing it, and its funny because most of us have stood up here and we say, we've been doing this for the last 20 years. Maybe 30, maybe 40, and maybe we have another 40-60 to go, doing what we have to do. But for those of you who don't have that privilege, well, guess what, you're going to have to figure out what you're going to do to fit into this picture.

It's a very difficult thing, because how do I explain to you what colonial violence is to me, as a Puerto Rican? How does a Native American sister explain to me what it is to have her lands invaded? How does a black sister tell me about what happens in Mississippi against the white police? I can't really, that's really hard to explain, because we just have to live it. There's no book that's going to explain that us. And it's a very hard task that we have taken on our shoulders, and that we've carried on our shoulders.. If you're new at this game, get ready. If you're in here you have to understand we're here for the long haul, and it is a long haul. You are probably not going to see all the wonderful fruits of your work, but you know what, as long as we're still standing, and we're still talking about it, and we're still discussing it, and two generations later (hopefully not), but if two generations we still have to have the same conversation about how to deal with colonial violence and imperialism and capitalism and the seven great nations, be it so. Let's talk about it until its done and its over with. (Applause).

So how do we do this? Well, its funny because we talk about violence against women and we kind of talk like we're not part of it, or we haven't lived with it. Well, wrong. Most of us that have stood at this podium, or most of us that have been here, know exactly what we're talking about, when we're talking about going into your house and getting your ass whapped, or being raped in your own bed, or being a little kid and crying into pillow not knowing who to cry to. And you wonder, how do you stand? And how are we going stand? And how are we going to build a movement about women against violence. Well, exactly how most of the women in this room have survived it -- we reconstruct. We rebuild. We do it all over again. And when we think we're at the end of the road, we find that wonderful light, and we say, let's rebuild it again. Those of us who are survivors in this room, you know what I'm talking about. Just when you think you're ready to give up, and you're standing at the edge of that point where you say, this is as far as I can go, something comes along, a tree, an ocean view, a sunset that reminds you where you need to get to.

So sisters, when we build a movement against violence again, we have to build it as a reconstruction of our own lives. Just as we build ourselves, and just we sit here, or stand here, that's exactly how we build this movement. And we build it with everything that has been taken away from us. We build it with compassion, we build it with love, we build it with anger, we build it with a target. We build it because we're going to get somewhere. That's how we need to start looking at what we're building here today. Maybe we're going to have another conference soon. Maybe in five years we'll get back together and see where we're standing. Hopefully we will. And hopefully the next one will be in a community where other women need to sit with us to tell us their stories.

So, I said I was going to be brief. In that sense I believe that Ho Chi Minh was right, there is people like Mao Tse Tung that will speak forever, and then there was people like Ho Chi Minh, who did forever. So, I am going to end this. I just wrote this up because I'm thinking of a lot of women that have influenced me, and the most recent one was something said by Assata Shakur. I'm happy she's happy in Cuba, and I hope that continues for the rest of her life. But Assata Shakur did a radio program. I don't know where; I don't when. I just heard it. And I freaked out when she started her speech by saying, she hated to struggle. And I said, "damn." But when she said why she hated to struggle, I understood what she was talking about, because imagine if we wouldn't have to struggle for justice and equality. We wouldn't be sitting here. . We would be doing something we really like, and some of the women that I was telling this to were telling

me, man, I would love to cook. I would love to bake cakes. Others were thinking about planting flowers, and talking to animals. So, I wrote this poem, I hope you enjoy it, and with this I'm going to close.

I hate to struggle
And Assata Shakur told me these words
Because if there was no colonialism, imperialism, capital monopoly, the seven great nations
I would be taking care of cattle or dogs
I too would be making books for children
And women and men would have human relationships
Based on equality and dignity.
I hate to struggle
Because I have to fight this fate
And look at this audience
And wonder who will take back to the FBI
And the State Police
Our intent
To begin the process
To eradicate violence from our lives.
If there was no colonialism, patriarchy, racism, injustice
We would be gathered here today to celebrate
Our beauty.
The beauty that surrounds us.
We would live without the fear
Of walking alone.
We would talk to each other without the isms
And the politically necessary classification to be politically correct.
We would instead
Of stating Assata's words of why I hate to struggle because
We would be saying the words of Conseulo Litadia
'I would live and love to help you to live as well'.

Roma Balzer

We have speech competitions in New Zealand. I want to say one of the good things about being the fifth speaker, in a group is a six, is that I'm not the sixth. One of the bad things about being the fifth speaker, is that the other speakers have been so good.

So, kiaora, my name is Roma Balzer. To the Ohlone Nation, and to the tribal nations of Turtle Island, kiaora. To the other nations represented here tonight, and to my eight sisters from Aotearoa, kiaora. Tena koutou. To anybody else I may have missed, Hi.

About 30 odd years ago, I remember looking in one of our newspapers at home, and there was this black and white photograph of this young woman, and she was a young black woman, and she was standing at the top of some stairs, and she had this hair, like a halo, and her arm was upraised, and her hand was in a fist, and it was the first time I had ever seen defiant resistance. The thing that struck me, and on reflection 30 years later, was that Angela was standing up there,

in my memory, virtually on her own. One of the few women that were standing out there, and one of the women who made an impression, an image on my mind, which actually, whether you knew it 12,000 miles away, 30 years ago, there was somebody that was affected, and has been affected by your actions, and by your bravery. I want to say kiaora to you. Angela, a woman of her time, created a blueprint for many of us internationally. I'm here today because of women like Angela.

My people, our people, come from a very strong tribal base. We will all be able to name the tribes that we come from. We will be able to name our ancestors, and while we're called Maori, that's the name of the combined tribes. We all have our own individual tribes which we identify with. And every two years, we have this festival in Aotearoa where the tribes from the eight waka (waka is a boat) that migrated to Aotearoa, where they get together and it is like a really, really big event. There are 350,000 Maori in Aotearoa now, 30,000 of them came together over these three days to compete in these competitions, and I'll assume that some people don't know much about Aotearoa, but we are a competitive people at the best of times. And we do a lot of singing, and we do a lot of dancing, and we kind of move our hips a bit, and we do a lot of war dances as well. Symbolic war dances anyway. And the best tribal group, is heralded throughout our nation after these competitions, and of course my tribe has won, shall I say, on many, many occasions. Two other of my tribe are here as well.

The Te Arawa people are known for their kind of religious almost adherence to our traditions and our protocols, and some of the protocols as they have been interpreted and reinterpreted through the generations, and particularly over the last 160 years since the influence of our colonial brothers and sisters, has resulted in men taking a rather upfront leadership role, and women taking a more passive, quiet role. That's my tribe. Its one of the things that all the other tribes laugh at us about. But anyway, the women in my tribe are also known to have been songbirds. Of course I take after my mother's side, she comes from another tribe, but, we're known for being songbirds. And in the competitions, for the last 18 years, there's a prize given to the lead female singer, and my tribe has won it. And the image that the women, her name is Areta, has presented, is the image that is known in my country of Te Arawa women, of being very contained, slightly aloof, quite, almost ethereal, with this beautiful songbird voice. We don't make physical contact with each other, we stand slightly apart. And that's an image which has been portrayed for many, many years of Te Arawa women.

Well, in February of this year, we had the competitions and a new and very young group, not young in age, but the group itself is a young group, performed. And there was this woman, and her name is Tiny Morrison, and if anybody has seen the film 'Once Were Warriors', her brother Temuera Morrison was Jake the Muss. And Tiny Morrison, of course, comes from a performing family, but she has this hair, and it comes down like this, and it is blonde. We say that she captured the rays from the sun and sprinkled them over her hair, because we're quite poetic. Normally we would stand in lines and we would kind of move our hands, and sway our hips, but Tiny did something really, really different. She ran around the stage the whole time. And, when the party were doing their number, she was breaking through this crowd and she had, what was called a patu, and a patu is stone adze; it's a weapon used in warfare. She was on the stage, and she was yelling at other members in the group. And she was pumping their blood to war. And the more she pumped their blood, the more stirred they became, and the more passionate they became, and the more frenzied they became, and it was the most brilliant session I have ever

seen. And the hairs on the back of your head just stood up, and it was like, we are warrior women. We are not passive. We are not quiet. We are not docile women as has been told to us, and as has been portrayed by so many of my elders who I love very much. She brought out what had once been there, and we knew was there, but was never talked about. She, in that one act, will change the image of women in these cultural festivals, for mai ano, for the rest of time.

In 1830 my people had a population 150,000, by 1900 we were 30,000. We had introduced to us over those 70 years, guns, muskets, which completely changed the face of warfare amongst my people. We had disease, which decimated the tribes. We had English legislation and government. We had their military come and totally reconstruct our communities. But the one thing that they did that I think was most damaging for us as women, was the introduction of the concept of ownership of land. Now we had been raised, prior to that, believing that land was communally owned, and that our role with land was as governors, as caretakers of that land, to ensure that what we took out of it we replaced back into it. It was both a nurturer and a provider, a sustainer for our lives. The introduction of that concept of individual ownership of land, meant that we now saw land as a commodity, as a possession to be carved up and divided.

Now in my culture, one of the really important things that we're taught is the connection between women and land. Whenua. The word whenua means land, the soil, Mother Earth. Whenua also means the placenta, that encases the baby. Puna. Puna is the word for a pond, or for a small body of water. Puna is also the word used for using the amniotic fluid inside the placenta. Tangata whenua. Tangata is people, whenua is land. Tangata whenua is the people of the land. So, in that, we were part of that land. Te Whare Tangata. Whare is house, and tangata again is people. Te Whare Tangata is the house that people lived in. Te Whare Tangata also describes our reproductive system. So that, when land began to be seen as a possession, that could be owned and sold or misused or abused or ignored, it was not very difficult to transfer that concept onto women.

The women's liberation movement in our country probably arrived in the late sixties, early seventies amongst my white sisters, but it didn't necessarily incorporate, or even understand, or even want to tolerate indigenous women, or First Nation women. A lot of us got involved in it, because it was a movement that seemed to be going somewhere, and included women, and we all really could identify with that, but not really understanding why we didn't fit in very comfortably. In about 1983, our first women's shelter actually opened in about 1973. Maori women stood up at a national conference, not unlike this. We left, and said there will be the day when we will come back, but now we want to work with our own sisters. And that caused such a furor in the movement that there was media coverage about it. The movement itself began to crack. There was much antagonism because we were accused of creating an unnatural division in the movement, or an unhealthy division which could potentially bring its downfall. In 1986 we did go back to that conference and we said, now's the time. And there are other things we want as well. We want you to recognize us as the First Nation; we are the first nation in this land. And the second thing is we want you to recognize yourselves as the second nation and to accept responsibility as second nation people. And the third thing is that we want you, this organization that we've worked within, to become the umbrella to protect us from the racists out in society because we couldn't do it on our own. Racism wasn't an issue that was ours, racism was an issue for people who hated us.

And I have to say that with much blood letting, and crying, and personal pain, and a lot of women leaving at the movement at that time, there were an equal number, if not more, women who said, yes. We're a movement for change. We're about social activism. Even though we don't understand what you're asking us for, we will try to do it. And they did, and they did try to do it.

What has happened now, is that we have Maori women's refuges, or refuges only for Maori women, run by Maori women.. We have refuges for Pacific Island women; we have refuges for Asian women. We actually have a refuge for women with different disabilities. And so the diversity has become spread amongst the movement.

And I just want to come back to the concept of individual ownership of land, because along with that was the whole development of individual services, of fragmentation of services, for women who have been battered. The development of Rape Crisis Centers of Women's Health Centers, of Refuge Centers -- many of those agencies didn't start because we had a political ideology that we were following. They started because we actually couldn't stand the other women in the room, to tell you the truth. We were working in Refuges and we couldn't stand this person, and we'd say, well, okay, we're going to go and set up a Rape Crisis Center. And then for ten years we created a political ideology around it.

I think that the challenge in the year 2000 is to bring those agencies back together, because, as a Maori woman, whether I'm beaten because I'm colored, because I'm first nation, because I speak differently, because I think differently, because I'm a woman, or for whatever reason I'm being battered--it doesn't really matter. The oppression is the same. I need to deal with the racism at the same time as I need to deal with the issue of rape, intellectually, physically and spiritually. All of these things come together and I think that the challenge for the year 2000 is how we, as women, as activists, as people who are going to create the images for our daughters, are going to do that.

I started with a story about Tiny, who is a youngish woman, I want to finish with a story about a woman who, age-wise, is an elder (but she'd never accept it because she always saw herself as being very young). She died this year. Her name was Hanna Jackson. We have these political actions that go on, that actually result in people getting arrested at different times, and Hanna got arrested, and was in court. And she went into court, and she said to the judge, via another person who had also been arrested alongside her, that she was going to speak in her first language, Maori. And the judge was ensconced at this, the court was postponed, held over while they went off to find a translator. She was going to refuse to speak in English. So the translator came, and Hanna stands up to address the court, and she says, 'Oma rapiti, oma rapiti, oma, oma, oma'. And the judge is sitting there, and he's nodding, and the judge kind of looks at the translator and the translator says, 'Run rabbit, run rabbit, run, run, run'.

One of the biggest things that I think we can teach our young women coming up, is to not respect our oppressor. The best thing to teach them is to not respect our oppressor with class.

Kimberle Crenshaw

Alright, I want you all to feel really, really sorry for me. Everybody is saying, I feel sorry for

you. Oh, the talk has been challenging, they've been provocative, they've been eloquent, they've been insightful, they've been riveting. I'm tired! I'm anxious. I'm overwhelmed. I can't sing a tune.

So I say all that to say, I'm going to throw a couple of things out there, and I'm going to make you think that I had a bigger speech to give, but since you were tired and so was I, I decided to save you from it.

I can't tell you what an amazingly beautiful sight this is, I really just can't describe it. There is so much energy in this room, surrounding the conference. I'm just so thrilled to be a part of it. Now, I also have to say that some of my friends know, that I've been freaking about being part of this. Asking my friends, what do I say, and they're like, oh, come on, just talk about intersectionality.

I feel like those people who had a good record in '76 and every time they go somewhere, someone just wants to hear that song. I tried to think something different. So even though I thought I would say something different, being the seventh person up here tonight, anything different I had to say has already probably been said.

But I do have to say in all seriousness, as I was coming in this evening, I had the wonderful opportunity to talk with a young woman, I'm not going to name her or embarrass her, because I'm about to say some things that really impressed me about her. She is a survivor of some many different kinds of subordinating actions, not violence per se, but the broader sense of just having to struggle against so many different things. She told me that she was working as the only woman of color, the only bilingual woman, for an outreach center. So I starting asking her about some of her experiences, and I know she thought this is weird, why is this woman interviewing me? But I kind of just went down a list of things that we knew five years ago was a problem, and we knew ten years ago was problem, 15 years ago was a problem. So I was kind of interested to see, are these still problems? So we talked about how she has to go into migrant communities that she's working with, and the ways that she had to negotiate her presence there, so the content of what she is doing didn't raise so much opposition, by some of the men that she had deal with. So I checked that, boy, that's still happening.

Then we talked about the fact that she's the only person that doesn't have support and interns, check that one. We talked about the fact that recruiting people to come in for volunteers, basically involved recruiting through English language newspapers, through colleges and universities, and through other women's groups. Recruitment didn't involve community recruiting, didn't involve the kind of outreach that would be necessary if you really wanted to bring people who had on-the-spot experience, and cultural expertise. I checked that one.

Then I asked well, is your supervisor coming to this conference? Are other people in your organization coming to this conference, and the reality of that was another check. No. So as I listened to her I thought, well, maybe my friends were right. Maybe its never too often, and you can never say it too much, to talk about intersectionality. It's a message, it's a reality, its our reality, and I just think we always have to try to keep our attention focused on it.

I think that this opportunity that we have here is really unique. Its one of the rare occasions to come together to talk about our experiences, our needs, and our aspirations as women of color,

and as women who serve and support women of color.

So often the conversations that we're going to have today, tomorrow and the next day, occur at the margins of some other event, organized by some other people. So, sometimes, the conversations that we're going to have here, have taken place in hotel rooms, during the 'women's conference', sometimes over coffee at the 'race conference', sometimes we're lucky enough to get a panel, or even a plenary, and when we're really doing business, we get a caucus or a taskforce. Either it's the women caucus if it's our ethnic group, or it's the women of color caucus if it's a women's group, or it's a lesbian caucus if it's a straight group, and then the categories start all over again if it's a lesbian and gay organization. Now, however, the caucus has become the conference. And with this move a fundamental shift, I believe, is taking place that may take us beyond the politics of prodding, pleading and posturing for inclusion.

I want to digress for a moment why it seems to me that this conference, the Color of Violence, constitutes a moment that I believe, as Angela said earlier, we'll look back on in the future as a moment when many factors converged to create something that was new. I have to draw an analogy for a moment, between this moment and the development of critical race theory – a different, but related project in which I'm also engaged. Now for years, progressive scholars of color have been situated betwixt and between radical white scholars on one hand, who were resistant to developing a race critique of law, and moderate civil rights types, who were resistant to the development of a radical critique of law. So we go back and forth, and back and forth, between the two of them, meeting in hotel rooms, meeting over coffee, having caucus', trying to get a panel, sometimes getting a plenary, trying to persuade the radicals that any honest critique of law had to center race; and trying to persuade the moderate civil rights types that any honest critique of race and law had to be more critical.

There we might stay as under utilized and tokenized participants in these projects, until that one voice that finally said, enough about fighting for a panel or a caucus on an agenda that's been organized by someone else. Let's figure out the location from which we are situated, at the racial margins of the Left and at the left margins of Race, and claim that as our space. And we claim that as our space, and its now called Critical Race Theory. Now with that stroke of independence, we created an intellectual movement with feet in both discourses, but with a set of questions and projects that were generated from centering our experiences, rather than speaking from the margins. Now, perhaps its impolite to mention it, but I will. Having directed our energies to the more immediate task of naming and politicizing the condition of our lives, our movement has grown tremendously, while our predecessors have become depoliticized and immobilized.

Now, that's what's exciting to me about this particular gathering. I've been fortunate enough to have studied and worked and learned from many of you around this room tonight, about the complicated conditions that have shaped your efforts to do the work that you do. As women of color, and as providers of support to women of color, the stories of your struggles to maintain an integrated, coherent politic around violence, speaks volumes to the heavy burdens and expansive insights that we all inherit, living on the fault lines of American society.

So many of have stitched together, struggling, for example, within our cultural communities to challenge beliefs that gender violence is less important, say, than other forms of inter-racial

abuse. Or we have been challenging our colleagues in the violence movement to structure interventions in a way that acknowledge, rather than suppress, group differences. I'm the last one to tell many of you about the personal toll that these multiple engagements have cost us, the consequences of literally being pulled apart at the seams. And then having to struggle, sometimes repeatedly, with people who are supposed to be our allies. What a relief! What a respite from politics as usual, to come to the Color of Violence conference, and to get it all here. One stop shopping. Its like a retreat.

So what we now have is the opportunity to redirect our energy from elbowing our way in, to getting comfortable, to occupy the center, and to tell each other, what the world looks like from our vantage point. And it's a vantage point that I've called the intersection. Sounds simple enough, but it is in effect a radical departure from the usual politics of most identity movements, including feminism and anti-racism, just to name two.

There, the usual starting point for politics and analyses is a vantage point which focuses on group members who are not otherwise oppressed. To the law, this is seen as the purest, the cleanest way of getting at the problem of racism or sexism. Discrimination is measured by the extent to which an individual's race, or gender, denies them access to power, property, prestige, the property of privilege that they otherwise would have had. I call this 'but-for' identity politics. It is where the sum total of what racism looks like is measured by the distance between a person but-for his race (he would have been a white male). And sexism is frequently measured in the same way, but-for their gender, they would also be white male. Now of course for many of us gathered here, it would take a lot of but-for's for us to be white male. All of us are two, three, four steps removed from that norm. So from this vantage point it is not at all surprising that many of the experiences and issues that we deal with as women of color, do not readily come into focus within any of the discourses within law, and many of the identity politics among the groups that claim us.

Now I began to figure this out myself by asking some very simple questions. For example, what does discrimination look like from the vantage point of an African American woman? Certainly it doesn't look like the sum total of what happens to black men and white women which is initially what many folks thought it looked like. Now the inadequacy of this framework seemed rather obvious in cases where white women and black men weren't discriminated against, but black women were. And there are a lot of cases like that. Law didn't seem to understand that racism and sexism could easily operate together to produce something that was different and greater than the sum of these two distorted narratives.

So what occurred to me at some point, that if law misunderstood so completely these intersections, could our identity movements do much better, especially with questions of law being addressed by them? So because legal challenges were so central to the problems of domestic violence and rape, it seemed to me that the movement against violence was ripe for precisely this kind of question. From who's vantage point was rape and domestic abuse being politicized? Was it really all women? Or was it from the vantage point of some women? The most privileged, the but-for women, with the women of color thrown in at the end, in that add and stir kind of variety.

I think we can capture this intersectional analysis by asking ourselves more direct, simple

questions. What does domestic abuse look like from the vantage point, of say, a Chicana? What does rape look like from the vantage point of African American woman? What does sexual harassment look like from the vantage point of an Asian American woman? What does economic violence look like from the perspective of a Native American woman? What does the sexual violence look like from the vantage point of lesbians?

Asking these questions over the years, and listening to the answers of many of you in this movement, provided me clearly with the idea that the way that many of these problems are being gendered in anti-violence movements, was exclusive rather than inclusive. Women of color, as we all know, like white women, experience violence as women, but they do so in the context of overlapping patterns of other subordinations. Patterns that shape our experiences in ways that are just linked.

Time after time advocates for women of color demonstrated how the failure to attend to these intersections compromise the ability to provide effective services, and advocacy for women of color.

Now what you've taught me is that we have to struggle against intersectionality in any number of ways, the intersectionality of our oppression. There are any number of examples; I'll just give you a couple. One that I've already talked about that probably resonates with a lot of people, is what happens when women are battered in a context in which there's another parallel system of subordination, that either creates more consequences to that battering, or makes her more vulnerable to it. One example relates to anti-immigration legislation which forces women who are immigrating to this country to marry an American citizen and stay properly married for two years, and the man has to go with them in order to get their permanent residency. Obviously, when Congress was coming up with this anti-immigrant policy, which is largely racialized, what they did was create a context in which women who were first of all subject to the anti-immigrant policy, were also made more vulnerable to the violence of their mates. And sure enough, many women ended up being hurt, and some killed, because they were afraid to leave their husband, for real reasons.

Another more contemporary example is suggested by the Kimba Smith case. What some of you probably know now, especially if you went to Critical Resistance, is that the rate of incarceration in African American and Latino communities has gone up over 400%, particularly for women. One of the reasons this has happened is because, number one, the racism involved in the war on drugs, and in particular the 100:1 ratio for punishing crack cocaine possession. You have to have 100 times the amount of cocaine to get the same penalty as having one times that amount for crack. Now, that gets talked about as targeting men of color, and it does. There is racism there, and its undeniable. What is missing is, what happens to women of color who are their girlfriends, their wives, their sisters, their mothers, their aunts? Because one of the things we know is that, number one, women often are involved at some level in some of the economic activities that their men are involved in. More problematically, women who are battered and who are intimidated by the threat that not only they will be victims, but their families will be victims, are coercively involved in these enterprises. Here's a classic of structural intersectionality, that crack cocaine comes from a race direction, and the battering and the violence comes from the gender direction.

What happens when this intersection is not understood within our movements? What tends to happen is the same thing that happened, for example, with the anti-immigration legislation. Someone came up with the great idea, hey, lets let them get a waiver. How do you get a waiver? Well, you have to go to a psychiatrist. How many immigrant women, particularly non-English speaking women, are going to find their way to psychiatrist to get a waiver? And the same is true with respect to incarceration. There really isn't any attempt right now to deal with the problem of coercion in the crack cocaine sentencing.

So I say all that to say that there are any number of issues that would come up, if the question is how do we look at violence, from our vantage point? What are the additional issues that would come up if it weren't for the assumption that one narrative tells the whole. Well, the reality is many times we can't, and we shouldn't have to.

I had the occasion to see what happens when two identity don't recognize the intersections between the two. One example came from when I was trying to actually develop some data about the rate of violence claims on the part of women of color in Los Angeles, and ran into a few troubles. The police department didn't want to release it, and they told me that there was broad consensus among ethnic groups and feminists that it was not a good idea to let this information out. And the reason was actually quite interesting. The ethnic communities were concerned that if these statistics were released it would give support to the police departments claims that we were inordinately violent. So it would reinforce that stereotype. And the argument was that the feminist community didn't want that released because it would undermine their efforts to persuade the police department that violence isn't just about the stereotyped 'other', but its actually a more broad problem. It is not just happening in South Central, or the East Side, its happening in Beverly Hills, Bel Air and Santa Monica. I was fascinated by this, because on one hand, within the narrow confines of how those movements articulated themselves, it made some sense. But, if those movements had thought about putting women of color at the center, surely they'd find some other way to negotiate those concerns. .

We've talked about here how far we've come. One way that we've come a long way is in the Violence Against Women Act. There are some problems with it. One of the problems is just the way that the Violence Against Women Act was politicized. It is as though our presence in this group of potential victims was a problem that many women felt they had to get around. So the beginning point of all kinds of support for it, that even the Senators picked up was, now I know you all think that domestic violence is a problem of the inner cities, and of poor people, but its also a problem for our wives, our mothers, our sisters, our daughters. So, implicit in that message is, number one, they always knew that domestic violence was a problem, but it wasn't as policy problem, as long as the victims were imagined to be those racialized others. What did the women's movement do in order to contest that? Did they buy into it, or did they contest it? And again, if women of color were centered in that rhetoric, would it have sounded a little different? I dare think that it would have.

So, in conclusion, we are at a moment, I think, where we're reconfiguring the identity politics that informs the ant-violence movement, and I think its an important moment for us to acknowledge. Now, clearly there are going to be a lot of people who challenge what we're doing. They'll say that we are dividing up the movement. They'll say we're undermining solidarity; we're making difficult to speak with universal morality. And there are those anti-

essentialists who say, oh well, we're basically reproducing essentialism. You know, to organize around race is a bad thing to do as though organizing around other things doesn't also implicate some of those same problems. But I think that we have an opportunity, and an imperative, to claim this space -- to recognize that what we are doing is no different from any other identity group that we claim ourselves to be a part of. Yes we are a coalition, and yes it will involve some negotiation around difference and attempts to find ways of finding parallels and similarities. But its no different from the coalition of race that we're in. Race is a coalition of men and women, gays and straights, middle class people and poor people. Women is the same coalition. So, we're just claiming this space and making this ours in hopes that we can make a space that is in some ways hostile to us, more of our home and claim it for our live and for the lives of the women that we care about.

MORNING PLENARY SESSION

Beth Richie

I'm excited to be here because of the places that I've been in the past years, almost 20 years in the anti-violence movement, this is one of the most important to me. It is important not only because of the excitement that we felt at the opening panel, I think its important because the stakes here are very high. I come, like many of you, looking for inspiration and the strength to go on in this work, for a little bit of rest from the stress of our lives. I come looking for the old friends, many of whom I've already seen, and the chance to meet new people, the chance to grow and to think again. But mostly, I came to try and get reconnected to the movement on behalf of women of color who have been left out of this work for so long. I came desperate for an analysis that would take our lives seriously, finally. I'm urgently looking for new language to really say the same things that women of color have been saying to the anti-violence movement for years. So its kind of here we go again. I'm searching for the dignity and respect that our humanity has not always been shown in the mainstream anti-violence movement, at least not yet. And I want to begin my remarks therefore, by honoring and praising the women of color who are survivors here, who have come before me, and who are here now, who I hold as the real heroines of this work. Because these are the women, its their work, their commitment, the ways they've lived their lives and built analysis on their own experience that challenge us, as women of color and allies, to do our work at this conference. They're an inspiration, and I'm always very humbled to be sharing space with women of color who are survivors.

I'm glad also that there are so many women of color in this color. Because it is women of color who have chosen to stay in this work, to come to this conference, despite the uncomfortable, and sometimes unsafe spaces, where racism persists, even amongst feminists in this movement. It is those women of color advocates who have found somehow the means to resist those rigidly controlling programmatic structures that are found in the anti-violence movement, that no longer concern themselves with justice or freedom. We've changed, when we could, those structures. We've left this movement when we needed to, and many have come back and pressed on despite the odds of survival in this movement, in this world, that isn't ready for us yet. I'm honored to be standing here today, with my sisters of color, who are at last receiving the recognition for our accomplishment as warriors in the struggle to end violence against women.

And for those of you who have stood along our side, leaving the seats for us this morning, our allies, white women and men, I also appreciate that you chose to come to be witnesses at this Color of Violence conference. That you chose to put yourself in a place where you will learn from, take leadership from, and give honor to the experiences of women of color. I think that's good. I hope that's why you came. I welcome you respectfully then and ask you to listen carefully, learn well and give us full honor. And don't walk away just saying that you were here. Because that, walking away with our truth, is what my friend Catlin Fulwood says, walking with all of our stuff, that's not ally building. And that's not empowering, that's not collaboration, and that's not solidarity. That's robbery.

And the stakes are too high for that because even as we've entered this new millennium, and the feminist based ant-violence movement in this country is celebrating extraordinary success in our third decade, the concerns, the very particular concerns of women of color, who are feminist

activists in this movement, and our work to end violence against women, are as urgent as ever. So for twenty years there's been an appreciation for gender vulnerability, in part because of grass roots activism, and we have legislation, and we have laws, and we have protections for survivors. We have emergency shelters, and universities that teach courses on domestic violence, and journals. We have tremendous evidence of our success in this movement. We still have tremendous disrespect, tremendous degradation, and tremendous unmet needs that women of color are experiencing, not only in our communities, but indeed, in this movement. And part of the success of the movement has been because of the leadership of women of color, and it is only now that we have a conference that's planned for us, by us, to address not only our own needs, but our needs to work within the larger movement.

Part of what I think our problem has been, and I say "our" because I consider myself a part of creation of the problem, is that we lodged ourselves onto a rhetoric that initially was designed to make sure that the analysis of violence against women didn't fall into the trap that so many other social analyses have in this country, that is that the social problems lie within low income communities of color. Many of us began our public speaking saying that any woman can be a battered woman, that all women experience rape. While we know that is true, what has happened in this country is the 'every woman' in that rhetoric has become a white middle-class woman. A white middle class woman who can turn to the law to protect her, or go to a therapist, or send her batterer to a therapist for treatment. Someone who can rely on sanctions that were never designed to protect low income women of color. The 'every woman' was the woman that people paid attention to, who had a lot of political power in this country. The 'every woman' was never us. But she still consumes the greater proportion of attention from the literature. Intervention strategies in this movement are based on her needs. She is featured in public awareness campaigns except in some very tokenized exceptions. She is reflected in the national recognition and the leadership in the mainstream anti-violence movement. So what began as an attempt to avoid stereotypes, did exactly what we in this movement were trying to do differently.

The consequences of this problem of the 'every woman' is that the victimization of low income women of color is invisible to the mainstream public, at best, and I think worse, that women of color are victimized in such a way that the mainstream movement not only can't see, but condones.

I think that we have to offer at this conference a similar critique of the initiatives and analysis that looks at the vulnerabilities and subordinations in communities of color. Just look at how we think about drug using women, or women in prison, or women who live in dangerous low income communities, or young women involved in street gangs. When they're thought of or examined or considered at all, and this is again outside of the mainstream anti-violence movement, but in the movements that look at those issues, they're seen as special cases of addicts, or special cases of inmates, or poor members of a community, without gender, or gang members, rather than women. Gender is not considered a central part of their identity. Its subsumed under other identities of greater interest to the men of color who work with them, and the social scientists who attempt to study them. Its as if they can't experience gender oppression and violence against women at the same time, because they're subsumed under a master race narrative.

In both cases women of color and women in low income communities are essentially

degenderized. And as a black feminist, activist, and academic, I worry deeply about this problem in our movements, and I think about it, and I write about it, I talk with many of you about it. I try to understand it, mostly as I'm talking to women outside of this room.

Many of us have talked inside rooms like this. We've been to caucus after caucus, we've been in hallways of hotels and rural retreat centers, and in vans trying to get to those rural retreat centers, and staff meetings and classrooms. We've talked and talked and yet we've talked, I think, too much only to ourselves. So on the one hand, while I'm excited and I think the stakes are very high at this conference, I also come with a concern and a feeling of rage and sadness about the women who aren't here to celebrate with us. They're women who aren't in the mainstream anti-violence movements eye's, and I worry sometimes that they're not here with us either, because they're still trapped. They're locked up, still imprisoned, not yet set free. And if we feel an urgency here, and if we have high expectations, imagine how they feel. I want us to focus for some time at this conference on our sisters who could not be here. Not only the blessed, lucky, celebrated, those who had a connection to get to this conference, but those who could not. And the most obvious place where I think we need to pay our attention to, and focus our energy toward, are women who are locked in prisons, jails and other conditions of confinement.

We need to be deeply worried because they are held in increasingly harsh conditions of confinement, with fewer rights, diminished contact with the outside world, where services are being taken away from them, visits are being limited, 24 hour lock downs are more and more common, and restraints are being used more and more frequently. Parole is being abolished, phone calls are being denied, healthcare is withheld, and rape and other sexual violations are common practice. We understand something about that kind of imprisonment because we are interested in ending violence against women. We have not however taken our work to the places where women are really locked up and locked in. They're held captive, held back, ignored, strung out, running, hiding, trying to find safety, trying to find hope and trying to find us in this movement to end violence in the lives of women.

Many are also victims of abuse on the inside of the correctional facility. Increasingly they're trying to call our hotlines, but you can't call our hotlines collect. They're looking for legal services that aren't available even though we have done training, legal advocate after legal advocate after legal advocate in this country. And our analysis of violence against women has been so isolated from the experiences that women of color, many women of color face in their real lives, that is the lives somehow outside of conference settings, and settings like this, that they are still trying to find us. Our credibility is undermined by the extent to which they cannot reach us for support.

There are three things however I'd like to say to all of you before we leave. One is, I think we have to never, not for one moment, take our freedom for granted. All of us are privileged in some way to be here, limited though it seem many times. And without denying the difficulties and tensions and pressures that we face, it is nothing short of a privilege to be here at this conference today. Kimba Smith would love to be here. Instead she is serving her seventh year of a 24 year sentence in a federal correctional facility in Danbury, Connecticut, on a conspiracy charge. But really she is there because she is young, she was loyal, she was black, she was battered, she was afraid, and she was trying to escape.

Second, we have to understand that the goal of our anti-violence work is not for diversity, and not inclusion. It is for liberation. For if we're truly committed to ending violence against women, then we must start in the hardest places, the places like jails and prisons and other correctional facilities. The places where our work has not had an impact yet. I think we have to stop looking for the easy clients, and we have to stop being the friendly colored girls as some of our anti-violence programs require us to be. We must not deny the part of ourselves and the part of our work that is least acceptable to the mainstream public. Just because we're a lesbian. Or maybe because a survivor is addicted and relapsing, or because she may be young and pregnant, again. Or because she's a sex worker or because she does not have legal status in this country. We must not let those who really object to all of us and our work, co-opt some of us and the work we're trying to do. As if this anti-violence movement could ever really be legitimate in a patriarchal, racist society -- in a society where building more jails and prisons is a growth industry, where racism is allowed to flourish through hate speech, hate actions and hateful neglect of communities of color. Where violence against women and poor people in this country is condoned and celebrated. Not only in this country, but around the world. Where some women don't matter except to serve those in power, as nurses or secretaries, sex workers, wives or prisoners.

And the third thing we need to do is listen more closely and remember the voices of the women of color who are farthest from this room. We need to listen to the hardest stories of the failure of our work. We need an analysis that is based on the experiences and needs, not just of some women, that 'every woman' somewhere, but of all of us. All women. We must take leadership in this movement from those who, up until now, have been excluded from this movement. Not only by white women, but by some women of color too. And ultimately needs to be accountable not to those in power, but to the powerless.

We've made some important progress, but it has cost women of color a lot to have made that progress. This movement has cut too many deals with people who don't pay us back. We've built too many coalitions with people who don't understand us. Worked in collaborations with our enemies, and we've overlooked the disrespect and we've excused too much abuse. So much so, that the situation for women of color, in each prison in this country is as dire as ever now. And that's on our backs. The relevancy of our movement and the integrity of our work is only as solid as what we do to end all forms of oppression.

So as we celebrate and learn some new strategies at this conference, I think we have to be ready to go down again with the struggle, and take this historic moment, this moment that we've named as historic, as an opportunity for mass mobilization for women like Kimba Smith, as well as high profile male prisoners. We have to organize communities to resist brutality against all citizens, not just young men on the streets. And we have to end violence against women even when the perpetrator is in a precarious situation himself, or herself, with the law. For if we understand our work at the Color of Violence conference, we understand that its not a just about gender or ethnically specific programs, its about liberation. Its not about getting paid back for past abuse or healing, its also about social change. Its not about model multi-cultural intervention programs, its about freedom. Its not about legal reform, its about justice.

Norma Alarcon

I'm very pleased to be here among so many women of color. I haven't seen so many of us in one room for a long time, a very long time. I'm very encouraged by the enthusiasm, because we certainly need to regenerate ourselves in some way through a great deal of enthusiasm and optimism and sometimes hopeless situations or very difficult ones.

Now, I asked myself, when I received the invitation to come, which I couldn't refuse, because I wanted to be here with all of you, and as I thought about the many sites of violence, and what is an everyday, low intensity conflict in the many structures we inhabit in a white capitalist patriarchy, and the state, I realized that I really have the most experience to address the site of violence in the academy. So I thought I would try to elaborate some areas, some points that need a great deal of work.

As some of last night's panelists pointed out, certain locations, academic locations were created, anywhere from 25-30 years ago, in order to take up the study of ourselves, and these could be African American studies, Ethnic studies which was inclusive of Asian American, Chicano, Native American, and Women's studies. These are spaces within the academy that emerged 30 years ago and were slowly institutionalized into the academy, as it were, to answer to our demand for what I've been calling interpretive agency as well as doing archival and new research through this interpretive agency, that would help us remap knowledge, not only in the academy but elsewhere as well. So these particular programs that emerged at that time have been caught in some very important contentions that were not foreseen, I think, in the seventies, and maybe all the way to the beginning of the eighties. And I just want to start out with one major contention that was not necessarily foreseen, or if it was foreseen, people might have thought it didn't matter, but 30 years later it comes back to us in different ways, and that is the issues of real time, which I think is what many of the panelists addressed last night as well as Beth, those are the issues of real time, contingent, contemporaneous with us, that make us feel that we want solutions now. And, academic time. What is academic time. I'm not quite, I haven't refined what I'm calling here academic time. I do know that political scientists, in the nineties, after post-structuralism, when all the real was in question and can continue to be in some ways, that political scientists were, who as it were, ... that onslaught that came from the humanities, and they felt as if they themselves were going to be erased, started talking at meetings of real time. Is this in real time? And for me it became a useful concept especially if you're working in the academy already to differentiate between real time, of issues, of emergencies, urgencies that need solutions now in academic time, and to ask how does academic time flow. That it does not work sufficiently fast enough for those of us also concerned with the issues of real time.

I think that not necessarily all women's studies programs in the nation, but many, can move more towards academic time so that consequently, depending on where you're located, women of color do not frequent women's studies as much as they might, unless they're more upper class, more middle class. Those of us who come from working class find a huge conflict between academic and real time, so to speak. And, I think that this becomes one of the low intensity conflicts that multiply incrementally, and rise and rise, when we work in places like Chicano studies, African American studies, Ethnic studies, etc. Because if you are in the humanities, as I am, a great deal of my reading is already viewed as second order reading, its not real issue reading, not reading the social text, so a very huge conflict is created between those lenses.

I want to clarify those lenses so as to minimize at least one area of the conflict, and that is

between us as anti-racist, anti-misogynist, feminist women of color. And, it is very difficult to do this because it requires interdisciplinary and trans-disciplinary work, and this is still appears as hocus pocus to a lot of locations in the academy. And part of it, and Cultural studies also appears as a kind of hocus pocus, and part of it is the entrenchment of disciplines as such, who see themselves as free to appropriate our knowledge, incorporate it piecemeal into their, shall we say, conceptual framework, which go back a hundred years and they've been slowly moving along this way and that way processes of appropriation, which I think is one of the things that Beth Richie was talking about when she said don't rob our stuff. We are placed in positions where even our insights that emerge out of conflictive, a low intensity conflict experiences, those insights are picked over, if you will. So that as they are picked over, then we are, as it were, still not producing scholarship that is good enough. According to, well, at least the University of California at Berkeley.

I guess you must, because I do want to speak from, shall we say, my experience, and my anthropologizing of the institution that is a kind of reversal of the anthropological lens and of the ethnographic lens, anything I say, as I proceed here with the comments that I have written, can be located in your imagination as at the University of California, Berkeley.

Now let me go on with some of the parts that I did write before coming here, and some that I have added as I worked, and as I listened to yesterday's panel and other people that I've visited with since arriving. Now given the deeply ingrained misogyny in most of our social and political organizations, and given that often both racism and misogyny, I want to keep using the word misogyny, even though I know that more sophisticated aspects of critical theories have come up with hetero-normativity for example, as the kind of ruling code, I think that an older term like misogyny still works.

I'll have to skip some of my remarks here, I only have five minutes she says. I think that misogyny is still a very important way of looking, as well as what my friend Lisa Hall said maybe I want to say misogynist racism, and part of the reason for that is that if we are brought into a society in the context of a state, that as Angela says interpolates us, too, is that we seek answers from it when it has no answers for us, that to go back to something like misogynist racism for women of color that works along the hierarchical scale that we exist within, may help us also to continue to work against the grain of our own internalized misogynist racism. This is a very important process, I think, because we have to work in a double way, again, it's a kind of another version of a double day, that, and this is not in the household anymore, now this is in relation to the state.

And I say this, become white men somehow, at the level of the voices we must adopt, the forms of reasoning we have to adapt and adopt, in order to talk to that state. So what are the new languages? What would be other languages that would work against the grain of that voice at the same time that we acknowledge its existence. Now, I just want to, in order to remember, as it were, our legacy, I want to remind us that many of the foundational books of 20 and 30 years ago, such as *This Bridge Called My Back*, *Sister Outsider*, *All the Women are White; All the Men are Black, But Some of Us are Brave*, and *Borderlands*, all of these books continue to have a great deal of primary relevance to most readers. There are other books I'm sure. And in that particular book, we were told, by the editors and other contributors, that we were already constituted in conflict and contradiction. These have only grown, as I said, real time, academic

time, how do we work against the grain of academic time at the same time that we're interested in the issues of real time, and this is what we were told in *This Bridge Called My Back*. We are the color in a white feminist movement, we are the feminists among the people of our culture, and we are often the lesbians among the straight. I think I hear us saying that again, still. And it becomes worthwhile to remember that we are constituted in conflict, contradiction and paradoxes, that we have not yet managed to escape, but we have made progress in identifying some of those, and in making that progress, and putting more of our texts together, and refining them, we can perhaps continue to expand what also the writers in *Bridge* said that they wanted to produce a theory in the flesh. I think that this kind of theory in the flesh may very well address the possibility of the new languages, or not new languages but a form of restating that which we already know, and continue to work against the grain of a state that does not necessarily to us, nor can even comprehend it.

Inés Hernández-Ávila

A friend of mine asked in a conference that I was at, at the end of March, Robert Warrior asked the audience, what is it that gives us this sense of independence. He was addressing a lot of Native people, some academicians, some community activists, some leaders in their tribes, very much a cross-section of people, and he said what is it that gives us this sense of independence is our ancestor spirits pushing us on. I believe that, I believe that very much. So I do want to talk a little today about Spirit. Again, not pretending to be what I'm not, and I think its very important for me to say this, because at the same time that I burn the smudge somebody will say, not necessarily in this group, but maybe in this group, will say that I'm falling prey to the stereotypes of Native people, of Native women, as the ones who do the blessings, and not as the ones who articulate a Native intelligence, or an intelligence of any kind. That is one of the odd situations that we find ourselves in sometimes. So I want to burn a little bit of this Angelica root, and for a lot of Native people this is, with all due respect, the big guns. And I want to burn it, and offer it, first of all in respect for the original peoples on whose land we're on right now, and for all of the relations, from the beginning of time though eternity. And I want to offer it for all of us here, all of you, all the ones who are in the other rooms for your spirits, I want to say hello to your spirits, and I want to say to hello to your ancestor spirits, and I want them to know that we know that they're with us right now, and that the real conference is going on up there, and that when it hopefully filters down to us today, and as we go from this place, I think its going to be pretty amazing.

I went through my period of atheism, then I realized that wasn't really going to work. Not only was it not going to work for me, it wasn't going to work for the communities that I was trying to help because it took a little while to get through this thick skull that one of the reasons that I was even where I was, was because I had been sustained by Spirit. I have been sustained by the spirit of my family.

The issues of spirituality and violence are one of the more complex, one of the more complicated issues for us, given what we know of the colonial project, given what we know of the missionization campaigns that are still ongoing, given what we know about the impact of the evangelical movements on our communities, not only in this country, but throughout the hemisphere. That's only speaking of the Americas. There is the incredible grief of having to recognize that Christianity has made such inroads in our communities, that its really almost

impossible to speak about a Native community that hasn't blended in some way Christianity with the original teachings of the people. That has been cause for me, cause for cosmic grief, and one of the main reasons that I'm sure many of you in the room know, is because of the way that Christianity displaces, or has attempted to displace, the sacredness of the female principle.

One of the things I wanted to do with my few minutes today is to talk about healing, to talk about the healing of ourselves so that we can continue to do the work that we do. I know there are a lot of really powerful women, all of you in the audience, and I know that you have your ideas. I think that one of the things that I've been saying lately is that we need to recognize, one, that we are in communities that are in solidarity with each other. And when you're in solidarity with someone you really have to recognize their autonomy. You really have to recognize who the person is, or who the community is and why they're taking the position that they're taking, and respect it. Because they have their reasons for doing something in the way in the way that they're doing it.

I heard a young woman at this conference that I was at the end of March, who's from the Eastern Cherokee people, and she told a story about how her nation, because of gaming, is able to get itself on its feet, in a way that they hadn't before. Before what they'd had to do is to develop basically a strip in their town called Cherokee that was a strip where their people danced for the white men and women, and any tourists who would come to pay. And she said, you know, all of my family has done this, I've done it, I've worked in the restaurants that have Indian themes, I've sold in the gift shops that are not owned by Native people. She said, we had to eat. I sat there, and as she was speaking I felt the deep grief and she recognized that even with gaming, with all of its problematics, has shifted the stage for that community to be able to find another kind of economic livelihood. As we talked later on at a social part of the conference, I told her I appreciated her comments very much, and I said, you know, its not really for anyone to tell you, or to tell your community that what you've done is wrong. And she said, that's what we had to do, and I said, I recognize that. So those are the kinds of things that are very heart-wrenching, you have to have walked that path, and you have to have been in those shoes. .

The other thing that I wanted to say is that I've thought a lot about the term politics of resistance, and one friend commented to me, and it just bugged me when he said it, but I thought about it and it is true. He said, what you resist you become. And I said, oh God, you know, you think about it and its so true, and its happened with lots of revolutionary movements that we can look at. It has happened in community organizing kinds of efforts that we've looked at. Suddenly we're mouthing the very things, or doing the very things that we said that we were against. And so I would like to suggest that we maybe we not use that so much. Now I talk about the politics of transformation. And the reason that I like politics of transformation is that I think that its more female. I think politics of resistance is very male. And it implies an incredible amount of effort, so you have to hold on, push forward, and make this happen, whereas, politics of transformation, to me, as a woman, is using the female energy, that's ours. We have male energy as well, but female energy is effortless. And yet in society we're taught to do things and think in a male energy mode. And I suggest to you, you think it would be logical, of course, I'm a woman, I'll use my female energy. But no, we often use male energy. In academia that's how we're programmed is to function from the male energy mode, and in a lot of other social kinds of situations. So I would suggest try it, and bump up your female energy really high, and see what happens.

So what are the new languages, Norma asked, and I'm so glad she asked this. I'll just say very fast, that to me, for Native people, the new languages are the ancient ones. There are languages that have been ripped from us in many instances and I truly support and believe in the language revitalization movements amongst indigenous peoples. Even the United Nations understands what's at stake when Native languages are lost, they've actually made the statement that biodiversity is linked to linguistic diversity, and when languages are lost, incredible stores of information are gone from us as a human race. I'm very excited about a movement that I see happening in Mexico where Native writers recognize writers who have made it on the national and sometimes international scene, are promoting, advocating vigorously language revitalization movements in their communities, and throughout the Nation, through the use of literature, by writing plays, stories, poems, whatever, essays, in their languages and then translated into Spanish. And I see that as a challenge for Native people up here.

I want to close with a song that was written by one of these Native writers, Rosa Jimenez-Perez from Chiapas. She is a story teller, a writer, an activist, a Native intellectual, very grounded in her community. Recently she just finished a term as one of the administrative staff for the writers and indigenous languages national office in Mexico city, and I want you to think about her, because, I just talked to her last night, and I told her I was going to sing one of her songs, and so she was really happy, but she is an incredibly powerful woman. Her smile would light up, I say it lights the universe, certainly would light up this room, and when she sings the whole history of who we are passes before you, and through your heart. So I can't quite replicate that voice, but I do want to offer this song for her. She is someone who has been battered by the men in that movement, in that association, she is someone who the men have tried to erase, to displace, because she will not be quiet, she will not stand back. You should see her, she is so incredible when she stands up, and she does not often choose to do otherwise. So I'd like to have all of you send her an hello, with my good wishes for the gender politics, first of all to be born in that movement, and then to flourish for an understanding of really who the people are, and who the community is, so what else is new right.

This song translates: Come voices all, all, our thoughts and our hearts we shall unite, hand in hand we will walk this path, that will take us to harvest the fruit of our values.'

Dorothy Roberts:

I'm really happy that the conference organizers decided to include reproduction in this meeting on anti-violence work. Those of who know what's going on in terms of reproductive repression, it really is, and has always been historically, some of the most brutal and barbaric violence perpetrated on the bodies of women of color, and all upheld by the law, in the name of official social policy and often not even recognized as a violation of our rights and our bodies at all. I first became involved in reproductive work when I learned about the practice of forced cesarean sections which happen mostly against women of color in public teaching hospitals, and that allowed doctors to get orders to let them literally cut into women's bodies against their will because the women disagreed with the way in which the obstetrician wants to deliver their baby. And I thought, the law allows men to literally take a knife and cut into you, which would be, in anybody's terms, an assault with intent to kill in some cases, but it is considered legal and something that is for the benefit of the baby, and not even seen to many people as a violation.

I thought I would begin by talking about two women who've experienced this kind of violence, just as two examples of what's really an explosion of policies in this country against women of color to control our reproduction.

One involves a woman named Laurie Griffin who gave birth to a baby at the Medical University of South Carolina, which is a university hospital in Charleston that serves almost an entirely black population. And, this university hospital started a policy called the inter-agency policy, which was a collaboration with police and prosecutors, to address what they saw as the increasing number of crack exposed babies at the hospital. And they decided that instead of treating this as a health problem they would criminalize it, and they instituted a policy that tested women, without their consent for drugs, and gave them a sheet of paper saying if we test you again and you test positive you will be arrested. This is how patients at a hospital are treated. And, in fact, nearly 50 women were arrested under this policy. They were literally taken from, within hours of giving birth, some of them still bleeding, handcuffed, leg shackled, to the Charleston County jail, which is a filthy, disgusting place. Women who were still pregnant were taken there for the rest of their pregnancy, and Laurie Griffin was one of these women. She spent the last three weeks of her pregnancy in the Charleston County prison. Each week she was brought for so called pre-natal care, to the hospital, chained in leg irons and handcuffs, and when she went into labor she was rushed to the hospital and shackled to the bed through the whole delivery. And this is what happens to these women. Now, needless to say, of the some 44 women prosecuted and jailed, all but one were black. And I should mention the one white woman who went to jail, the nurse noted in the chart that her boyfriend was black, so she was being punished for having a black boyfriend.

I considered these policies as punishing poor black women for having babies, and I don't think they have anything to do with protecting black children. This is what the Attorney General of South Carolina says, but we know that in South Carolina, which has an extremely high black infant mortality rate, that they are not doing anything to benefit black children. And these policies are just designed to punish women for having children.

The other woman I want to mention is Yvonne Thomas who was a 30 year old mother in Baltimore who was convinced by the local family planning clinic to have Norplant implanted in her arm. Many of you are probably familiar with Norplant; it's a long acting contraceptive that lasts five years. It consists of silicone vials that are filled with a hormone that pumps contraception through a woman's body consistently, and it can stay in for five years. Now the thing about Norplant is you need a surgical procedure to insert it, and you need a surgical procedure to take it out. So once its in your arm, you are at the mercy of doctors and clinics to take it out. And Yvonne Thomas, like a number of poor women in this country, began experiencing side effects from Norplant and wanted it out. Norplant can cause hair loss, weight gain, and depression. The most common side effect is continuous bleeding, without stop -- continuous heavy bleeding. And I don't have to tell you the implications of that for women when you're bleeding all the time. And she wanted it out, but she couldn't get it out. She said in an interview that when she went to the clinic, and these are her words, 'then they tell me that it's not putting me in bed, as if they know how I feel on the inside of my body'. In other words, you're not sick enough for us to take this out of you. "I feel like because I'm a social service mother that's what's keeping me from getting this Norplant out of me. Because, I've known other people that had the Norplant that spent money to have it put in, and spent money to have it

put out, with no problems. That's how they make me feel. Like you got this Norplant, you keep it." And this was the story of women, some women so desperate to get it out that they literally cut it out themselves, with razor blades. I considered this to be a form of government torture on women. This is violence against women that was promoted in many states, a campaign to distribute Norplant in poor neighborhoods. So much so, that in the United States, this very expensive contraception is used primarily by poor women. Not by wealthy and middle class women, but by poor women. It is paid for in every jurisdiction by Medicaid, and yet Medicaid policy in some places instructs doctors that we intend for Norplant to remain in for the full five years, and only to be removed in the case of medical necessity. In other words, we're not supposed to have control over taking it out of our arms when we want to. It is for a doctor to decide. And it wasn't just decided on medical necessity but also doctors' opinions that women on Medicaid shouldn't be having babies, and they should have their reproduction controlled by the clinic, not by themselves.

The Philadelphia Inquirer just a couple of days after Norplant was approved by the FDA wrote an editorial pointing out that there was also a report that said that half of black children in America live in poverty. And the Inquirer said well maybe we can use Norplant to solve this problem. To quote the editor, 'the main reason more black children are living in poverty is that people having the most children are the ones least capable of supporting them'. And it suggested using incentives to have poor black women use Norplant as the way of ending black poverty.

All over the country state legislatures proposed legislation that would either give poor women financial incentives, you know, bonuses every year they keep Norplant in their arms, or even mandate it. Some legislators suggested bills that said that if you want to continue getting your welfare check, you have to use Norplant. Now, these bills didn't pass, but there was a lot of popular opinion in support, as well as support from high circles of legislators and policy makers that this was the way that Norplant should be used.

As I said, these are just a couple of examples. There's welfare policy that has been passed, family caps that encourage poor women to either not have children, one way or the other. I think that its trying to force poor women to use these kinds of high-tech unsafe means of contraception or be sterilized. And we already know in New Jersey the rates of abortion and sterilization and use of Norplant and Depo Provera have gone up as a result of the family cap there.

This comes out of a long history in America. In fact I would say American society is rooted in brutal reproductive repression of women of color. The very institution of slavery was based on forcing black women to have more children who were owned by white slave masters. They had an economic stake in controlling slave women's reproductive capacities. When the birth control movement started in the United States, a lot of people in this area know about Margaret Sanger who promoted family planning for poor women. The movement had some feminist roots, but it soon collaborated with eugenicists who promoted birth control as a means of keeping people thought to be genetically defective from having children. Then we can look at the 1960s and 1970s where it was revealed that hundreds of thousands of poor women, primarily black and Puerto Rican women had been sterilized -- sometimes even without their knowing. If you want this medical service, you have to sign this form to let us sterilize you. But women were also used as experiments, at hospitals in New York City, in Boston-- interns learned how to perform

hysterectomies on the bodies of poor women of color. This was a common practice, it was so common in the South that it was called a Mississippi appendectomy.

This kind of thinking continues today. It's the thinking of population control that says social problems are caused by the victims of those problems. Its caused by nature. We have so much inequality in our society, not because of racist institutions, not because of misogyny, as Norma said, not because of heterosexism, not because of disgusting wealth inequality, but because the people who are at the bottom are having too many children. And if we just come up with plans to keep them from having so many children, we will solve all of these problems. It's a way of saying forget about social change, instead we'll put Norplant in the arms of poor women. It also follows a way of thinking that says that women of color are appropriate subjects for social experimentation and social regulation.

I was really disturbed reading about the whole debate about Norplant, and poor women, because it always went like this, what is the best way to get poor women to use Norplant? Should we have mandates? Should we give them financial incentives? How much should the incentive be, should it be a lump sum, should it be spread over the five years? This was the kind of debate that was going on, as if poor women of color were just objects to be used by society and their bodies, subject for violent torture, without any discussion, whatsoever, about their own control over their bodies. This is the way in which women of color were talked about in these debates.

One of the latest programs is the crack program. It started right here in California, by Barbara Harris who offers women who use drugs \$200 to be sterilized or use a long acting contraceptive. And, she's got this story about how she had to take in some little so-called crack babies and this is the only way to solve this problem of women on drugs having so many children. And this program has now spread around the country, and has received enormous support, even among people of color. The Chicago Defender, a black newspaper, came out with an editorial calling it the lesser of two evils and that we have to reluctantly accept these kinds of programs.

Reproductive technologies, there is billions being spent to experiment and do research on new reproductive technologies. New reproductive technologies, there's a whole business that is designed to assist wealthy women to have more children, and its very popular. Whenever they advertise it they show the little blond haired, blue eyed baby produced. But there's another kind of reproductive technology research going on as well, which is coming up with more efficient and better means to stop reproduction without the control of the woman. So we've got billions of dollars being spent now on new contraceptive vaccines where you get a shot and it changes your immune system to actually combat some aspect of pregnancy. This is the latest frontier or reproductive research.

Now, Quinacrine is another form of sterilization caused by inserting Quinacrine pellets into the uterus which cause scarring of the fallopian tubes. And there's always some new form of technology that's being researched designed to keep women of color from having children, with as little control as possible in the woman's hands.

Many people so far have discussed the struggles that women of color have had with dominant groups, the mainstream anti-violence groups, and this is certainly the case as well in the reproductive rights movement. Beth said they not only can't see the violence against us, but they

condone it. In the reproductive rights movement many of the mainstream groups have become our enemies on these issues because they're focused on the right to abortion and the right to birth control as the only issue in reproductive rights. And they see the kinds of policies I've been talking about as not a problems at all. More Norplant is better. And so, the struggle to get them to understand that its not inconsistent to fight for access to reproductive health services, while also fighting against coercive reproductive health policies, has been a painful and long struggle for a century that is still going on today.

Well, let talk on a more positive note of what I think we need to be working on. First of all I like when Beth said this is a question of liberation. I think in the reproductive health area, we also have to struggle for liberation of our own bodies. An understanding that reproductive rights is not an issue of individual choice. As the mainstream movement is so fond of calling it, choice is the key term. But what that usually means is that the most privileged people get the choices, and the rest of us don't get any choices. Reproductive freedom should not be designed to fulfil the desires of the most privileged people, but it has to be part of the struggle that we have all been talking about, for a just and egalitarian society.

Now I think part of what we need to do is continue to demand, as we have been, that groups like National Abortion Rights Action League, and Planned Parenthood, and all those groups, that they have to make radical changes because they're focused on the wrong thing. And as I said, often they become our enemies in this struggle, and over the years they have been. They must incorporate these types of violence against us into their agenda and the definition of reproductive rights. But, we also have to continue local organizing among ourselves to control our own reproductive health services. I think what happened with Norplant is a good example of how women of color just refusing to use it, and in fact lots of clinics had to just stop using it. The company has lost lots of money because the word got around. Just do not use it.

Another thing is to join the global movement that sees reproductive rights as a human rights issue. Some of the most exciting work is going on among women in other countries like Brazil, where they kicked the Norplant researchers out of the country. And there's also a campaign against research on contraceptive vaccines and Quinacrine. Americans think that research is always progress, and we're reluctant to say, no, you should not be doing research on this. There is no good purpose for this other than to control and violate women's bodies. Do research on something that will allow us to control our own reproductive lives, and women around the world are saying, just stop the research on contraceptive vaccines. We need to be gutsy, and say the same thing. There's no reason why we shouldn't demand an end to this kind of research.

My time is up, to make some final points, we have to advocate for ending the lie that controlling our reproduction will solve problems that are created by unjust institutions and systems, that's the first thing. We have to end violence against our bodies, and this is primarily the bodies of, as others have said, of the women who are least respected and valued. These are women in prison, women who are substance abusers, prostitutes, all these women who society says don't deserve to have any control over their bodies. We have to end violence against them which is justified by social policy. And we need to claim the power of controlling our own bodies and reproductive lives.

AFTERNOON PLENARY SESSION

Luana Ross: .

First of all I would like to thank all of the indigenous people from what is now the state of California. You always make me feel so welcome in your beautiful homeland.

When I was thinking and trying to organize my thoughts about colonialism and violence, there were so many things going on in my head because there are so many different ways in which we have been violated as indigenous people. So I was sitting at the computer organizing my thoughts, the radio is blaring, the news is on, and the news that's on is about a young white woman who dares to call herself an activist, who was on a jet ski in Nia Bay in what now is called Washington State. The Macaw Nation were out whaling. She is an anti-whaling protester on her jet ski. She is zooming towards the canoe of Macaw people in the hopes of creating waves big enough to dump the boat of indigenous people who were doing nothing more than exercising their sovereign rights. It was a very violent colonial act. The coastguard, incredibly, came to save the day. Unfortunately they knocked her over and the boat ran over her. That was a tragic accident; everybody recognizes that. Yet the news that I'm listening to is focusing directly on the violent actions of the coast guard--how dare they!--, and not on the colonial violence against the Macaw by non-Native activists. These actions, by non-Native 'activists' are racist, and they need to be seen as such. Steeped in the history of violence against the indigenous people these white people envision themselves as environmental activists. Indeed they envision themselves as rebels. This is so colonial. They are nothing more than eco-racists.

This incident reminds me of a documentary by a very brilliant Macaw filmmaker, Sandy Sunrising Osawa called Lighting the Seventh Fire which chronicles the racialized hatred that the Anishinabe encounter over fishing rights in the Great Lakes. This film contains very disturbing accounts of white children encouraged by their parents to spit on Native children, and white adults carrying signs that read 'Spear a pregnant Squaw, and save a walleye'.

Today one can readily witness colonial violence whenever Native nations attempt to assert their sovereign rights. As Gail Small said last night, our war never ended. We are still fighting that battle. The Americas were founded on violence, campaigns of genocide commonplace. Colonialism was, and remains, an act of violence.

Another form of colonial violence that I just want to very briefly say, but its very important to touch upon it, is the criminal justice system. There was a newspaper article talking about Saskatoon, Saskatchewan where Native leaders are demanding a full inquiry into Canada's justice system. This move came after a Native man said two white police officers dumped him on the outskirts of the city, and forced him to walk back in freezing weather. This is not an isolated case. It turns out they had over 100 calls from Aboriginal people talking about violence, that kind of colonial violence.

Incarcerated Native prisoners are left to the discretion of guards and jailers. I've had many Native women tell me chilling horrendous stories about being in jail, and being beaten, and having to play that game of deferring in order to just get by. I've had many imprisoned Native women tell me about being raped, and one woman that I talked to was raped not just once, but

raped seven times by the same jailer. This jailer has now had his status elevated and is the county sheriff.

Another form of colonial violence that you should recognize right away as I'm talking about the criminal justice system is the fact that Native people are over represented in the prisons. Not only are Native people overrepresented, Native women are more likely than Native men, to be in prison. So there's that kind of gender relationship. In the state of Montana last spring, Native women were 40% of the total prisoner population, in a state where Native people are six percent of the overall state population. And so when I say overrepresented, I really mean it.

Looking at colonial violence and the process of criminalization, I think it is important to note that the imprisoned women that I talked to were violently victimized prior to their incarceration and we now know that there is a connection. Their histories were characterized by violence of every form including physical, psychological, denial of culture as a kind of colonial violence, poverty, racism, sexism and so on. Moreover this violence is institutionalized. These women were violated by family members, boyfriends, jails, reform school, adoptive and foster care system, Indian boarding schools, and on and on and on. The oppression is as complex as it is relentless.

Inside prison these women experience a violence that is very unique to the penal system. It is not uncommon for imprisoned women to attempt suicide or to slash, as they call it, as a way to relieve their emotional turmoil, because of the brutality in these women's lives prior to incarceration. They are repulsed; they are sickened about what takes place in prison. They continue to have nightmares about their beatings, their rapes. They are unable to watch violent movies or read about violence because it nauseates them.

Moreover, its important to note that many Native women have been in prison their entire lives. Their prisons all based on control take the form of family, boarding schools, abusive relationships with men, jails and prisons and so on. Many Native women directly connect their involvement in an inhumane crime to a childhood filled with violence.

Imagine that you're at a pow wow in the Plains area and you're sitting there, and the elders have come in, and the tribal flag has been honored, and then there's this really, really good looking, traditional dancer. He's the stereotypic image of the Plains Indian, and he's graceful with his moves, and his feathers are flowing in the air. That would be the man who raped my niece. That's what we're seeing in Native communities -- a staggering amount of violence in Native communities.

Not only is there a staggering amount of violence in Native communities against women, but there's a staggering amount of violence in Native communities against children. And what I found in my community, in Montana, Salish and Kootenai community is this kind of violence is ignored. And why? Precisely because of the example that I just gave you. It is because these men are seen as 'respected.' They have very high status in Native communities. They're either cultural leaders, tribal councilmen. It's the men that have the control, and so that's why the violence is allowed to continue. We also know that historically Native women were routinely violently violated by agents of Euro-America, although sexual violence in Native communities prior to colonization was rare. Today, the violence remains invisible and hidden. Today, tribal communities are patriarchal, not egalitarian.

In an essay by Andy Smith about sexual violence and American Indian genocide she notes the silence surrounding sexual violence in Native communities. Her research reveals that while the Department of Justice poured millions of dollars into tribally based sexual and domestic violence programs, virtually no tribes have developed comprehensive sexual assault programs. Thus the survivors of sexual violence often find no support in tribal communities as they try to heal and as they seek justice. As a result, some survive; we all know them, I'm one; you're one. Some do not survive. I have a sister who is a street person; she did not survive the violence. We all have sisters or are related to somebody who did not survive.

Andy Smith also says in the same essay that according to the Mending the Hoop Technical Assistant Project in Minnesota, many tribally based sexual assault advocates argue say that one of the difficulties in addressing violence in tribal communities is that many tribal members believe that sexual assault is traditional. This couldn't be further from the truth.

Smith argues that "far from being traditional, sexual violence is another attack on Native sovereignty", and, as stated by an elder at a conference that Andy was at "as long as we destroy ourselves from inside we don't have to worry about anyone from the outside." Andy also argues that through colonization Native people have this internalized self-hatred. This self hatred is another form of colonial violence. This self hatred was learned in a lot of different arenas, including boarding schools and institutions of confinement.

Okay, now there is some good news, so I'm going to say the good news. The good news is that Native people have been reclaiming traditional methods of justice. Traditional methods of justice were outlawed by the Federal government in the 1800's, so that's the encouraging news. They're doing this in two different ways. One way is some courts are combining indigenous customary law with the Euro-American paradigm, so there's this blend of dual justice systems. An example is the Navajo Peacemaker Court. It is important to note with that this kind of blend the Federal government will limit you to misdemeanors, and they're always watching what you're doing.

Okay, here's another example, a real rebel example. The other example is that of the Pit River Nation, right here in Northern California, who exercise their sovereign rights, and implemented traditional tribal law by banishing a tribal member for 'acts unbecoming' a family and community member. This Nation found him guilty of, and this is from their letter 'committing incestuous acts with his teenage niece'. This hideous act of violence against Native girls by Native men does occur, and must be made visible.

As Native people who are still reeling from colonialism we cannot ignore this type of violence. And the reason I bring this up is the Pit River Nation said we're going to do it. The Federal government has said we don't have the right. B.S. We do. We're a sovereign nation. This guy has violated a female in our community, we are no longer going to consider him a community member.

So, the point I was trying to make was that there are inter-related systems of oppression that render Native women vulnerable to many different types of colonial violence. That was my point. And as we struggle in our efforts to decolonize, you guys must help us, as indigenous people, in our efforts to decolonize. We must remember as Native people in these efforts that

violence against women is not a Native tradition. And, one last thing to say, as we meet and share our knowledge, I want you all to remember you are on Indian land.

Anannya Bhattacharjee

I'm a first generation immigrant woman from India, from a regular kind of family, with its dose of child abuse, domestic violence and incest, and financial difficulties, and I don't remember the last time I was as honored as I am this time to be in the presence of a lot of women who have worked many more years than I have, and from whom I've learnt a lot. And more importantly I have a very special note of gratitude for you all and that is that as a first generation immigrant woman from a Third World country, you all have created a space within which I have found my voice in this country, and that is fundamental to living.

I remember one night when my co-worker at the time and I heard about a South Asian immigrant woman from Bangladesh who was pregnant, and was being beaten and kept isolated by her husband and in-laws. A friend of the woman's family told us about her. There was no way to reach her, she was not allowed to use the phone and did not speak English, and was undocumented. Some family member was always guarding her movements in the house. Her husband and father-in-law owned a grocery store below the apartment. The three of us showed up, my co-worker, the family friend and I, pretending we were there for a social visit. We chatted briefly with the father-in-law and the husband, bought a couple of newspapers and proceeded upstairs to the apartment. Two of us then engaged the other family members so that one of us could have a quick whispered conversation with the woman and give her a piece of paper with our numbers on it. I started to mouth the word police, saw the horror in her eyes and stopped right there.

As domestic violence advocates, I did not see a precedent around me among the women's movement which would just make me run out of that apartment and scream to everybody on the street and say look what's going on there, and I don't think the woman either had that precedent. So the privacy of this home was sacred, is my point.

Yet another time, another co-worker and I were called by a woman who said that she had accidentally met a live-in recently immigrated Indian domestic worker who was working in a house owned by a professional Indian couple. She was working around the clock, was hardly paid at all and had no permission to communicate with the outside world. She was desperate and wanted to escape, but did not know how. We knew that if we just showed up it would be no good, as we would be lied to or accused of trespassing. We contacted the police briefly although we knew that was risky. They said could not help us reach the family without being charged with trespassing. The privacy of this home was sacred too.

Recently in the process of writing a document on violence and law enforcement I found the following story. A 50 year old African American woman was lying in her room, and her daughter was in the living room. The daughter heard a drilling noise and went to the door to check it. Just then the cops busted in. The daughter ran out of the room scared. They shot after her and the bullet went into the wall. She ran to her mother's door. The cops grabbed and pulled her back and broke down the bedroom door. Five officers ran in cursing wearing riot gear. They told the woman to shut the fuck up. They picked up the bed and said there's nothing here. They

claimed they had reports of heavy drug activity, but the woman told them they had the wrong house. They made the mother and daughter stand in the hallway in full view of the neighbors while they searched their house. They took them to the precinct, kept them locked up for several hours and gave them a summons for half of a joint and a three dollar bag of marijuana they said they had found. The privacy of this home was clearly not sacred.

Its telling that in these three stories, laws of privacy are ultimately broken by law enforcement—not in the pursuit of ending immigrant worker exploitation, or in the pursuit of protecting a domestic violence survivor, but in the pursuit of an imaginary drug bust. It is a lesson in irony to me, that the cultural privacy that is a product of laws which protect the batterer and the employer, not the victim of police brutality, is the very culture that constrains us as advocates in our intervention. To me this is a signal that its time for some new definitions and rethinking. It is time to take control of definitions which are made for us, not by us.

How would we envision safety in the home in a way that includes the live-in domestic worker, who fears not only her employers economic power, but their access to the state? How would it include an immigrant woman worker at the border whose house is suddenly busted in an INS raid? Or a US born woman of color in New York city whose house is busted by the police as they illegally enter without a search warrant? How would such a vision also include an immigrant or US battered woman who wants protection but also fears that if she calls the law enforcement they'll take away the little control that she has? A view of home as a place that is vulnerable to not only private violence, as with intimate partners, but also public violence that is state violence, can help to break the artificial public and private divisions in our anti-violence work -- divisions that are against our interests.

It is inconsistent for us to think that we can demand protection from law enforcement on the one hand, and organize around police brutality on the other hand, as if we were seeking protection and resisting brutality from two different agencies. We must have consistency as we imagine strategies for safety. We need to strategize to develop broader cross issue and community based strategies for ensuring safety in the home.

Another concept that has been very important in the women's movement is the concept of mothering and more broadly care-giving. An African American woman who is a member of a support group for mothers with sons and daughters in prison, and whom I was interviewing for my document said, my oldest son is in prison. I attended the trial everyday until the jury was given the case. My son was found guilty and sentenced. There was no-one with whom I could share my grief and heartache. I closed the door to my room and cried most of the day and into the night. Each and every one of these young men and women has someone who is concerned about them. What is happening to our children? Do we realize there are issues of accountability. There are constitutional rights which protect them. Do we know them? No because we rarely are able to ask these questions without being looked upon suspiciously ourselves. Women often bear the financial, emotional, and legal burden of the prisoners inside, which often goes unacknowledged.

Take the case of an immigrant woman who's out on the street with her children because her husband was just deported in an INS raid. They get evicted for not being able to pay rent, and she has to figure out how her family will survive this sudden tragedy. Going back to her home

country would put her back into the poverty that made them leave in the first place. She is shocked that what began as a desperate for economic survival ends up as a criminalized activity. Her immigration status is no more secure than her husbands was, and she has to figure out how to survive as the sole care giver now.

Immigrant and US born women of color in these two stories both have a lot to share. As we see the state without any acknowledgment, and quite shamelessly, lets the mother of the prisoner and the wife of the deportee bear the high cost, emotional, legal and financial, of incarceration in one case, and deportation in the other. These costs have to be borne by women who continually attempt to unify their families and build their communities even as their efforts keep getting dismantled.

What does motherhood involve for the migrant domestic worker who has left their children in another country and is now an absent mother, relying on care givers in her homeland as she sends her earnings back to support them? Immigration laws privilege the entry of high skilled professionals and their families. A poor immigrant worker faces two options, starve with the children in her home country, or near permanent separation from her children as she migrates to the US to work without legal papers. This near permanent separation is also a result of the 1996 immigration laws. She cannot bring her family as she earns well below the income that is required for family sponsorship, and she cannot go to visit them. What does motherhood mean for a woman facing a decade being bars for drug use, as she struggles, like an absent mother, to arrange her children's lives which are spinning out of her control? She struggles against unbelievable odds to find caregivers, to negotiate with the foster care system, to keep custody, to keep her relationships with the children, and to keep her sanity. As absent mothers, which has emotional, legal and financial consequences, both immigrant and US born women of color must deal with the state sponsored and often corporate engineered forces that deny them motherhood, criminalize and stigmatize their right to motherhood, make them struggle for it, but at the same time, forces such women to bear the cost of their families survival.

A third concept that has been pivotal in the women's movement is women's bodily integrity or reproductive freedom. In the name of protecting the foetus, the state with the help of anti-abortion activists has been gradually shrinking the right to bodily integrity for all women. I would like to ask, where is this compassion for the fetus, when a pregnant woman is caught in an INS raid at her workplace, or at the John F Kennedy airport and whisked away to INS detention, possibly for deportation? She may go without adequate food, suffer physical trauma and may even miscarry. Where is this compassion for the foetus when a woman of color is singled out among others in her public hospital ward, tested for drugs, charged with child abuse and incarcerated in a prison where she is unlikely to get much pre-natal care, and may even give birth in a bed shackled in chains? Where is the concern for the fetus when there are few substance abuse treatment centers that allow pregnant women or women with children, and instead she gets a prison sentence? Where is the concern for the fetus when a pregnant woman who kills her batterer in self defense has been incarcerated?

By claiming to protect the fetus, by claiming that it is women who is anti-life and therefore need to be controlled, the state, along with its supporters, has managed to clothe its agenda in morality and compassion. We cannot give up that to the state. As organizers and advocates who believe in reproductive freedom for women we need to include in our framework an understanding of

those issues that violate the bodily integrity of women at the US borders, in the prisons, in detention centers, in public hospitals conducting unsolicited drug tests. Otherwise we will continue to implicitly participate in masking the agenda of those who wish to first devalue pregnancy for so-called criminalized women, and then through that broaden support for devaluation of all women.

In general, in order for a broad strategizing to develop that addresses reproductive freedom in the broad and only meaningful sense, it is critical to break the false divisions between criminalized women and so-called non-criminalized women; between immigrant women and US born women of color; at the border, in inner city homes and hospitals, at the workplace, in jails and in prisons. Its through this lens that we can define reproductive freedom as a community issue, about self determination in communities of color.

Before I make some concluding points, I would like to describe a few thoughts that have occurred to me during my involvement with police brutality work in New York city. Let me first say that its an area of work that I'm very committed to and which has done some spectacular work in recent times. While doing the work it is abundantly clear to me as it is to many other women whom I worked with, that there a lot of women in the police brutality movement, of all ages. That is to say there are a lot of women given the fact that most of the victims that one hears about are around whom maximum mobilization occurs, are mostly men. That is great. I do not mean to say that should not happen. Nevertheless it raises some questions for me. When I first got involved in the issue I would be told, and I began to believe it at first, that it is because men face more police brutality because it occurs on the street or in jobs that men do. I've had time to learn more and think about this, and the issue is more complicated, and the quick answer is unsatisfying.

While advocating for police brutality victims, looking at records of police watch organizations I have found that women play unacknowledged roles, and their visibility depends on who is counting them. When a man is arrested it is very common for any woman accompanying him to go through similar treatment up to a point, with the police, but her encounter may not result in a police record, and the man's might, therefore erasing her role as far as records go. After a man is arrested it is common for his mother or grandmother or sister to negotiate on his behalf with the police and bet beaten up or harassed in the process inside the precinct, leaving no record.

In addition women may face policing in spaces removed from the public eye, such as the home. Young women may be sexually taunted or harassed by the police and may have a difficult time talking about it, because sexual harassment is not easy to talk about it. And the fact that maximum mobilization seems to focus on the male victim, which is not to say that's not important to do, makes women minimize their experiences.

In the movement that we build we have to be watchful to see how women are not counted, silenced, not acknowledged or minimized. As we support the very important and critical mobilizations that do take place against state violence it is our responsibility as women to make visible such silencing. Not simply because we are women and we must look after ourselves, but because we have that a movement, however powerful, when women are not counted the movement remains half conceived.

And as a women's movement we need to engage with state violence through law enforcement otherwise it will become a domain defined by the perspective that by and large centralizes male victims of state violence. In the women's movement we talk about protection as if this state has no relationship with the other, and this lack of connection weakens the foundation of our work.

Finally, the point I want to make is that unless immigrant and US born communities of color can work together around this issue, then the state will continue to benefit from our divisions. Words like national security or job protection or overpopulation are used to explain law enforcement in immigrants of color communities, and quality of life for US born people of color, until we realize that these terms have similar consequences for both communities except that one is a global term relating to national borders and national security, and the other is a domestic term relating to racist and classist borders within the borders of the United States. Unless we realize these things, false beliefs will continue to deepen suspicions and one community will support an increase in law enforcement in the other community thinking that that's where the problem is.

So I guess, alliances and common strategies that have so far eluded us for the most part, is I would say, the order of the day. What are the points of intersection and strategizing that are important to discuss if we got together in a room, critical advocates in the domestic organizations, reproductive rights organizations, sexual assault groups, INS accountability organizations, police accountability organizations, prisoner's rights groups and welfare rights groups. In these configurations views might be oppositional, but it is precisely through the working out of these oppositional views that we can begin to address the complexity of state responsibilities, and the centrality of women. Through the notions of safety in the home, reproductive freedom, mobility and value of women's labor, self determination in motherhood and care-giving, the women's movement can bring a critical analysis to the growing resistance against state violence, at the same time that it can develop a more holistic and fresh analysis of the concepts that have been the cornerstones of violence against women work.

Margo Okazawa-Rey:

I'm going to talk about one form of state violence which is military violence against women and the whole system on which its based -- militarism. What I want to do is talk about militarism and its connections to violence against women --the relationship between US foreign policy and domestic policy and frameworks for organizing against military violence and militarism.

Tomorrow marks the 25th anniversary of the end of the US war in Vietnam. And I say US war in Vietnam, not the Vietnam war. Most likely, any kind of meaningful discussion committed against women and children and against the environment in Vietnam will not be covered by CNN, New York Times or ABC. These issues will not be covered -- the rapes, the sexual assault, the murders of Vietnamese women by US military personnel, of Chinese women in Nan King and the sexual enslavement of poor Korean women, the so-called comfort women, by the Japanese Imperial army, of Muslim Bosnian women and ethnic Albanian women in Kosovo by Serbian forces, and the UN Peacekeeping forces, women in Rwanda, Sudan, Sierra Leone, by their African brother soldiers, of the 12 year old Okinawan girl, by three African American service men, of women in the US military by their fellow military personnel, and, wives of military personnel, Mexican women at the US Mexico border by the INS patrol, women in prisons across this country. There is rape, sexual assault and murder of indigenous women all

over the world by colonial militaries. And last, but not least, there is the devastation of the physical environment through military operations that in some ways are not reversible. The military is the most environmentally devastating institution there is.

These are dramatic yet I'm afraid very routine forms of military violence against women. They are on the extreme ends of the continuum of violence against women, and the continuum of masculinity and masculinist values. They are perpetrated to humiliate, obviously the women themselves, but also the men who, in their patriarchal roles, are supposed to be able to 'protect' them. The common elements that tie these examples together are, what I think about, is the complex inequalities of gender, race and ethnicity and class, and equally important, and sometimes we forget this category, the category of nation. And by nation I mean nation states and First Nations within nation states. We need to focus on issues of imperialism, colonialism and neo-colonialism.

We must also look at the global capitalist system and the central role of military in the operations of that system. And it is not surprising that not only the US, the richest country in the world, but also very poor countries, spend enormous amounts of their national budgets on military operations, which I will say something about.

In the fall of 1998 I heard William Cohen (Secretary of Defense) on CSPAN speaking to a Fortune 500 audience and basically he said, you all open the markets and we'll keep them open. That's the connection.

Another important element is the cultural values promoted by militarism, particularly the social construction of masculinities described as militarized masculinity by Cynthia Enloe, and hyper masculinity by Rita Nakashima Brock. These masculinities revere invincibility, relationships of domination and subordination, and also the eroticization of domination as part of male sexuality, emotional detachment, and construction of an 'other'. They also include at its core, misogynist ideas. Angela Davis, last night, gave an example of cadence chants, which are based on very misogynist ideas about women and how they should be treated, are at the core of military training, and most notably the Marines are at the forefront, but they're all bad.

Military violence gets played out in three specific contexts. I want to just talk a little bit about each of those. They are justified in the name of national security and community safety. And in fact, militarism creates gross insecurities.

One situation is in armed conflict situations with open warfare, and other forms of active armed conflict such as in Sierra Leone, Rwanda, the Sudan, Chiapas, Indonesia. The second, is in preparation for war. Although the US is not formally at war, it and other nations actively prepare for war. The US is supposed to be prepared to fight two battles at two fronts, simultaneously—the Middle East and the Korean peninsula. And that means the long term physical presence of military bases and personnel outside the US. In Korea there are 96 US bases and installations with 37,000 troops. And Korea is about one fourth the size of the state of California. In Okinawa and Japan, there are 39 US bases, 48,000 troops another 15,000 or so troops on ships. Bases are in Germany, Iceland and of course, Vieques in Puerto Rico and Hawai'i. It also has joint military exercises with the Philippines as prescribed in the visiting forces agreement that was ratified last year. The US continues to train military personnel for many other countries,

particularly Latin America, through the US Army School of the Americas in Georgia. And the US is increasing its militarization in South America with the construction of facilities in Peru and Ecuador as a strategy to isolate Colombia in its effort to control drug trade.

The third setting is in low intensity conflict situations. What's referred to as low intensity militarization is happening in our communities. There is increased police activity, proliferation of security guards and private security firms, and the establishment of the prison industry that is currently fueling some local economies and making it one of the fastest growing industries in the country.

What I want to do is for all of us to really make this connection between the US military presence overseas and the kinds of militarization I talked about, by connecting foreign policy and US domestic policy. The disinvestment in schools, socially useful spending, and increasing military spending, which the US right now in the fiscal year 2000-01 results in 47% of the federal budget being spent on past and present military efforts. That includes things like interest on the national debt that was accrued in very dramatic rates during the Reagan-Bush administration. It also really causes us to look at the JROTC programs in our high schools, in urban areas and in southern areas. California and Texas, are prime states. And having JROTC programs used as ways to deal with 'at risk' kids and teach them discipline and self esteem and all of those things that you don't really learn from the military.

And then there is specific targeted recruitment of youth of color. And I think there's a several million dollar effort in particular to recruit Latino youth. And in fact, one of the three men who were captured in Macedonia last year, during the war in the Balkans, has been used as kind of the poster guy, going around and recruiting Latino kids to join the military.

The other thing I think it is really important for us to do as anti-violence activists, based in the US, is really to recognize and understand the concept of nation. I think we're very good about talking about race, class and gender, but forget that this category of nation is a very important organizing and analytical principle. But when we do that I think it brings up some very serious and important contradictions for us as people in the US or connected to the US. And I'll give you an example. In 1994 I went to South Korea as a Fulbright Scholar doing research on the military situation there, and until that point I'd never thought about the category of nation, and about what it means to be privileged because you don't think about the category that privileges you. I went there and I'm also African American and I'm Japanese, and in fact I wouldn't be here if it weren't for the US military because my father was part of the occupational forces right after World War II. Because I couldn't speak Korean, I had to figure out some other way to get around, and one way that I was able to get around was my very rudimentary ability to speak Japanese which allowed me to speak with some older Korean people. And of course, the reason they spoke Japanese was because they were forced to speak Japanese, and I realized, being in Korea, that I embodied these two imperialist nations, Japan and the US. But it was that experience and coming back to the US that really helped me to recognize this category of nation as a very important analytic tool.

The other thing I saw in South Korea is how working class men of color, African American and Latino men, coming face to face with poor Korean women who are prostituted women around the US military bases. And, interpersonally, well, if you stepped back and looked at their class

positions, they were in very similar class positions, poor and working class people. But when you add the category of nation to the men of color, it sent them off the chart as far as privilege goes. So that's another piece.

And the third piece is for us, who are US citizens, or who are connected in some ways, our tax dollars go to military operations. We need to think about the question, What does it mean to be American? What does it mean to be connected to the US? What are our responsibilities, especially when ideologically and rhetorically all these things that I just mentioned, the militarization, the murders, violence, etc, are being perpetrated in our name? We have to ask these questions even if we don't identify with the nation. We think we're the "good" Americans, just like white people say they're the "good" white people. We're the good Americans, we're the good people, the progressive people. Nonetheless we're implicated unless we actively address this question of nation.

Now I want to call on the International Frameworks for Human Rights and Progressive Social Change as possibilities for organizing both locally and internationally. International legal and policy frameworks are very problematic; there's no doubt about that. But they have been, and I believe should be, used to bring international attention to violence against women and to frame organizing strategies. I think most of us know about the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW). The 1993 UN World Conference on Human Rights in Vienna is the first time that rape was declared a war crime. The 1995 Fourth World Conference on Women produced the Beijing platform for action. The International War Crimes Tribunal in the Hague, for the first time in the history of the world, formal charges were brought against a military defendant for the mass rapes of Bosnian women. There is the international rights of indigenous peoples and the International Criminal Court that's currently undergoing the ratification process. I think all of these international, legal and policy frameworks I think are really important to be used. We need to think about how to make them better. We need to think about how to put some weight behind those and how to hold our governments and other people accountable.

And the last thing is really talking about building an international grass-roots movement across all these various forms of violence, including economic violence. So for example organizing labor movements across international boundaries, violence against women movements, and so forth. And again, that has lots of contradictions. But unless we do both the local organizing, the national organizing, and the international organizing, they will always be separated out from each other and be divided from one another.

What I want to do is end with a rhetorical question, and that is, I mentioned before that all of these military forms of violence, that I discussed, are sold to us as promoting national security, community safety and so forth. Now what I'd really like for us to think about is, what constitutes genuine security, for all human beings, and the physical environment? What constitutes genuine security, and safety for all humans, and the physical environment? And the second question is, what do we have to do, both individually and collectively, to achieve that?

Loretta Ross:

Well, for those of you who know me, I have a reputation of pissing a lot of people off because I

have a tendency to speak truth to power, because I really don't give a damn. And I actually believe that the main difference between me and all of us in this room, and a whole lot other people, who are oppressed by the way, – the difference between us and the rest of the people in the world may be, everybody's getting fucked over, but activists fuck back.

But I do want to congratulate those of us who have hung on, because it is not easy to hang on when you do work against violence against women. You end up seeing the ugly side of the world. You almost live in the vomit; it is your job to study the vomit of America. That is not a pretty place to be. And you end up becoming very cynical and very jaded.. We have to consciously put joy in our life because the more conscious that we become, the less joy is naturally there for us. And unfortunately once you learn something, you just can't turn your brain back off and say I want to go back to that ignorant time. So I want to congratulate us for holding on.

My momma, Loreen Ross (I'm saying her name so if you steal this quote you have to use my momma's name, ... you learn to protect yourself in these situations, I can steal it from my momma, but that's my momma, okay) says that I think we stay in this movement so long because we determine, as my momma says, that we're not the ones who let our success go to our heads, or our failure to our hearts, which is even more important. We just keep plugging on and plugging on. And so I remember you all from 1980 the violence against women conference. That was when I started growing my dreads; for those of you who want to know, they're 20 years old. They're marked by the movement to end violence against women. And it was at that violence against women movement conference in 1980 where a lot of us were at, that we first starting talking about the many violences that are committed against us. We thought we were only going to talk about rape and battering and street harassment, and we ended up talking about the East Timorese, we ended up talking about the political prisoners in the United States. Little did we know that one woman who was there talking with us would be assassinated only six months after the conference because of her political work. And so even then we recognized that we have to deal with the multiplicity of violences against us, and there is no way to neatly pigeon hole those of us who work on rape, versus those of us who battle globalization. It is all the same struggle. And we understand and appreciate and recognize that.

I was a teen mother. I had my baby due to incest at age 15. I'm now a college student, and as a grandmother going back to get that degree teen motherhood never allowed me, I am ironically majoring in Women's Studies after 25 years in the movement. But I also tell that story because I work with a lot of poor women who have histories similar to mine. I survived mine, some of them are still on the edge, and I think letting them know that it is possible to go back to school, that it is possible to survive and thrive, you know, coming from these statistical categories where we weren't supposed to do neither, is very important. So I wanted to put that out there.

But I left the women's movement a few years ago, about 15 years ago, in a formal kind of way because I wanted to formally study the operations of white supremacy. I got tired of being battered by it and couldn't really tell you anything about it. I mean, if you're born a person of color, you kind of know how racism works in this country, but you don't connect racism necessarily to the larger white supremacist construct, and so I got a chance to do some anti-Klan work. I actually took a job where my job was to go to Klan rallies and militia meetings and all those kinds of wonderful things. And I became an expert on hate groups, and I claim that word

expert because I think, first of all, women of color who give our lives to this movement, we don't claim our expertise often enough. And you notice that men, particularly ignorant white men, have no problem proclaiming their expertise, and so we need to maybe learn some of that.

And secondly, it was a field that is dominated by white men. It is basically the field where the white left, meets the white right and get along quite well sometimes. That's not today's speech either but I could talk about hate speech and white supremacy feels it necessary to maintain the Ku Klux Klan as a way of keeping us in check, and why things are connected.

So I'm going to talk about white supremacy, violence against women and human rights today. Lets first start talking about white nationalism and white supremacy, because it is very important that we understand the complex nature of the force that we're up against. This is not an accident that is just the product of run away capitalism here; otherwise there wouldn't be racism and white supremacy socialist countries. This is not something that is just practiced by white people, otherwise we wouldn't have all these conservatives of color driving us crazy. This is not something that is separate from everything that we're dealing with, but I fear that most of us become the victims of white supremacy instead of the experts on it. And that's what I'm going to talk about today.

White supremacy in my mind encapsulates racism, patriarchy, militarism, Christian nationalism, genocide, homophobia, ableism and ageism, and I could go on, but I wanted to name those major pillars for now. And people say, Loretta, why would you focus on white supremacy? (Actually my mother thought I was crazy when I quit my job chasing the Klan, because she knew I had job security.)

In sixty seconds I want to tell a very quick story. In 1975 David Duke started the Knights of the KKK and then he went on and ran for governor. When he started the Knights of the KKK which became the largest Klan faction in this country, he dedicated the Klan to a plan of action that included four things we should pay attention to. First of all he wanted to end all non-white immigration to this country. He wanted to end all support for welfare, because he felt that lazy black and brown people were benefiting from the hard work of whites. He wanted to end all support for affirmative action for the same basic reason. And then most perniciously, he wanted to create in the minds of the white public, two years before the Bakke decision with the concept of reverse discrimination. Now the question becomes how do those four ideas move from the margins of society, from the lips of a hate group member like David Duke, to the White House ears? We need to know that movement. It wasn't like David Duke just picked up a phone and said, hey Bill Clinton, do I have a welfare reform proposal for you. There is a process by which the ideas of white supremacy determine all of our debate on racism and fairness in this country, and by not paying attention to them, we're paying attention to the symptoms and not the cause. And you can spend your time marching all day for affirmative action, but you are not offering ideas to counter white supremacy. And that's what we really need to work on.

Those ideas go through a process of acculturation at the hands of the religious right. We need to talk about the religious right as a political force that maintains white supremacy. I am not bashing Christians; I am bashing Christian racists, and I make a distinction. I'm not saying that only racists are Christians, but I am saying that there is the cynical manipulation of Christianity in this country as a way to maintain white supremacy. I watched a TV show where Pat

Robertson of the 700 Club led a prayer against the sins of poor people. And I'm like, wait a moment, I know I didn't pay no attention in bible study, but I thought Jesus was poor. I mean what are we talking about here? So he is willing to be biblically inaccurate in order to talk about how poverty is a moral condemnation of our society and how immigrants are like a Babylonian plague coming to America. He is using religion for political purposes, and we need to be clear. And unfortunately a lot of our families are not clear. My mother sends money to this man. We can't talk about organizing people that we hold disdain and contempt for. We have to do our organizing in way that includes my momma because that's the reality. And then the next time we see these ideas is at the hands of ultra conservatives, or the 750 think tanks like the Heritage Foundation or the American Enterprise Institute, where they are writing public policy based on these ideas, but they don't say it is because of race like David Duke would, they don't even say it is because of religion, like Pat Robinson would. They say it's the economy, stupid, and we must cut back welfare to save the economy. We must cut back social services to erase the deficit. You know the routine.

Anyway, I'm talking about a transition of ideas. With time and repetition these ideas take on the power of truth. So much so that even the victims end up believing the lies. And that's where it really gets dangerous. For 400 years we've been in this country as African Americans, resisting the lies, and now we're telling them on ourselves. And that's a real issue here. Genocide is disguised as we just needed freedom. You end up with conservatives of all colors supporting white supremacy, and they don't even know why or where it comes from.

One of the things that Margo that also made me think is that we do have wonderful expertise in protesting our pain. We can complain with the best of them in more elaborate ways than I can shake a stick at. But, while we are expert at protesting our pain, we don't know shit about protesting our privilege. And that pisses me off. Not only that, there's a whole lot of women around the world pissed at us for not taking our responsibility to change the United States more seriously.

By the way, did you all hear last night that yet another angry white man killed five people in Pittsburgh yesterday, another white supremacist. First he defaced these Jewish synagogues, then he went and killed two Indians, two Chinese and I think one Korean in an obvious hate crime. While this was going on, and I caught a snippet of it on the news, CNN was broadcasting the regret that we didn't win the Vietnam war. Pisses me off.

Anyway, so let's talk about white supremacy. And I have to do a quick commercial here. We did talk about many of the world conferences that have gone on in the past. There's one in the future that I want you to pay close attention to. Next August-September, 2001, there will be a world conference on racism that will be held in South Africa. I really, really urge you to get involved in mobilizing for this conference. We have had wonderful successes with these conferences on racism, but we do have our problems as well. One of them is it is really hard work to get them to include a gender analysis in their racial analysis, so again the trauma that is experienced by women of color is still invisible. All the women are still white, all the men are still black—you know. But you need to get involved in this world conference on racism, and I think it is very important.

White supremacy is not just the far right, and I want to be very clear that even though I'm

focusing on the far right, the religious right and the ultra-conservatives. It is also the centrist liberals who support the structures of white supremacy. I was just on NPR a couple of nights ago debating this amendment absolutist who swears that we can't do anything about the Ku Klux Klan, but they can wipe out neighborhood after neighborhood, beginning with MOVE. You know, they can wipe whoever they want to wipe out, if they chose to do so. So we have to tolerate the Klan because they say if they go after the Klan they'll come after you next. I say, bullshit, they're already after me. For a black child it's a question of who gets there first, the Klan or the liberals. I mean who's going to get here first. And we also have to talk about the evils of neo-liberalism. That again is not this speech, but I refuse to let us off the hook of thinking about how the people who control our economic destiny are deciding that we are a workforce they no longer need, that they have separated production from consumption and so they want us to be a consumer nation, and we are consuming at the expense of peoples lives around the world. Do you really need those tennis shoes to be that cheap? And we need to ask that question, but I'm not here to talk about neo-liberalism.

Other features of white nationalism that I think are important to pay attention to is the fact is that it always has pseudo-scientific basis for its analysis. From the eugenics movement to the Bell Curve, they can always figure out a way to do bad science to get the same old results. They allege genetic inferiority that means you either got to control us or wipe us out. Well basically they've been trying to do that for 400 years, so what's original about that? But what is scary is how again so many people within the academies, within our institution are debating these things as if these are real scientific debates. We're even debating whether the Holocaust took place. Excuse me! There's no biological justification for racism, just a sociological one. Matter of fact, we can't even find that there's any real significant biological differences between the races. So we're dealing with a number of fictions that are used to sustain white supremacy and white nationalism that we must deconstruct.

Rapists, particularly those who rape in wars and in colonizing efforts, tend to worship purity while committing the most violations against it. And that is again part of white nationalism. And we need to be careful to draw a strong critique on the role of women in nationalist struggles, in general, and white nationalist struggles in particular. Because always women are told that we must be the mothers of that nation. That is then used to exclude everybody else. The only time they worship our role as women is when they can use us as a weapon to oppress somebody else. And we have to be very careful not to fall into that trap, even on behalf of our own comrades. Remember the brothers that wanted us to have a baby for the revolution. Throw your birth control pill away, sister. Yeah, right.

I want to close by talking about what passion drives me because I went from women's rights to civil rights to human rights, and that's where 25 years of activism has brought me. What I've found is that human rights have never really been fully explained to the American public. We're told that the only rights that matter are civil rights, your right to be treated as an equal in someone else's society, and that's very important by the way. The gay rights movement, the disability rights movement, etc, are very legitimate civil rights movements because they are denied simple equality. But the problem is, with civil rights, what if everybody you're seeking equality with is being treated like a dog? Then you just marched and died and prayed for the right to be treated as that. And many of us cynical African Americans would say that we just died for the right to be treated like poor white folks. We find that equality, in and of itself, does

not deliver justice. You need all five categories of your human rights protected. You need your political rights protected, your right to freedom of speech and association. You need your economic human rights, your right to have a society arranged in such a way that people can work for a living wage, not a starvation wage. You need your social human rights, your right to have food, clothing, shelter, healthcare, education. Without those things you are not treated like a human being. And you can't tell me that a poor person only needs freedom of speech, because all they can tell you is that they're hungry. And I also offer a small critique of people who work for the human rights of people overseas. I'm not critiquing working for their rights overseas, I critique those of us who step over a homeless person to mail the letter. Human rights are indivisible and connected. And we are also entitled to cultural human rights. That's the right to practice the culture of our choice, to speak the language of our choice, to worship the way we choose to.

So I firmly believe that if we need a vision for our new movement in the 21st century we need to finally, as a country, connect to the global movement for human rights. That movement is 50 years old and they've been waiting for a long time for us to get off our asses and join them.

Rosa Linda Fregoso .

I would like to continue the discussion that Margo and Loretta began around Human Rights. I just want to thank you for inviting and for giving me this opportunity to bear witness about these horrific events of femicide in Suidad Juarez, Chihuahua which is on the border of El Paso, Texas –events that have themselves been galvanizing and revitalizing a grass roots feminist movement in Mexico, around anti-violence activism. I've been so very inspired by many of your comments today, and so I really want to begin my talk by paraphrasing a question that Kimberle Crenshaw posed for us last night, and this is my paraphrase, what does sexual violence, murder, look like from the vantage point of poor and indigenous women in Mexico, especially for women who have not survived that violence -- for women who are no longer with us in the physical realm, but who are with us here in spirit. I also present my comments today in the hopes that this organization takes up a challenge that one of the commentators made today of broadening scope to deal with global issues, trans-border issues around violence.

In preparing my talk I had to choose between discussing the cultural imagery used to devalue the lives of murdered women, or about the kind of grass roots response to their devaluation, and I think that given the media blackout around events and the murders of Suidad Juarez, what I'm going to do is I'm going to restrict my comments to the cultural representation that has pretty much structured the devaluation of women of color.

Rights groups began tracking the murders of women in 1993, so it is in the past seven years the murders of these women in Suidad Juarez have topped 200. Of these 200 the majority of these victims have been victims of femicide, that is, sexual assault, rape, torture, mutilation. We're talking about nipples cut off, buttocks lacerated. And the ages of those murdered have ranged from 11 to 50 years old, most however are in the 11 to 30 year old age range. A very large percentage of these women are dark, all of the women that have been murdered are poor. Now I draw your attention to the fact that this is the largest mass sex murder case in Mexican history. These killings, and I'm talking about femicide, should not be confused with the mass graves that were uncovered in November of last year, and which got all this publicity. Remember there

was a team of FBI agents that went over there, courtesy of the US government, to help the Mexican police and military. These mass murders were linked to the drug lords even though that doesn't mean that they're not related to these events that I'm talking about. But I want to draw your attention to the fact that these cases have not been solved even though there have been arrests on three separate occasions, mostly in response to rights groups. The police in 1995 arrested an Egyptian chemist who was a convicted sex offender and was working as a consultant for one of the Maquiladora industries. The murders continued and then the police afterwards, again due to protests from several grass organizations, arrested a gang who confessed and were charged with six of the murders, and then three years later, as the murders continued, they arrested another group who were transporting workers in the Maquiladora industry.

Now the police, what they did is that they fabricated this elaborate crime between these two separate gangs and the Egyptian sharif and of course they say that he's ordering the killings from prison, from jail, and paying \$1,200 for each of the murders so that he can prove his innocence. The families of many of those arrested have charged the police with torturing to elicit conviction, but the point is that, of the over 200 killings, mass sex killings that we're talking about here, only 12 of them have been solved. In the past two months four more women have been murdered under similar circumstances, so I want to repeat the question, and I think the question that has bearing on this conference theme, is that why has the biggest mass killing in the history of Mexico not been solved?

There are a lot of theories as to why the women are being killed, and why the murders remain unsolved. There's a lot of conspiracy theories, but rather than take you through all of these, I was going to restrict my comments to the role of cultural imagery, or social discourses in devaluing these border women.

Anyway, I have an analytic framework that considers the symbolic, which is the images and the experiential, and the murders, as inseparable. So one can't talk about feminicide in Suidad Juarez without taking into consideration the ways in which the social identities of race, class, gender, sexuality and nation intersect. I am informed by Kimberle Crenshaw's concept last night, of intersectionality, in determining the structural, political and representational aspects of violence against women of color. There is in fact a gender and sexual hierarchy operative, and not simply in terms of male power, that male-female relations, but also in the way in which women's bodies are devalued. Which women's bodies in Mexico have more value, and which women's bodies have less value, and the fact that these victims of feminicide in Suidad Juarez are poor, are dark, are indigenous, explains their devaluation on two levels -- as choice of targets, who gets killed, but also in terms of the state's indifference, which murders get solved. So here we have this interplay of social identities in structuring power relations in society.

In terms of the representational aspects of the violence against these border women, let me just talk briefly about the cultural imagery that's used to devalue the bodies of these women, and this is after their deaths. There are two major explanations to explain the feminicide in Suidad Juarez. One is the moral discourse that is perpetrated by the state. We know this strategy. It is all too familiar in cases of sexual violence toward women. You blame the women who lead sexually autonomous lives for their moral victimization. You attribute their sexual assault to their moral values. In fact, among the questions that the police authorities ask family members who report their disappearances, or once they find the bodies, is, did you know that your

daughter was a lesbian? That's one of the questions. Or, did you know that your daughter led a double life? That she did respectable work by day, and casual sex work by night? So, besides the fact that we have the intersectionality of race, gender and class, devaluing the bodies of these women, their sexuality is also framed through this discourse of morality.

For those of you who have kept up with the cases, every film that has come out, every television news report, every article, every news magazine and investigative essay, has strained the accounts of these killings by linking them to the Maquila industry. And I call this, in my work, the master narrative on Ciudad Juarez murders. It's a discourse of economic globalization mostly favored by the North, by academics and journalists. A kind of anti-modernity critique which has really not been disputed by the officials in Mexico, though it has been challenged by the family of the victims and by researchers in Mexico. And the argument goes something like this, the Maquiladora industry first started in the sixties by the border industrialization program, and later intensified with NAFTA, has resulted in a development model that's now out of control. So feminism is linked to this development model, out of control, in the same way that researchers have made a connection between globalization and the feminization of wage labor. So it is this feminization of wage labor that is the unifying trope, the connection for explaining what happens to women in export towns like Juarez. For example, in the anti-development explanations, the murderous assaults of these women are linked to what is called a far more insidious and widespread violence of work in the global assembly line. And since these murders started one year after NAFTA was signed into executive agreement, you can see how these accounts of femicide are linked to the growth of Maquila industry.

According to this logic that's critical of development in the Third World, development produces in the Third World chaos which in turn leads to higher incidences of crime and violence in these export processing towns. This logic ignores the fact that femicide of this type is not occurring in other export processing towns throughout the world nor in other border industrialization towns even in Mexico. So what interests me is, about this analytic framework, is it is logic. Why would Maquila workers be targets of sexual violence and murder?

The explanation coming out of the US is between labor exploitation and female sexuality on the one hand, and murder and sexual violence, on the other. So what the anti-development critique does is it posits a development model in which global corporations are eroding traditional arrangements. Or say, trans-national corporations, like the Maquila industry, are perpetuating a kind of hyper femininity and sexualization on the global assembly line. Again, the implication here is that trans-national corporations erode traditional gender roles, or introduce Western values and ideas, into the Third World.

Let me just quote from one of the writers from the US, who says, 'unlike their North American sisters who dress for assembly line in no-nonsense t-shirts and sneakers, most Maquila girls don mini-skirts, heels, gobs of lipstick and eye shadow. This sexualization spills over onto the weekend and in the after hours. Downtown Juarez is clotted with bars who's clientele are mostly assembly line workers'. So several of these accounts have noted that the Maquila workers engage in casual prostitution, and are leading a double life. These women are described as mostly young, often living free of family, with their own money and their own desires.

In fact, the US critic's shock at the modernity that they have found in Juarez speaks more to their

own primitivism, than to the contemporary reality in Mexico, where manifestations of modern youth culture have been evident for some time, certainly since I lived in Guadalajara in the late sixties. But the point I want to stress about making all these connections, is that the killings are read as a male backlash against economic, but also the sexual, autonomy of women who have entered the workforce.

‘Killing girls’, and I quote, ‘has in effect become what men of Juarez do with the frustrations of living in a town with less than one percent unemployment, but with abundant poverty. It is the local language of rage, a blood price exacted for what Juarez is, the world’s largest border community with 300 Maquilla plants and the highest concentration of Maquilla workers in this country’.

Now as compelling as this denunciation of NAFTA and of global capitalism may be, unfortunately it simplifies the complexities and to a large extent represents a very colonialist view of the Third World. One fundamental flaw in the analysis stems from the fact that the link between expressions of female sexuality, and autonomy, and femicide, or say their murder, was initially established by the police and thus connected to this official discourse of morality, deployed by police authorities, and designed to defame the victims, and hence to devalue their deaths.

But just as significant is the fact that the master narrative, critical of globalization, is based on grossly inaccurate information. Of the over 200 deaths, only sixteen of the women were actually Maquilla workers. That is 10 percent of the victims. The rest include a housewife, a secretary, sales clerks, students, domestics, drug dealers, employers at bars, with the great majority in unknown occupations, but clearly not in the Maquilla industry. Indeed this dominant interpretation, that is critical of development and economic globalization, is so pervasive that it shapes even further the devaluation of victims of femicide, at the level of experience.

As ethnographic research on Maquilla industries suggests, the dominant perceptions among US management, which is white, male administrators, is that Maquilla girls are prostitutes. And I offer a quote from Melissa Wright’s study of managerial narrative, in which she notes how Mexican female workers were often narrativized in terms of prostitution. ‘For example, when I asked one of the production managers, Roger, to describe the labor force, he said, “some of these girls have second jobs, you know. I’ve heard that some work the bars”. The message that you cannot tell the difference between a prostitute and a Maquilla worker was common in my interviews.’

In fact, what Wright terms the managerial narrative has a much longer history. It is part of an earlier colonialist view of border towns as sexualized spaces for masculinist rites of passage, young men and US soldiers. That is the border as brothel, and border women as prostitutes. And this then is the sexual imagery shaping contemporary discussions of poor racialized women on the borderland.

The term Maquilla (girls) has become a new ‘word for prostitutes’. The term, and in patriarchal societies like Mexico and the United States, where prostitutes are condemned as immoral, it comes as no surprise that women who are perceived as leading economically and sexually autonomous lives would not merit the kind of rescue operation one normally would expect from

the state. The kind of rescue operation deployed to protect patrimony, as in the case of Elian Gonzalez or to investigate the mass graves of victims of the drug war.

The media blackout and the state indifference to the largest mass sexual murder in the history of Mexico has been due to the ways in which class, race, gender and nation intersected in the lives of these women. Ultimately this is what sexual violence looks like from the vantage point of a poor and indigenous woman in Mexico.

LAW ENFORCEMENT

Beth Richie

(Note: the first section of Beth Richie's talk was not recorded).

One of the biggest mistakes made by the anti-violence movement was its decision to collude with the state as a strategy to end violence against women. Our analysis is deeply compromised by our collaboration with one of the most dangerous, ineffective, homophobic, racist systems in this country that increasingly impacts all countries in the world, and that is the criminal justice system. So, even if we believe that what our work should be, to have criminal justice response to violence against women, it is simply not working.

Now I want to tell you two brief stories that I think illustrate these two trends.. Sadly, there are two women, both of whom are thirty, one was thirty, one is thirty. One is dead, now for a week, and the other wishes she were dead. The first one trusted us. She trusted the anti-violence movement. She was dating a man who battered her, and she left him, she left after three months. She called a domestic violence program in the community that she lived in. She knew many people who worked in the anti-violence programs, was related to some, so she got what I would imagine to be some of the best advocacy support information that we could possibly offer in this movement. She had an order of protection, she had a cell phone, but nevertheless, she was killed by her abuser when she tried to go to court.

The other one mistrusted the police. She never called our programs. She was involved in the illegal sex industry, in the city of Chicago. She was seldom paid by the man that she was trying to earn money for, so she understands herself to be a rape victim. She was selling contraband because sex worker, actually being a rape victim, wasn't supporting her. She was abducted by someone else who peddling contraband on the streets that she was working, and he raped her again. This rape was so severe it required hospital intervention. The hospital had mandatory reporting programs. During the prosecutors intake around the rape it was found that she had two outstanding warrants, and is since now in the Cook County jail.

Now if both of these, there's a story there of a woman who trusted us, that we were going to really transform the criminal justice system, and giving her a cell phone, making sure that she order of protection, that he wore a bracelet, that she would be safe. The other woman, didn't trust us, because she knew that the law would never protect her, but we still couldn't do our work because the law, not only didn't protect her, but it criminalized her. Our over investment in law enforcement, to the expense of other work we needed to do, has one of them dead early, and the other one wishing that she were.

I don't tell the stories to make it dramatic, but to make it real. And I think that we need to be accountable to the lives of women, for whom our work in law enforcement and criminal justice intervention is, not simply not working, but is deeply failing them and their attempts to survive.

Stormy Ogden

I'm really pulling from my experiences when I was prisoner 20170-other. I was housed at

California Rehabilitation Center in Norco. And I'll also be pulling from some of my activist work since my release. The W20170 is my state number, and the 'other' came from state ethnic classification of me, since I was not white, black or Mexican, I was an other. I would like to quote this woman, 'just as alcoholism has touched the life of every American Indian person, so is the prison system'. To quote Luana Ross, a Salish woman, 'that is all that is left of research on imprisoned Native American She says 'it is common for Native people, either to have been incarcerated or to have relatives that have been in prison. Because we are colonized people, this is nothing new to us'. Since the beginning of colonization imprisonment was used as a form of social control and blatant genocide against Indian people. This can be seen in the numerous laws that were passed, all without our consent, geared towards assimilating Indian people into the mainstream dominant society. Historically Indian people were herded into military courts, boarding schools, reservations, state mental hospitals, county jails, and prisons. And in a way, people are being herded into the universities too.

In California you must look to the mission system, where volunteers was another name for the militia, would ride up into the hills to kidnap Indian men, women and children and force them into slave labor in the missions. So remember that when you're driving by these missions, that they were built in this way, they were built on the blood, sweat, tears and backs and bodies of our people.

Speaking of slave labor, in 1850 California passed into state legislation an act for protection for Indians. And what this was in reality was legalized slavery. If an Indian person was jailed, if an Indian person was found on the street without a home, white people came to those jails so they could buy those Indian people. The raiders would go into the hills and they would steal the children, and they would bring them down and put them into labor. So the South wasn't the only place where there was slavery. We had slavery here too in California against our people, Californian Indian people. Now they had slave auctions, and this can be found in old documents of, like, in the San Francisco Chronicle, or the Sacramento Bee, or the newspapers down in LA if anybody wants to look that up.

The research on women in prisons, or Indian people in prisons, is very limited. When I got on the internet to try to find some stuff I couldn't find hardly anything. This reminds me of a story of when I was incarcerated. Outside our door we had these name tags, they would have our number, they would have our last name, they would have our ethnic identification. They would always put the 'o' after me. Every morning I would get up and before I would go to my state job, erase that 'o' and put "AI--Kashaya Pomo." I would come back and what I would see is the 'o' – other again. I kept doing this, over and over and over again. One day, I decided I didn't want to keep doing this any more, I took a laundry marker, and marked it. Well, I got reprimanded and I got 60 days taken off my good time. But it was worth it, because I stood for who I was.

Some of the problems that are facing the women inside, after the humiliation, the fear, the pain of the court system. They're transported again into these jails, into these prisons. Upon entry they're made to strip, they're searched, cavity searched, they're deloused, and I understand now that the men are having to get their hair cut. Sounds like boarding school to me. Hasn't changed much. And for our women, culturally, it is hard for us to be stripped down, and expose ourselves, and let me say right now that I'm speaking for Indian women, I know this happens to

all women that go into prisons, but I'm speaking here for Indian women. So, it is hard for them. They're going into this institution and they're getting stripped of their identity, of their pride, of their culture, of their respect.

When I was in prison, somebody had taken a sheet and smeared blood on it, took it down to R&R, which is the receiving and the releasing. I was at CRC at the time. There were about seven dorms, I believe, and they made us all strip and stand there for over three hours so they could see if one of us had been stabbed. Now, that's humiliating, for any women, but that's especially humiliating for Indian women, to be standing there, no clothes, as the men guards came and checked to make sure that none of us was stabbed, because somebody had played a joke and put blood on the sheet.

Another thing that's bothering the women in prison is medication. When they find out that we are on the way to prison, they start medicating us. I was given a combination of 300 milligrams of Elavil, Mellaril, Thorazine and Chlorohydrate, to keep me calm. What it did was make you stop talking. I still stutter and still have problem getting my words out because too much medication has gone through my body. I had to take this. There was no way I could get around not taking it; they make sure. And a lot of Indian women are being given Thorazine, to keep us calm, because we are the savages. We are the ones with the tempers.

My sister, right now, my baby sister, she's down in Stockton, and she writes me letters and we talk back and forth, and she's having problems because she's got too many issues that she needs to deal with, but she's afraid to go to go to counseling, because she's afraid they going to give her Thorazine. And she cries, you know, I need to talk about these problems, I need to talk about them to somebody, I don't want to go because they're going to give me Thorazine, and I don't want to do the Thorazine shuffle.

I want to touch briefly on another problem that the women are having and it is dealing with our spirituality, our religion. I'm sure you all know about the American Indian Religious Freedom Act, and our people trying to get our spiritual ways, and our spiritual practices to be left alone so that we can practice them -- so that we can have that connection with the Creator. There is, down in Dublin the women who are wanting to go into the lodge because they want to pray. They want to heal themselves and their families. They couldn't go in because they wouldn't let the non-Indian women go in -- they wouldn't let the white women go in. That was their place to heal, that was their place to get strong. It is not our responsibility to share our spirituality with others. As Indian people, it is our responsibility to each other. That doesn't make me a racist; it makes me pro-Indian. And I'm proud. (Applause).

And the reason I say that is for two reasons. One is to let you know what it is like inside, and the other is to say, these are our ways. Let us have our ways, stop stealing them from us, stop exploiting them, stop selling them, and stop raping the land. And if anybody's offended, I don't know what to say.

Is there an answer, is there a solution? Yes there is. There are programs out there that are helping our people with recovery, alcohol, drugs, sexual abuse, domestic violence, but people are still going to prison. And that's because of the laws that were passed against us, on our land, without our say-so. There needs to be programs for our women, that when they do get sent to

prison, in lieu of going to prison, they can go to voluntary healing programs. There are some up in Canada that are great models. They're given the skills, they're taught the skills to be mothers, to be strong women, to be able to live in this society, which is hard because it is so culturally different. For many Indian people that are in the Bay area, that don't have that really strong connection to the reservation, it is still hard for us out here to be in this different culture. Every day you see something, every day you see something, that is stabbing us in the back.

Now, this is my closing. My crime, what I did five years for, less than \$2,000 in welfare fraud. My crime, being addicted to alcohol and drugs. My crime, being a survivor of domestic violence. My crime, being a survivor of incest. My crime, being an American Indian woman.

Renee Saucedo

I can't tell you how proud I feel to be at this conference put on by, and for, women of color. I think for many of us it is like coming home. It is very affirming, inspiring, it is that breath of fresh air we all need in our day to day work. Last night I had to speak at a panel up in San Francisco. As usual, I'm the only woman sitting there talking about immigrant rights, and it is male dominated, and they give nice flowery introductions to the men, and we're left till last, and, you know, hurry up, Renee you only have three more minutes. So it is nice to be at a conference that's meant for us, and lets us talk about women.

What I've been asked to address today is how women, particularly immigrant women, are faced with INS enforcement. I'm not going to focus so much on the border, because I can go on and on about what happens at the Mexico/US border. I'm going to be focusing primarily on what INS enforcement activities look like inland, and how they impact women in particular.

So what I would like to do is two things. First of all I'd like to describe to you what INS raids look like because they're secret. And then the second thing I would like to do, most importantly, is talk about how immigrant women are organizing to resist the repression by the INS.

Generally, INS raids, arrests and detentions are characterized by abuse, physical violence, and humiliation. And these are all the things that immigrant women have to face and are terrorized by almost every day. Even if they are not personally victimized by INS raids, day in and day out, thousands and thousands of immigrant women wake up, every day, wondering is today the day when I will be caught by the INS. Is today the day when I walk my children to school, or take my kids to the Health Center, or go talk to my social worker, is today the day when someone will betray me and I will be reported, and ultimately deported?

So let me tell you what happens to those women who unfortunately do see the claws of the INS. The first way the INS raids happen are at peoples' homes. INS enforcement officers, generally speaking, arrive at peoples homes without warrants, without the necessary probable cause or suspicion that people inside, living, are undocumented. They usually arrive at four or five in the morning, pounding on the door. Usually it is an official that speaks perfect Spanish in plain clothes. And the families open the door; why shouldn't we? We're not committing any illegality. So what happens is, for example what happened at 305 Chestnut, at about six apartments in Redwood City, California, in October of last year. Redwood City police officers collaborating with INS agents stormed about six apartments where families were sleeping,

paraded them in the hallway before they were sequestered in one family's apartment, would not allow the family members to dress even though many of them were in their underwear since they were shaken out of their beds. Two of the women were forced to raise their blouses, exposing their breasts to the INS agents, the police officers, and fellow family members. And ultimately about half of the people caught in this raid were arrested by INS agents, and weren't allowed to even put their shoes on. Afterwards, one INS agent yelled at them, 'What are all you Mexicans doing here? Don't you know you belong in LA?'

Now what is significant about this case in particular is, you know who called the INS? It was the landlord of the building they were living in. And do you know why the landlord called the INS in this situation? Because the immigrant families, most of them undocumented, were complaining about the slummy conditions of their building. The rotting rugs, the broken windows, the urine smell in the staircase, the cockroaches falling down into peoples food when the oven's steam was being used.

Many times when the INS shows up at peoples homes, INS agents tell the women, "If you don't sign these voluntary departure forms, you will never see your children again." And we've seen cases where I work, where the women tell us that their children are left behind, parentless, when both the mother and the father are arrested and deported.

A second way that INS raids happen is that they happen at the workplace. And in particular, INS raids and the threat of INS raids are particularly dangerous to immigrant women workers. How? Let me tell you about the case of Guadalupe Sanchez, who I have the honor of knowing for many years. She was working for a janitorial company in San Francisco, and she was raped twice by her employer, the head of the janitorial company. Now, a lot of people ask me, well Renee, you really believe them? Why didn't she leave the first time she was even threatened by this guy? Well, Ms Sanchez was the sole bread winner of her family because her husband, who had a bullet in his head and who was bed-ridden, had to not only support her three children, but found it extremely difficult to find another job, because under Employer Sanction, which is this law that we have since 1986, it is not easy for people who don't have immigration status to get a job – Or at least a job that pays over \$4.00. Besides Guadalupe Sanchez' employer told her that if she ever complained, or if she ever left her job, he would report her to the INS, and she would be deported. Now that was enough of a threat for her to have to continue the abuse. It is very common for women workers, for example, who are unionizing their workplace, to be told by their employers, if you lift a finger in the direction of unionizing, I'm going to have not only you, but your co-workers, reported and deported.

Now, undocumented women still have the right to organize themselves into unions, knock on wood. Let's hope a bad law doesn't pass in the next few years. But employers, just like the landlord in Redwood City, California, use the threat of INS and deportation as a way to intimidate women in those institutions.

The third main way that INS raids happen, is that INS conduct raids in collaboration with local law enforcement and with the criminal justice system. I have been doing immigrant rights work for over ten years, now, and I can't tell you how many immigrant women I have spoken to who suffered from domestic violence, and who would never report their batterers to the cops because the police most of the time, ask not only the batterer, but they ask the woman what her

immigration status is. Why? Who knows, because they're pigs.

I have a situation in Contra Costa County, where there was a probation officer in the juvenile court system who had such a close relationship with the INS, that the INS would come around every so often to poke around and ask, well, who are your gang members? Who are the people on your caseload who are gang members? And so this man reported Jadine who is age 15, and said she had a tattoo on her face. It was never proven that she was a gang member, but she's in the system, and you know what INS found? She has no papers. What happened? The INS goes to Jadine's home. Jadine by the way has been living in the US all her life because she was brought over by her mother from Tijuana, Mexico, when she was younger than one year old, she's never been to Mexico. The INS arrests her at her home and puts her in detention. And they put a \$10,000 bond, so that she can't get out. Why? Because of her so-called gang affiliation.

The INS right now is very tricky. They say that we're conducting raids, but we're not arresting the women that you're talking about. Of course not, we don't want to interfere with union organizing, and we don't want to deal with sleazy landlords, we just want to arrest those criminal aliens. We are helping you US citizens, because we are getting rid of the criminal aliens amongst us. Criminal alien! Jadine was charged in juvenile court for petty theft, and she went to juvenile hall for two days, and was put on probation. And she was put in INS detention, and that's who they use as a justification to terrorize and entire community.

So, INS raids are being used to subjugate women. They're being used to subjugate women into submission, or they attempt to anyway. They try to do that is by intimidating women not to ask for services they're entitled to, morally and legally. They try to subjugate women into submission, and into not complaining. They are trying to subjugate women into submission so they won't fight back.

But, immigrant women are fighting back! Forced through political pressure, the police chief of Redwood City has established a no collaboration policy between his police department and INS, meaning that after this campaign, spearheaded by the women who had to lift their blouses and expose their breasts, no Redwood City police officer is legally allowed to collaborate with INS agents in any way. These immigrant women know that they're not going to be able to legislatively get rid of the INS by next year, but what they do know is that they have the right to do everything in their power to make sure that the INS doesn't come back.

(Part of speech deleted from recording). We have also pressured the city of San Francisco to declare itself an INS raid-free zone. Now Mayor Brown has not yet met with the INS, and that's a whole different story, but the Board of Supervisors, and the President of the Board of Supervisors, officially, said, I'm going to meet with the INS. And for the first time in the country, that the papers and the radio and television said, an elected official from the county, met with the INS to convey the message, INS raids are wrong. And the story of the immigrants came out in full force.

Women are fighting back because INS raids are wrong. They try to terrorize women into submission but women, along with our allies, are fighting back.

Peggy Bird

We have a lot of duty and responsibility as we are here, to take it back, and to carry it back to where we go, and what we do.

I was talking about new words and the way we think about things and I keep hearing the word 'historical', and I don't think of it that way. I think of it as 'herstorical', and I think of it that way because traditionally, societies were mainly matriarchies. And I come from that kind of society from Santa Domingo Pueblo, where my identity comes from my mother. My clan is Sun Clan, and it comes from my Mom. My Indian name, which I will translate for you, is 'Young Corn As It is Just Growing', and corn is very important. As you see I have cornmeal here. Corn is very important, it is our connection to the Mother Earth, and women also represent that Mother Earth. And that is also part of our identities. And the reason I'm sharing this with you is because, in the work we do, it is not just the work, it is our lives, and it is what we are doing to make things better to stay here, to continue this surviving, to continue to make things better down the road for our grandchildren, and for their grandchildren, for those generations to come.

Something that happens quite often with Native Americans or Indians, or Native peoples or First Nations, is that we're all lumped together. Well, we're not all the same. We all have our own unique traditions and our languages, and our ways of connecting to the Great Spirit or whatever we call it in our language, because it is not really that in the English language, but that's the only words that I can use to express that, because we have this language. But I can generalize to say that most of the tribes do have a lot of the same problems that you were raising with law enforcement. And as we do this work, what am I going to do? I don't want to become part of it because I don't want to become part of the institutions that are exercising that power and control, and continuing to oppress us, and it is a real dilemma for me. And I really have to look and stay strong to my identity so that I can continue to do the work that I need to do. I think that law school has been a door. It has been a way of opening doors, to do work, and to come out and be able to speak out, because otherwise, for my community, it took them a long time to even acknowledge that a woman from Santa Domingo was able to go to law school. I stepped out of the role that they see us in, and I'm still stepping outside of this role. .

When you look at law enforcement's role, it has really changed from what it was traditionally. Traditionally the men were in roles of respecting women – I refer back to the matriarchies, where women were the ones that were governing the communities. There was peace. We didn't have these problems with all of this violence. There was peace in our communities. Communities didn't even have litter. People had respect for everything, and women were the ones that were educated. Women were the ones that were the teachers. Men gained their identities from us, and they gained their status from us. Our children, our young boys they gained their identities from us. And I bring that forward to you because that role of Native man has changed so much. The respect for Native women has really been eroded, and we've all talked about the colonization process, and we've talked about, it is so destructive, the knowledge that existed, the knowledge that we were placed here with as Native peoples. And I have hope that we can make changes as long as we continue to look at what our values are.

One of the things about law enforcement in this country is that it came out of the War Department; their history is from the military. The people who put us on reservations have

caused Native peoples to oppress each other and to continue the internalized oppression. And I say internalized oppressions because we still have the outside oppression, but we also have the internalized, which means that we are oppressing ourselves now. And in the systems that we adopted from the outside world we continue that, and one of the things that we can do to change that is to look at this issue. We need to see what mistakes are being made, and we need to be able to see what other movements are doing. Because we're kind of slow in getting moving, we've been able to see a lot of the dangers that are happening out there with all of these other movements. And because we're able to see that, we're able to look at that from a different perspective, and look at it so that we don't just adopt all of these other practices, and all of these other methods of trying to stop the violence against Indian women. We can look at, in developing training of law enforcement, we can look developing training to incorporate our own values. We can look at it to incorporate the traditions and to bring back that respect for Native women. We can remind our law enforcement officers about their history, and also about our history. We can remind them about where they came from, and their connections to all of their relatives, their connections to their mothers, to their grandmothers, to their aunts, to all of the women relatives out there.

And one of the things I want to apologize to all of you here, is in the work that we are doing to stop the oppression, is changing the way that we teach each other and changing the way that we learn from each other. And I'm apologizing because I don't like to stand up here and talk at people. Because that's another form of expecting you to just take what I'm telling you, and I don't like to be in that position, because I don't feel I am able to tell you what to do with your life. I think we're all able to make those decisions for ourselves so that we can make those changes because we know in our communities what's right for us. But we've gotten into such a habit of looking out to the outside and having other people telling us what to do, and I see so much value in us being able to develop our own ways of training and educating each other. And I was so happy to see recently, a Mending the Sacred Hoop and the Department of Justice sponsored training the trainers program that was called 'In Our Best Interests.' It was based on the concept of we teach each other, and it is also based on the concept, I learned way before I was in Law School, organizing in our communities. We know what's best for us, and we can make those decisions for ourselves, we don't need other people coming in and telling us what to do all the time.

Something that I see is that we are returning to the matriarchies. We are returning to those traditional roles for women, where we're respected, and what we were looking at in the training with law enforcement, and working with law enforcement and working with the people in different institutions, women's voices are very important to be heard, and to be there in all of that work, because traditionally, we were the ones doing it. We knew what we were doing. There was peace in our communities, and I look around the room and I look at, and wherever I go, there are so many women this, we're doing it because that's in our, we know how. We know it from way back, a long time ago. We have that strength, and we have that courage, and we have that ability to do it. And I'm so encouraged to see it happening, and I'm really encouraged, and I would to acknowledge all of the young women who are here too because you are carrying forward what we are bringing so that we can bring it out for our future generations as well.

I forgot to mention, we've got all kinds of law enforcement officers. We've got tribal law

enforcement officers, then we've got BIA law enforcement officers, we've got state law enforcement officers, and then we've got federal law enforcement officers. So we don't just have the state to look at, we've got this whole range of law enforcement mix to look at when we're doing this training, this educational work. And to open eyes, to bring awareness, it takes a lot of communication, a lot of dialogue, a lot of not giving up hope. I haven't given up hope. It is hard to explain how we can bring, what I consider natural things, like our values, the things that we were given when we're placed here as Native peoples, those kind of values of respect for women, and it is hard to think about how to bring that into unnatural systems like the law enforcement and the courts, and the prosecutors. But I have hope that we can do it. Because, we were doing it before, and we kind of let it go; we kind of let them get separated from each other. But we can bring it back, and we can make it back and work together. I see that the values are there and we have to live them. And the Creator in Her great wisdom brought us here and gave us these basic values, with the instructions to carry them forward. Without these we wouldn't be here today, to be able to honor these values. We must make them a reality, to end acts of violence being committed to the women. I want to share this, from Mending the Sacred Hoop, 'If the physical, mental, emotional and spiritual well-being of the woman is intact, so too is that of the family, community, and society'.

COLONIALISM AND VIOLENCE

Luana Ross

She announces that she needs to leave.

Elham Bayour

The title of the conference "The Color of Violence" pressed me to attempt to count the numerous colors of violence that have been forced upon indigenous women and women of color for centuries. It reminded me of the white invader who came to this land holding his cross in one hand

and his sword in the other to subdue and butcher the native population. He is the same colonizer who sterilized the native woman without her consent, held her hostage in her reservations, aided her with his poisonous starchy food rations to multiple her fat cells, and shortened her life expectancy rate to 44 years. He is the same oppressor who enslaved the African American woman and terrorized her soul, and he is the same aggressor who fabricated lies about Middle Eastern women because they mysteriously hid behind their veil. The wide range of various colors of coerced violence on Middle Eastern women are colors of socio-historical injustices and biases practiced by the name of social science. They are the colors of the Ottoman Empire colonization that was followed by the British colonization and was succeeded by the cruel violent Zionist settler occupation in my beloved Palestine that had distinct implications on Palestinian women's lives. They are the colors of the racist Zionist apartheid policies that transformed my people into surplus people and herded them in Bantustan refugee camps in their own country and elsewhere.

They are the colors of the hegemonic British, French, and American missionaries that accompanied the white colonizer into my land. They are the colors of patriarchy that were intensified by the native male's authority due to the colonialist settler motivations in my land. They are the colors of racism, territorial, internal, cultural and imperialist colonialism, where Palestinian women face the dilemma of a double struggle. Their struggle against the racist Israeli occupation that cannot be divorced from the complex history of their country, and the indiscriminate use of societal oppressive practices against them. They are the colors of the forceful uprooting that painted (Sitti's) my grandmother's life along with 900,000 Palestinians May 14th 1948, and transformed her from a proud land owner into a despaired refugee overnight, after the Zionist's military forces killed 14 people in her village's church during mass, destroyed her village along with 480 other villages completely and drove her into disparity. They are the colors of generalizations that the Middle Eastern region has been portrayed with as a "Third World" territory in which the twenty-two countries that make up the region; function, socialize, treat its citizens and execute its jurisdictions and laws in the same manners and fashions. They are the colors of western intellectual terrorism that disregarded historical facts, western colonization, imperialist domination, class structure, rural vs. urban communities, gender relations, religion doctrines, globalization and capitalist motivations from specific contexts, never mentioned or analyzed them in its holistic content. They are the colors of a hypocritical

sisterhood that generalized Middle Eastern Women and judged them under one patriarchal umbrella of the "oppressed", "veiled", "passive", "Muslim", and "impotent" by a diverse number of Western writers, Western feminists, Western media and some male Middle Eastern writers. And finally they are the colors of torture, sexual conquest, dehumanization, disempowering and defeat of the Palestinian women's bodies, spirits and souls.

Palestinian women have been the backbone of the Palestinian national struggle for over eighty years. In the early 1900s Palestinian women demonstrated against the British colonization and the increasing Jewish settlers on their land. They sent women delegates to negotiate with the British administrators to stop facilitating and helping the Zionists in achieving their expansionist motivations in the land of Palestine, that is, to transform Palestine into a Jewish State. The Israeli occupation means denial and violations of Palestinian rights, it means that Palestinians are administratively detained without charges, tortured and sexually terrorized, it means living under curfews with fear, and constantly subjected to the Israeli military rule. By the time a Palestinian woman born in a refugee camp in Gaza is 23 years old, she will have witnessed and experienced the demolition of her parent's house by the Israeli army who brought charges against one of her brothers. She will have witnessed the murder of her husband or his arrest, along with her two children. She will have experienced constant interrogation, sexual harassment, severe beatings; and deprivation of sleep. She will be left alone with a male interrogator without a policewoman present in violation of regulations. The interrogator's legs are spread over her legs while touching her, verbally abusing her, threatening her with rape, and evidently reaching sexual climax. These tools and strategies are legal, and are what the legal system protects. They are what define who she is. They are sanctioned because sex as conquest is sanctioned, glorified, allowed, and assumed, in defense of "democracy". Palestinian women's sexuality was used as an arena where power struggle between males and females and between the occupier and the occupied took place. Sexual abuse and violence used against Palestinian women political prisoners is a manifestation of a pathological relationship of occupation and sexism. The occupier manifested its sexual terrorism as an integral feature of Palestinian women's prison experience where women's bodies were used as battlegrounds of men's wars. As part of interrogation, Palestinian women's sexuality is often brought to the center by accusing them of being prostitutes and of being pregnant at the time of their illegal imprisonment, so that their families will disown them. By using women's sexuality, intimidating and threatening them with shame, and rape, a cultural trait taboo, that the interrogators understood about the Palestinian culture, the occupier have hoped to achieve multiple goals targeted at the individual and the collective level.

Women Political prisoners reported repeated assaults of sexual retaliation, including beatings of women's breasts and genitals. At the Russian compound in Jerusalem, a male official threatened one detainee with rape and asked her how many men she had slept with. "Then he told me, She said: "Stand in the corner and I will take your clothes off and do many horrible things to you. I will take your breast and put it on the edge of the table and punch it with my hands. I will make sure that you will not be able to be a woman any more".

Another 20 years old prisoner said: "They beat me with a stick, on my stomach and my breast. Then they told me to take my clothes off. This was the first thing I found myself unable to do. I was shaking. A big ugly man came in with a stick, and I knew he was going to rape me with it.

He threatened me that he was going to take off my clothes if I don't do it. I started to undress. All eight interrogators came in, to fondle me, laugh at me, touch my breasts. I was so ashamed". Fatemeh told me that when Steve, a tall big Israeli soldier was beating her naked, he took a picture from his pocket and forced her to look at him when he was erected. He said to me "You see me small now, but here look at me when I am big".

Em Mohammed and Em Youssef, two elderly Palestinian women I interviewed, told me their stories about how the occupier forced them to transform their cultural identity by forcing them to erase sixty years of their national culture and nature. When arrested in their traditional Palestinian embroidered dresses, both women were forced to take off their dresses and fit into tight, short, sleeveless dresses. I did not have to ask why. My instincts answered that the occupier threatened by the Palestinian culture that is represented by every thread, design, stitch and color that the women adorned their proud bodies with, was an enough reason to attempt to erase thousands of years of Palestinian heritage and civilization and an enough evidence to the Zionist's immorality and its illegal and unlawful occupation and aggression. It is also a practice to disgrace, humiliate, and dishonor the elderly more pious Palestinian women.

Another form of sexual conquest that the occupier practiced is the story of Reem a political prisoner I interviewed who told me a horror story about her sexual torture. She said: "They hung me naked by my hair and extinguished their cigarettes all over my body and my face. After the cigarettes recreation affair, they brought me down, still naked, and brought an Afro Palestinian man and ordered him to rape me. He refused; they beat him as if he was a piece of steel. I felt sorry for him and asked him to rape me to stop his torture. They ordered him to take off his underwear, he refused, they took it off for him, put his penis in a drawer and slam shut the drawer hard on it, they continued their kicking and beatings, until he fainted.

The psychological goals of sexual torture are domination and dehumanization. It attacks the integrity of the woman as a person as well as her identity as a woman. It renders her homeless in her own body and it strikes at a woman's power that seeks to degrade and destroy. The story of Reem is an evidence of how sexual conquest played by the occupiers to disrupt, and obstruct the social fabric of the Palestinian society-while the actors are the natives themselves, where the Palestinian male was made to defeat and reduce the Palestinian female body, sexuality, spirit and dignity by raping her. Another tactic used to humiliate women is to handcuff pregnant women prisoners when they go into labor. A graphic example of "taming the animal nature of the Arab", and a graphic expression of occupation as control of women's fertility. In addition to the harmful psychological and health effects of sexual violence and physical torture experienced in the course of interrogations, women suffered from harsh living conditions, including abject sanitation, inadequate nutrition, denial of medical treatment, family visits, sleep deprivation, and denial of legal consultation. Palestinian women victims did not only suffer from their dreadful experience at the hands of the Israelis but also from the reaction of their immediate society, which responded by blaming them. Most girls who were detained while they were in their teens are still single women now, because society views them as "strong", "un-controllable", and not traditional", therefore non marriageable.

Western social scientist refuse to address this highly significant and sensitive issue. The result is evidently noticed in the void of ethnographical, sociological, psychological and feminist literature, by thus, eliminating Palestinian women's courage, steadfastness and resistance to the Israeli occupiers and to their own communities' societal pressures. Through my one year literature research on Palestinian women political prisoners, I came across a handful of short articles and one book written on their torturous experience in detention. I still yet to find a holistic study that includes all aspects of their lives; their lives as refugees in their own country, their involvement in the national struggle, the impact of the Israeli occupation and the negative psychological and health effects during and post-imprisonment, and a comprehensive gender analysis between the Israeli occupation, the Palestinian Authority and its consequences on Palestinian women.

Ghada Talhami, director of the Arab Women's Studies center in D.C. attributed the near total silence in academia on the contributions of Palestinian women to the process of nation building to two factors. First, she said, the need to address reforms at home; the feminist discipline lacked a genuine concern for Third World feminism. Any attempt to address the transformations taking place in gender relations in Palestinian society remained superficial and misguided. Second: because the American feminist movement was influenced by consciously Zionist women, the political mobilization of Palestinian women was seen in a negative light. During the 1970s and as a result of the Palestinian stand against Zionism in international women's conferences, the liberationist struggle of Palestinian women was portrayed in the United States as a male dominated effort. Palestinian women were simply denounced as political mouthpieces and their suffering and dehumanization by the forces of Israeli occupation were ignored. American Zionist feminists denounced Palestinian women as objects of clear male political manipulation. The Idea that suffering united women across racial, ethnic, and political lines was also quietly discarded". Nawal El-Sadaawi, the famous Egyptian doctor and feminist added that "Western feminists simply refused to listen to the problems of so-called Third World, and paid little attention to our analyses....Despite all the talk about diversity, difference, respect for other cultures, despite the postmodern discourse about multiculturalism and identities, there is no space in the media, or even in the academy, for a real, in-depth discussion of who I am, and who you are". Finally, in order to eliminate one color of violence on Palestinian women, Western feminists instead of gathering documentation evidence to women's oppression, they should gather documentation about how this oppression came to be and analyze it in the holistic context of the Palestinian national culture and the Israeli occupation.

Emile Durkheim pointed out that even a society of saints would produce its deviants. Palestinian women proved this theory to be correct. They subverted oppressive laws and defied codes in their society. They acted on their beliefs and convictions, therefore, were detained. They broke curfews by leading food convoys to their refugee camps and defended it with their bodies; consequently, their bodies were assaulted, tortured and sexually terrorized. The stories of Em Youssef, Em Mohammad, Reem and Fatmeh are few stories of a long list of credible strong Palestinian women, that prove the negative stereotyping I mentioned earlier, wrong, immoral and unjust. Palestinian women know that their battle against occupation could not be separated from their battle of women's dependence on men. They recognize that their country cannot be liberated when half of its inhabitants are dependent beings, and that class exploitation cannot be

ended without terminating patriarchal exploitation in the family, where the class system is founded on the slavery of women and children. Palestinian women admit that their dignity will never be restored without their freedom and their freedom cannot be less than a whole, and their rights will never be granted but should be acquired.

Neferti Tadiar

Violence is often thought of as a severe interruption of what is taken as the normal course of things, a course conflated with peacefulness. Violence also often seen as an extreme use of physical force, an abnormal exercise of coercion, an infliction of pain and suffering. In these respects, violence might describe the event and practice of colonialism, which some would like to remember as a terrible past now overcome, a historical trauma now over and done. Like violence, colonialism is viewed as a breach or rupture in some natural, ordinary and orderly progression of things. Colonialism is seen as the forcible intrusion of an external culture, by definition violent inasmuch as violence is understood as rupture, as destruction, as precisely the infliction of pain and suffering from an external force.

Many of us here know that colonialism is not over, and violence is an everyday occurrence, a fundamental dimension of the normal and present order. This order, which spans the world, is precisely an order of continuing colonial violence against women of color, a violence that is not simply directed against already racialized, gendered and sexualized human beings but, in fact, is the very process of racialization, gendering and sexualization which helps to create women of color as at once the target of such violence and the political agents of historical change.

I want to talk a little bit about how this is so, however, from the specific context of the Philippines and with a focus on the women who bear its historical burden and name, Filipinas. I want to talk about how colonial violence continues to determine the everyday lives not only of Filipinas, but of those huge social sectors of the globe whom they service with their labor.

In the 1970s, we experienced the massive prostitution of Filipinas as a direct translation of the so-called metaphorical prostitution of the nation (that is, its natural resources, including women) under the export-oriented development strategies under the U.S.-Marcos regime [transforming the national economy into a hospitality and tourist industry, which relied on a predominantly female and wholly feminized labor force.] In 1991, there were about half a million sex workers in export processing zones where factories are involved in electronics, semiconductor and clothes and garment industries, 70% of the workers are women. In the 1980s and 1990s, this labor force began to be itself the goods for export, constituting what is known as the "warm body export" industry.

It is also important to look at the conflicts in masculinities within this context. That is, Filipino men might protest the prostitution of women, but would not make the connections with domestic violence occurring within the society. There is an overabundance of evidence that demonstrates the femicidal nature of militarized masculinity. For instance, women in the Philippines are

described as “little brown fucking machines.” These relations of sexual hierarchy then become translated into economic structures so that nations themselves are constructed within sexualized relationships in the global system.

There are over 2 million Filipina overseas contract workers in 125 countries all over the world, 50,000 Filipina mail-order brides in the U.S., almost the same number of Filipina entertainers in Japan, 100,000 Filipina domestic workers in Italy, and so on and so forth. These are not only numbers, they are images. In a summary of statements made by U.S. American men about Filipinas, based on over 1,500 pages of Usenet News posts and material from 75 pen-pal services, Filipinas were portrayed as ideal women because of their eagerness to marry, their youthful looks -- their "exceptionally smooth skin and tight vaginas -- their real liking of sex, their loyalty and dispensability. They are "low maintenance wives", fully domesticated and convenient -- "She can always be returned and replaced by a younger model". Filipinas are status symbols, bodily signs of their husbands-proprietors' worldly experience, cultural sophistication, sexual prowess and liberal racial attitudes. They are things and signs whose meanings and devaluation are the product of a long history of "special relations" between the U.S. and the Philippines.

If you read the Human Rights Watch Global Report On Human Rights, you will get abundant evidence of violence, including torture and murder, against Filipinas and other overseas Asian domestic workers. The murderers are never brought to justice. But what I want to point to is the way this report presents violence as forms of abuse. For instance, one section is titled, "Abuses Against Women Workers". Or it is presented as discrimination, as in the first sentence of this section: "Women throughout the world confront physical and sexual violence as well as sex discrimination in the workplace...Human Rights Watch investigations have documented violence against women workers that includes rape and other forms of sexual assault, beating, kicking, slapping and burning. In addition, women workers have reported being subjected to illegal confinement, extremely long working hours and nonpayment of wages. Sex discrimination in the workplace and in the criminal justice system frequently compounds the effects of violence." [interpretation of the external relations between workplace or work, criminal justice system on the one hand, and violence on the other]

The term "abuse" is significant because it indicates an abnormal use of power, a mis-use of what would otherwise be proper structures, relationships, etc. It is thus in keeping with the notion of violence as abnormal, interruptive, and so on. In describing violence in the workplace or in the criminal justice system it is thus assumed that the workplace and the criminal justice system are depicted as sites where there would not normally be violence. Similarly, discussion about abuses of women who are abused as domestic workers, mail order brides, etc, suggests that the power relations between them and their husbands or employers is not inherently abusive. However, what I am suggesting is that violence is not an unusual or aberrant practice from normal daily life, it is the logical extension of the current world order.

These human rights reports depict women as objects without desire. They are “appliances” which do the work, but which have no agency. They are household utensils. They are considered property. Their body is their labor. They are seen as sexualized territory. The dominant of sexual relations enacted through colonization are now what structure international

economic and political relationships between nations. Sexual economies do not just refer to trafficking in women, but to the fact that international relations are themselves sexualized. Colonial labor that is both gendered and racialized is now the means by which cheap, abundant labor is reproduced and laborers are then devalued. Race and gender transform women into “natural resources” rather than human beings. The worker becomes “surplus labor” which is represented in the difference between her wage (or non-wage) and the income of her employer. Her employer may not always be white, but the process of racialized economies which devalues the labor of Philippine women still informs relationships between employers and employees even if they are both people of color.

The nation-state is a fundamental component of global capitalism. Under colonialism, women’s bodies often become the sites of contest between men who are colonizers and colonized men seeking national sovereignty. This contest continues between the nation state and the structures of multinational capitalism.

Dehumanization is the condition of possibility for humanization. That is employers seek a form of fuller humanity by greater engagement in civil society, but their humanization depends on the dehumanization of others. Those who were once dehumanized can then use the rhetoric of humanism to demand their own inclusion.

We have to remember the strength and power of women, which occurs not only in resistance. There is strength in the desire of women who are prostitutes or sex workers, who desire to liberate themselves from poverty and their current social status. They are not merely coerced victims. The movement of Philippine women throughout the world is a manifestation of their desires and power which have then been appropriated by nation states and economic institutions.

Being a woman is a ceaseless struggle to be free.

Lourdes Santaballa

If you believe in a creator, you understand the earth belongs to all people, and colonialism has created false divisions among us. There is really only one human race. The borders between us are false. We used to travel to see other peoples, but now we have borders. We had nations, but we did not have immigration laws.

The term “America” has been appropriated to mean the US, but really it signifies all of North and South America and the Caribbean.

When Europeans came and conquered the world, the indigenous people did not give green cards. What is interesting about INS laws is that the Chinese Exclusion Act was written because Chinese were brought here to work, and then Chinese men wanted to bring their families over. This Act was passed to stop them. Africans were forcibly brought here, and then denied citizenship. The situation with Latinos is very complex, because on one hand Puerto Ricans can come into the US because of their colonial relationship to the US, whereas Mexicans who are closest to the North American indigenous peoples are excluded through immigration laws.

In 1898, US acquired Cuba and Puerto Rico. Every US war is launched from Puerto Rico. There is forced sterilization of Puerto Rican women. Agent Orange was tested first on Puerto Rico. Birth control pills were first tested in Puerto Rico. Industries are set up by US companies where they don't have to pay federal taxes. All of these policies have detrimentally impacted the health of Puerto Ricans. The law is not about justice but is written by corporate interests.

We have an overrepresentation of violence and addiction in our communities because of the hurts caused by colonialism. Of course there is violence in all communities, but we do need to address the realities of violence in our communities that come as a result of the police state we live in. We internalize violence and oppression.

I would have liked to have been able to go the workshop on the depoliticization of the anti-violence movement, because in Puerto Rico, the majority of shelters are staffed by social workers and psychologists. Women who don't have these degrees do a lot of the work, but they don't get paid much for their work. The colonial relationship Puerto Rico has with the US compounds problems because Puerto Rico is so dependent on federal assistance. The price of food and basic goods is very high because of the export-based economy. Because of NAFTA, there is a mass exodus of businesses in Puerto Rico. There are three political parties: one which is pro-statehood; one which is pro-status quo, and one which is pro-independence. The domestic violence law was passed in 1981, but there is mass resistance to the law. The law is being challenged by an abuser as being unconstitutional because it limits free speech supposedly. That is, the law limits the power of men to negotiate their relationships within the family. I went to the court hearing to hear his case presented, and it was quite ridiculous.

60% of women experience violence in interpersonal relationships. Two women die every week in an island that is very small. The police do now document domestic violence, but they also have a category of crime called "crimes of passion" which are differentiated from domestic violence. Sodomy and adultery is illegal, so you can't prosecute a batterer that is part of either a gay/lesbian or adulterous relationship. You can get an order of protection, but you can't prosecute under domestic violence law since those relationships are illegal.

In Puerto Rico, the death penalty is illegal, but there are six people still on death row. The same federal law under which the Violence Against Women Act was passed, also created three strikes legislation and thus created a loophole so that people can be executed under federal law. Although, the death penalty is illegal under Puerto Rican law, there are six Puerto Rican prisoners who will be executed under federal law.

In Vieques, the US wants to take over 3/4 of the island to do military testing. Inhabitants were paid \$50 to leave. Those that didn't were forcibly removed. There is now uranium and mercury poisoning in the water. There was a march of over 15,000 on Memorial Day to protest the military, although the official count was only 80,000. Two weeks later, the pro-government party had a march for US citizenship in which only 60,000 showed up, but the official statistics said it was 120,000. There is a very direct relationship between the military, the government, and the media in terms of distorting reality. <audience member: over 1000 Marines have been sent in to remove the protestors. They are invading the island. Thousands of Puerto Ricans have

committed to go to the military bases to protest this>. The civilians are there continuing to protest and refusing to leave Vieques. <audience member: call the White House and call Janet Reno to express your outrage. They need to hear from you.> A sister of a civilian who died in these military operations helped spearhead this resistance. The military has also totally degraded the environment which symbolizes the disrespect the US has for Puerto Ricans.

Winnie Te Are and Stella Marr

160 years ago we (the Maori of New Zealand) were free of colonization. We had our own songs, our own laws. 160 years ago a treaty was signed which took land from us. By the time they came to us, colonizers had a lot of practice colonizing other peoples, so they were very skilled by the time they came to us. Colonizers came to us because some classes in those countries saw they could not own land and property, so they came and took ours. February 6, 1849, we signed the Treaty of Waitangi. The treaty was to keep them under control because they were beating us, killing us and raping us, but it has been used to try to control us. But we are alive and well and are fighting hard. Colonizers thought it would be easy to destroy us because they had all the military power. But we are still here.

Some of the laws were intent on stopping our cultural practices. They tried to change us into an image they could accept. They tried to mold us and Christianize us. But even so, we have only been colonized for 160 years; many indigenous peoples here have been colonized for much longer. We thank you for your experiences and resistance.

We were a communal race. We shared; we looked after each other. We had a big house we all gathered in and slept in. Colonization tried to break that communalism and make us think as individuals concerned primarily about money and materialism. They tried to destroy our culture and our sense of selves. They did a good number on some of us. We now want to go back to our traditional ways, because we're not doing well the way we are now. We are overrepresented in prisons and mental health institutions. We are killing ourselves with alcohol. I think it is a poison we should not touch. Youth suicide is high. We need to go back to the hard ways, even if that means going back to bush. Even the foods brought by colonialism is hurting us, bloody McDonalds!

We also have relationships with other Polynesian peoples, who have also suffered colonization. Many anthropologists have come to write about who we are and who we should be. They become the authority on us, and are taken viewed by courts as having the official version of who we are. We are being researched by US academics.

We have lost peoples through disease and massacres. In the turn of century, there were only 3,000 childbearing Maori women left in Aotearoa. We did not care if a woman had ten children with ten partners—that came with missionaries. It became an imperative to have as many children as possible. The government statistics say we are the worse parents. Our struggle is to maintain our families and saving our nations.

One in four Maori women have been abused. But there are many forms of abuse that are addressed in the law, although not addressed sufficiently. We do have refuges that only service Maori women. This is part of our struggle as first nations people to address our own problems first. We have to take care of who are and go back to our own traditions. We don't have to exclude other people, but we need to take care of ourselves first. We also need to bring our songs and daughters to forums like these.

DEPOLITICIZATION OF THE ANTI-VIOLENCE MOVEMENT

Kelley Mitchell-Clark

We will need to explore what we mean by depoliticization and how they are linked to institutionalization and professionalization of the anti-violence movement. Are there any benefits to depoliticization, and if so, for whom? And finally, how have we both participated in and resisted these processes of depoliticization. In order to foster more dialogue, our speakers will only talk for 5-7 minutes in order to maximize audience participation.

Kata Issari

I want to tell you several stories and make some points of them. One thing happened yesterday. We were looking for the women's center on campus. We were driving into campus and getting lost. We came across easily 10-15 women and asked where the women's center was. None of them knew. Most of them had never even heard of women's center. That was very distressing to me as I don't think this experience would be much different from most universities in the country.

The other story I wanted to tell is that when I was leafing through some magazines in my office before I came here. A picture caught my eye, so I opened up to the article and there was a picture of four white people linking arms wearing green plastic skirts. The caption read: This organization had their annual meeting on Maui and these were the speakers. One of the speakers is a well-known domestic violence advocate.

The third story happened in Honolulu, and the domestic violence coalition had a meeting. The summary of what happened is that one of the members of the coalition staff had gone to a meeting held by the Violence Against Women Office and someone from that office brought up the issue of division between domestic violence and sexual assault and suggested that we not use those terms and just describe ourselves as working against violence against women. It is fascinating how the federal government was coming in and co-opting our language and issues and telling us, the workers, what we should be doing. But even more fascinating was that coalition staff member brought it back to the domestic violence coalition and asked if should we adopt this language because she thought the sexual assault workers were feeling "left out." This is a pet peeve of mine because the domestic violence movement actually came out of the anti-sexual assault movement. Because of efforts to divide and conquer those who work in this movement, we have been pitted against each other. Now, the competition between movements is vicious. People say, "We don't want them in our meeting because we're talking about domestic violence," and they're talking about sexual assault workers. Anyway, back to the story, the

coalition decided it couldn't use the term "violence against women" because it would confuse the community.

Each of these stories illustrate the dangers of becoming depoliticized and professionalized. We have lost our connections with each other and our communities. We are disconnected in particular with youth. We need to question our leaders and the directions they are taking us when they do such blatantly racist things like wear plastic skirts in the state of Hawai'i. We must see the dangers of trying to make our issue seem palatable when the issue itself is inherently unacceptable in patriarchal society. Finally, I want to acknowledge my own difficulties in trying to do work in agencies that provide services, but using structures that ultimately oppress us as well.

Mimi Kim

I've been a worker for the past 10 years. I'm going to talk about the term professionalization in the anti-violence movement. What has been our experience is that we have started agencies that turn around and oppress us. I want to talk about the positive experiences working with Asian Women's Shelter, my current agency. We have been able to maintain a collective work experience. We say this is something that works in paper but not in practice, but we have managed to make it work. At AWS, we have 15 staff, but no management staff. We have an executive director, but she does not have a managerial role. We work together collectively in teams or on our own. So we have had much self-determination in implementing our vision. We do not have an educational requirements for any job descriptions. I recently interviewed people with advanced degrees, and asked them, how do you feel working for an agency that will not reward your educational degrees? Our board takes a supportive role of our agency but does not micromanage. Board members even do back up emergency work when one of the staff goes on vacation. So, working collectively can happen, it is something we can do.

Andrea Smith

I want to acknowledge genocide that has happened in this land, and in particular the sexual violence that has structured the colonization of Native peoples. Sexual violence and colonization are not separate things; they are part of the same practice of destroying Indian women, because it is the women who sustain nations when they are under attack. But if we look at the anti-violence movement, we see that there has been great difficulty in developing an anti-colonial approach toward ending violence. And why is this?

First, while we pay lip service to how all oppressions are related, the political practice is not consistent with this lip service. In our 40-hour trainings, we may talk about racism, colonialism etc. But are agencies politically mobilized around these issues? This fact is particularly evident in the difficulties of raising money for this conference. There was so much enthusiasm for the conference, I thought foundations would be excited about funding it. But when I went to more racial-justice focused foundations, they said we had sold out to white feminists. White feminist foundations said we had betrayed feminism. Both said, they were already doing this work, and hence this conference was redundant and unnecessary. One foundation even said they couldn't

support us because we didn't have permission from the National Coalition Against Domestic Violence.

Second, the anti-violence movement has adopted some uncritical assumptions about the criminal justice system. We have been critiquing the criminal justice system, but what the anti-violence movement tends to say is, sure prisons are bad, but they represent the "tough" approach toward ending crime. Prisons are bad—but they work. When we look at alternatives to the criminal justice system, however, we say they are inherently incapable of working. However, the facts do not bear these assumptions out. Prisons have no impact on crime rates, including sexual assault, and crime rates are more closely related to unemployment rates than incarceration rates. There are a number of reasons for this: 1) if someone breaks societal norms and commits a "crime," prisons simply take that person even further out of society ensuring it will be even more difficult for them to fit into social norms. 2) Prisons are based on the notion that there are few bad people who commit crimes that society must be protected from. However, when we have studies that say that 50 percent of men say they would rape someone if they thought they could get away with it, we either have to imprison half the male population, or we have to think of an alternate strategy for eradicating violence.

I'm not suggesting that there are not problems with the alternatives to incarceration for addressing violence. These community-based approaches work only when the community thinks what happened is a crime. However, in cases of rape, the community often does not think the rape survivor was a victim of a crime and hence will not hold the perpetrator accountable.

So, how can we actually develop community-based approaches for addressing violence?

3. Clearly, we need an approach based primarily not on social service delivery but on grassroots political mobilization. But, the problem we face is that progressives do not actually want to mobilize or organize. We have become increasingly lazy and have found it easier to travel from UN conference to UN conference and shmooze with those in power and congratulate ourselves when Clinton says something nice about us. As one activist stated: "White feminists spend a lot of time giving head to white male legislators and getting nothing but dirty knees." We have betrayed ourselves by turning our back on the political mobilization that gave birth to the anti-violence movement in the first place.

We do so at our own peril, because while we have forgotten the importance of grassroots organizing, the Right has not. Let me quote Ralph Reed on the success of the Christian Coalition. "I felt, just as a matter of political strategy, that the religious conservative movement had always gotten it backwards. It always tried to leap-frog over the preliminary steps to political influence with one long bomb: trying to win the White House. But if you win the White House and you can't control anything underneath it, it can be a Pyrrhic victory, as we discovered with Reagan, and as the left is discovering with Clinton."

We don't have money on our side. We don't have political power. The only thing we could have on our side in our struggle to end violence and oppression is numbers. And if we don't get these numbers, we won't get anywhere.

Loretta Ross

The question of depoliticization is one that has haunted me forever because I actually watched it happen. I was the third executive director of the first rape crisis center in the country, which was the only one run by African American women. When we had our first conference, we were sued in a court of law for not allowing in white women. I was recognizing then that on one hand, the center had been created by visionary white women who said that when the center opened, the jobs should go to Black women, and then we had the rednecks on the other hand, and we were wondering which way the center going to go. Over time, the conservative white women and women of color started getting on our boards and we lost our feminism and our politics. We were complicit in this as well. At one job, we chose a woman of color who had all the skills but no politics over a white woman who had all the politics, but no skills, and she almost killed us. So when we talk about issues of depoliticization, they hurt.

One of the issues that we have compromised in happened when we tried to get into the public schools to talk about sexual assault. To get in, we marketed ourselves as talking about child safety awareness. At the time, it seemed strategically smart. 20 years later, they have now lost all references to sex in these programs. Even the term “sexual assault” minimizes the impact of the word “rape.” The mainstream is defining our terms for us.

Other ways in which we became compromised: we stopped saying, why doesn't he stop beating her and started asking, why doesn't she leave? We began to assume we could treat misogyny with a therapy program. We have also been harmed around the question of men in the movement. I think it's good to have men in the movement. I applaud men joining the movement, but at the same time, we have also catered to them, saying to ourselves, at least they are the good guys. We have promoted survivors in leadership regardless of their politics. I think they are lots of survivors, but I don't think everyone should be in a charge of a program when they can't spell the “F” word. Feminism becomes marginalized whereas law enforcement becomes centralized.

Finally on issues of safety: in our efforts to create spaces of safety for women, we have allowed the concept to become perverted so that we aren't allowed to bring up issues of racism, classism, etc. because they make some women feel “unsafe.” They have always been afraid of women of color, and I will not allow these bullshit rules of safety to silence me.

The term “woman of color” was formed in 1977 at a conference that was not imposed on by them by white women, but was formulated by women of color themselves as a political identity. We need to own this term and its history.

I am concerned finally within women of color organizing the way Jesus seems to be highjacking our movement. We used to come together for mass protest, and now we come together for mass revival, and I think something is wrong with that. I don't have a problem with Christianity. But we got 3000 Black women together for a conference on health some years back, but we now get together 20,000 women for either a revival or a hair show, and I think something is wrong with that.

Select Audience Discussion:

Audience Member: In the conference, I keep hearing the terms “America” as “Americans.” I am a citizen of the US, not by choice, so I sit here with a lot of privilege. But I urge us all to remember this term has a lot of violence. The US is not America. We then erase the reality of the rest of the Americas. This “America” is just a bunch of states united by rape, theft and genocide.

Audience Member: I want to stress the importance of starting our own organizing instead of being subsumed by mainstream organizations where we get relegated to women of color outreach. Also, how do we deal with colorism, and the fact that the darkest, the poorest and the ones least able to speak English are still not visible.

Audience Member: I am the only woman of color in management in my agency, and I’m seeing four Black women driven from the agency. What can we do to address relationships between white women and women of color in these agencies, or how women of color can get their own agencies so we don’t have to translate ourselves every single day. What is there to be done about having white women in leadership saying they are serious about anti-oppression work, and yet I have to scream and holler, and get sanctioned for screaming and hollering, to get these issues taken seriously.

Loretta: I worked for white women’s agencies for many years. I have found that women of color are also very capable of being endlessly creative in oppressing each other. Re: white women’s agencies where we get hired to colorize their agencies: First, there is only so far white women can go in understanding us, so we have to speak for ourselves and be more strategic and do our homework in making interventions in these agencies. To survive these agencies, we need to know them and how they work, and also not loosely making charges of racism until we can clearly back up our claims. We also have to pick and choose our battles. We who have survived these struggles need to have classes teaching these techniques.

Andrea: How can we survive in white agencies? We can’t. We need our own agencies. In my experience, women of color work together fine when we’re battling white women, but when we try to organize our own organizations without white women, we start to destroy ourselves. What if we start forgetting about white women, and start thinking about how we can get work together to build the movement that we need for ourselves?

Kata: I think skills sharing is also key—grant writing, public speaking, etc.

Audience Member: I’m so infuriated by the depoliticization of the movement. I went to the President’ commission meeting on violence against women. I said, can we talk about what bullshit this is that the President is the biggest women-hater there is, and everyone gasped. And I didn’t think I was really saying anything radical. I was never invited back.

I’m a lesbian by choice because I got tired of the violence men perpetuate against women. But when I do education in the schools, people ask, does being raped make you a lesbian? I get stuck

saying that one out of three women are raped, so if being raped made you a lesbian, there would be more. But how can I make the statement that I am a lesbian by choice and that is good.

Kata: I think what is at issue with that question, does being raped make you a lesbian, is that being raped makes you damaged goods. Hence you're not good enough for men, so you need to be with other women and all be miserable together. I affirm that it is a choice that is about resistance and liberation. I don't know what that would mean to high schoolers, but maybe there is a way to say it in a way that would be meaningful to them.

Audience: How do you feel about what social change is and its relation to social service. I think we also need to question the hierarchical structures in domestic violence shelters. Also, what are the alternatives to telling women to go to the police? What are the programs that you have seen work?

Andrea: Re: the alternatives to incarceration, there is somewhat of a contradiction in trying to address this issue with a "program." When we look at the problems of violence, we are dealing with a systemic problem in which capitalism, racism, etc fractures our communities and makes it difficult for our communities to hold perpetrators accountable. So, our solutions then are about massive social change to reconstitute our communities, not about model programs.

Audience: But what do we do in the meantime?

Loretta: We used to do direct action and hold perpetrators accountable before lawyers started telling us what we couldn't do. We used to distribute pictures of the rapists in communities. We might confront perpetrators directly. Some other countries that have more tight-knit communities use various forms of social ostracism. We have to get creative in terms of thinking solutions. Now, I'm less willing to do these things since I bought my first home and don't want to risk losing it getting sued by a rapist by posting his picture. Also, I think we can't always be ideologically pure. Sometimes, we may have to call the police, but we should be aware when are making compromises.

Audience: I think this has been a great conference for all colored girls who have considered homicide when the movement is not enough. Also, I work with girls, and we need to have them more represented. The girls I work with don't see sexism as an issue and they see that has a "lesbian" or a "white" issue. How do we bring these movement to the schools and the streets?

Audience: Women of color are used against each other: We have become agents of the state in the movement. Heterosexual women are used against lesbians; lighter-skinned women are used against darker-skinned women. It's easy to complain about white women, but we need to deal with how we treat each other.

Audience: I am enthused to see women of color working together on these movements. We should think of how to include all women. I feel that disability is again at the margins, and I think it has to be centered in discussion of violence against women. I also think we need love and creativity. What we have here is a room of creative dissidents.

Audience: Do you think it's worth it to fight for women-only space?

Audience: I'm 12 years old. I want to thank you for being so strong and brave. It would be even better if all the other young women could see that they are not alone. This needs to be shared with them as well.

Audience: How can foundations support these struggles and build better partnerships between funders and activists?

Andrea: There was actually a very good article in *The Nation* that speaks to the problems with progressive funders. Right-wing foundations give more money to each organization; they fund more multi-year grants so organizations don't spend all their time writing grants, and they support organizational infrastructure such as media campaigns and think tanks, that give right wing organizations the space to carve a holistic message to the public. The Heritage Foundation, for instance is set up so that when any newsbreaking issues comes out, they are able to put a policy statement in each congress person's desk within hours that frames that event within their right-wing framework. By contrast, progressive organizations provide much smaller grants, and fund short-term campaigns expecting quick results. They want to know what you will accomplish in six months—but what we are fighting for is not going to have quick results. So, basically, we need a totally reorientation in what progressive funders are willing to fund.

Kata: To respond to the woman who asked about the necessity of women-only space. I say absolutely we need women only space; we need women of color only space and lesbians of color only space. Not that this is the only space should we work in, but we should have that space.

Loretta: We should not be in their bipolar thinking: we can have women only space, other space, and something else too. Women only space, etc., doesn't preclude other coalitions. We also need to learn to talk to people who are not like us. We should not critique women of color who work in white-only organizations; and acknowledge there are many ways to be in the world and to do our work.

Re: funders, I have had a foundation rejected by a women's foundation that was part of a two-year program to fight welfare reform because it "wasn't original." As if we're supposed to defeat welfare reform in one year with \$15,000. We have an old girls network in women's funding (and I'm part of that network), so that only the same groups get funded over and over and only those that use the language we like. We need to acknowledge that we are funding in a closed circle and deconstruct that. We also need to acknowledge that there are a lot of bad women of color programs.

Re: social change vs. social service. That's a binary we need to deconstruct. We need to put bandages on people as we mobilize them. We can't leave people bleeding as we step over them getting to a march. But we can't bandage them without asking why they got stabbed in the first place. We are all victimized violators, capable of victimizing others even as we ourselves are violated.

COLONIZED BODIES OF WOMEN OF COLOR

Dorothy Roberts

Throughout US colonial history, women of color have been seen as the worthy subjects of medical experimentation. Venus Hottentot was a slave kept on display and after she died her body parts were cut up. Women of color are seen as objects rather than as human beings with agency. This idea is so ingrained in white supremacist culture. I've talked about reproduction as part of social regulation, but dark-skinned bodies are also used for medical experimentations, such as the infamous Tuskegee experiments. The hospital in Charleston, South Carolina tried to justify its reporting policies by claiming they were doing research to figure out if using the threat of incarceration through nonconsensual drug testing to see if it is effective to use get them to stop using drugs. They got in trouble with the federal government for conducting experiments on human subjects. The US Supreme Court is going to review a challenge to this policy, where women sued for nonconsensual drug testing in this hospital.

I know there is a lot of debate around Norplant. The doctor who developed it, argues that it was never meant to be used against women. But it was tested on and promoted in the Third World. Millions of women in Indonesia have been forced to use it—India, Chile, Mexico, and other places. They were coerced into using it without follow-up care.

Lourdes Lugo

What am I about to tell you is a direct result of the colonial relationship between the US and Puerto Rico. When we are talking about colonized nations, we are talking about colonized peoples. I will focus on women, but colonialism affects men as well. Also, whatever happens to Puerto Ricans in the island also happens to the Puerto Ricans in the ghettos of the United States.

A doctor was sent in 1930 to Puerto Rico. He reported that Puerto Rico would be great if it weren't for the Puerto Ricans. They are totally degenerate and need to be exterminated so that Puerto Rico can be useable for others. He reported that he did his best to hasten the extermination by transplanting cancer cells into many Puerto Ricans. This letter was written while he was working under the auspices of the Rockefeller Foundation.

The policy against women as been as follows: from the 1930s, 40% of Puerto Rican women of childbearing age have been sterilized and 27% of men under a policy called "family planning." You can just go into a clinic, say you want to be sterilized, and that's it. Puerto Ricans have been guinea pigs for many forms of contraceptives, including the birth control pill which was used on Puerto Rican women 20 years before it was released in the US. We have been guinea pigs for contraceptive foams, sponges, nonoxynol-9, and pretty much any form of contraceptive in the US. As a result, there are high rates of ovarian cancer and other forms of cancer for women who have been experimented on. Since 1986, there have been high rates of birth defects as a result of mercury poisoning in the water, which the US government refuses to acknowledge any responsibility. There are no environmental laws that stop US companies from dumping toxic wastes into the water, so they can do pretty much anything they want. Ninety percent of the

birth control pills produced for the US are produced in Puerto Rico. The levels of estrogen in the air have high skyrocketed as a result.

Thirty-three percent of homicides committed against Puerto Rican are committed by their partners. Sixty percent of Puerto Rican women suffer abuse. Twenty-five percent of women who go into private hospitals to give birth get c-sections; twenty-four percent of women who go into public hospitals get them.

Because of the recent situation in Vieques, we have found that our water is contaminated by uranium. Puerto Rico has become a dumping ground for nuclear wastes. From 1950-1970s, Agent Orange and Napalm were tested in Puerto Rico. The second leading cause of death of Puerto Rican women is domestic violence.

All of this is part of an intentional policy of the US government to exterminate the Puerto Rican population. The only interest the US has in Puerto Rico is the land which it wants as a military base. It is very strategically located for US military operations. Operation Desert Storm was first practiced in Puerto Rican—whenever there has been a US military intervention, it was first staged in Puerto Rico.

So when we talk about violence against women, we have to talk about violence against all nations.

<audience member> what is the population of Puerto Rico?

3.4 million. We have had zero population growth for the past ten years. So soon, the population will be much less.

<what kind of resistance is going on in Puerto Rico?>

The reason it has not been able for US to succeed in the extermination is because of the long history of resistance. We still have Puerto Rican political prisoners in the US. The fact that one year and 9 days later after the resistance began in Vieques, the Marines have not been able to begin its military operations is because of our resistance. The fact that we have demonstrations of over 100,000 people shows this resistance.

Bernadine Atcheson and Mary Ann Mills

We are Dena'ina from the Kenai Peninsula in Alaska. We are reporting on our research on experimental vaccines conducted on Alaska Natives. In 1986, our tribal government was approached and encouraged to adopt the Heptavax B experimental program on tribal members only. This program affects the health of Alaska Natives. We have the highest rates for many diseases. Every illness hits Alaska Natives harder.

We went to our elders and asked, has our health always been this bad? They said prior to Europeans coming, we used to live to be 100 years or older. In the late 1700, foreigners came to take away our natural resources, bringing diseases and epidemics which wiped out our populations.

In looking at the relationships between immunization and diseases, it is the case that many diseases such as measles, tuberculosis and whooping cough were on the sharp decline before the vaccines were introduced as a result of improved sanitation and living conditions.

In 1992, it is reported that sanitation is still a major problem in Alaska Native communities. Many villages have honey buckets rather than flush toilets. Epidemics have resulted in some villages. But instead of taking care of these sanitation problems, the US introduces experimental vaccines. Many US federal reports describe how Alaska Native villages are ideal laboratories for medical research. We are targeted because our communities are very geographically isolated. These experiments are similar in nature to the Tuskegee experiments.

On the Rosebud reservation in South Dakota, the Dept of Health tried to do an experimental Hepatitis A and B program. They were originally targeting children and not telling them the vaccine was experimental. It is also true that in Rosebud, most of the problem could have been addressed by improved sanitation. Side effects from the vaccines are severe, including death in some cases.

Hepatitis B used to be a plasma-based vaccine but concerns raised that it might be transmitting AIDS. There is danger that it can be particularly hazardous if given to women who are pregnant.

When they came to inoculate us against Hepatitis B, we had a prevalence rate of less ½ percent. In 1987, a woman reported to us that her child had been vaccinated without her consent. And we found that the only children being vaccinated in public schools were those who were indigenous. The language used to discuss the experiments in Alaska is similar to the language used in the Tuskegee experiments.

In the 1950s, Alaska Natives were given radioactive iodine, resulting in most of them dying of cancer. This was done without their knowledge or consent. William Jordan from the US Health Department reported that all new field trials of vaccines were tested first on Alaska Natives, with most doing nothing to prevent disease. A field trial is essentially a euphemistic term for a medical experiment. The New England Journal of Medicine reports how thousands of soldiers from World War II contracted Hepatitis B from smallpox vaccinations. Many argue that many of the first outbreaks of AIDS cases correlate with Hepatitis vaccinations, and vaccinations in general often run high risks of contamination of other diseases or causing the vaccinated to contract the disease from which s/he is being vaccinated. With vaccines, we create more deadly diseases than the ones we created the vaccines for. There's no proof that vaccines protect; but it is clear that they do weaken our immune systems.

The reasons for this experiment is politics and profits. The US government actively pursues creation of new diseases as forms of biological warfare. Corporate interests also manipulate scientific results. Women of color, we can't control what doctors do, but we can take control over our own health. We can control what we put in our bodies or the bodies of the children of whom we are responsible.

Rajani Bhatia

I'm going to talk about the global politics of population control. I want to add to the list of suspect contraceptives we have been addressing, Depo Provera. It is provider-controlled, and once it's injected, there's nothing you can do about it. Not only does it not protect against STDs, but there's evidence to suggest that it puts you at higher risk for STDs. FDA approval of Depo Provera has less to do with safety and more to do with other political concerns.

US has made population control part of its national security strategies. Controlling the population of people in the Third World was seen important to protecting US interests. Global unrest was blamed on the growth of people of color rather than on colonialism and economic injustice.

As a result, there has been the promotion of long-acting contraceptives without regard for safety, informed consent, etc. These family programs are often funded at the expense of funding for health care in general.

At the Cairo conference on population, the population establishment worked hard to silence the voices of those critical of population control by appropriating feminist language. The UN platform did discuss gender equity and reject coercion. However, women of color were still marginalized in the processes as the population paradigm remained intact. The talk of gender provided an excuse for policy makers to avoid talking about race and colonialism. There are still no international mechanisms in place to avoid coercion in family planning programs. Also, Cairo repeats the myth that overpopulation is our primary problem, rather than racial and economic injustice. As a result, hysteria about overpopulation continues in the mainstream media. The focus continues to be numbers rather than looking at consumption or production patterns.

There has been a recent program of mass sterilization abuse in Peru to reduce the population drastically. Women are promised dental care in exchange for sterilizations.

Currently, the Quinacrine sterilization is being promoted which is a tablet that causes scar tissue to form in the fallopian tubes, resulting in permanent sterilization. It can be inserted into the uterus during a pelvic exam without the woman ever knowing. Tests suggests a high risk of carcinogenicity. The distributors of Quinacrine of, Mumford and Kessel of the Institute of Population and Security, have promoted trials on 104,000 women even though it's not approved by any regulatory body in the world. In Vietnam, rubber workers were sterilized by Quinacrine during what they thought were routine pelvic exams. The rationale for their efforts, according to Mumford and Kessel, is that immigrants (both real and potential) into the US is a threat to US national security. They blame immigration for all US problems, including terrorism.. Mumford and Kessel have been featured in feminist venues such as the Feminist Expo. Planned Parenthood seriously considered supporting Quinacrine trials until outcry stopped them. One doctor in the US said he would start using Quinacrine, saying it was okay because it would not be used against white, middle class women. Population control is fundamentally opposed to the well-being of women of color.

Lisa Ikemoto

I've been working with Asians and Pacific Islanders for Reproductive Health. We are a state-wide, social change organization. Our constituency is those most marginalized in the API community, particularly southeast Asians and Pacific Islanders. We do grassroots organizing, popular education and participatory research. Our analysis is feminist, anti-racist, and anti-heterosexist. We are also trying to promote gender analysis in environmental justice struggles.

We have a project called HOPE based in Long Beach which works with high school girls. We also have projects working with Cambodian girls. We address issues such as welfare reform, teen pregnancy, and we also educate foundations about the need to support different types of projects such as this.

Two years ago in 1998, girls participated in a three-day program in Sacramento. They marched against some racist initiative in California. One of their white, male teachers questioned them about their work and APIRH. The teacher said that the girls just need to keep their legs crossed and they wouldn't have any problems. The girls began educating themselves on a number of other issues such as sexual harassment. They are trying to empower themselves and their communities. They created a campaign survey on sexual harassment and collected over 500 surveys from their students. Preliminary results are horrifying with 87% reporting being targeted by harassment. Sexual harassment has a major effect on girls' ability to do well in school.

They have followed up the survey with a safety for girls campaign. They are working on a coalition basis and learning much in the process. The girls are changing their environment and their communities.

Audience Member: I'm from the Western Shoshone. I'm seeing we have all experienced the same things. We need to come together with a common statement so that we can fight back. My heart is heavy because of all this hurt. World powers have come and taken away all of our land. They didn't just take our land, they raped our spirits and committed genocide. Whenever the women are defeated, the struggle is over. Without land, we are nothing. Everything is interconnected.

ORGANIZING AGAINST VIOLENCE IN COMMUNITIES OF COLOR

Isabel Kang

My experience has been directed toward the Korean community in Chicago. When you do community organizing, it is important to have political clarity about how the structures of oppression affect our lives. It's important not just to provide social service delivery. We use a feminist, anti-racist, anti-classist perspective in the organization I was involved in. When we had this clarity it was helpful. We try to meet the community members where they are at, and pass information on to them.

Eileen Hudon

I'm Anishinabe from the White Earth reservation in Minnesota. In thinking about organizing for women of color and what has been effective for Native people, the question is how do we evaluate that when the work is just beginning. Because of VAWA, tribes now have funds to address domestic/sexual violence. In working with Mending the Sacred Hoop, we have a great responsibility in supporting tribes in doing this work. We have found that there have been women doing work for twenty years, but we haven't had the space to come together to learn from one another. We work with tribal grantees of VAWA. In 1994, 14 tribes were grantees. Today there are 131 out of 550 sovereign indigenous nations in the US. In thinking about Native people, we need to think about our sovereignty. There are three sovereigns in the US, the federal government, state government, and tribal governments. So we have government to government relationships. Half of Native peoples live on tribal lands; half do not. In working with the tribes, we can look at what we can do within our tribal communities.

We need places to come together. When I was working with the Minnesota Coalition for Battered Women, there have been trouble with women of color staff getting away from their agencies to meet with other women of color. When I started working a shelter, I was the only woman of color. I can't speak for other communities of color. I can't even speak for other tribes. We need to support the sovereignty of other communities and the sovereignty of women.

Native women all across the US had freedom within our tribes. We have a past to look to in which we were strong. We function in a class system in which Native women are at the bottom. The Department of Justice statistics have shown that we are the group that suffers the most violence in the community. It is not helpful to compare abuses. All abuse is bad.

We look at all aspects of violence against Native women. We have a prosecutors project for tribal governments that have tribal justice systems (190 tribes have these systems). In other tribes, we have the authority, but not the means to carry out that authority. In Alaska, there is a struggle against acknowledging sovereignty. But one tribe was asserting that authority without a justice system. They sent out a letter when they heard about a domestic assault and said to the men that it has come to our attention that you have been involved in a domestic assault. We want you to know there are resources. We also you want to know they are resources outside

community. And here is the date we want you to come before the tribal council to tell us what you are going to do to ensure you can still live here.

How do we assert our authority in our own communities? We have so many problems with the legal system. In Minnesota, women of color opposed mandatory arrests and that's why we don't have it. We have to look at the context in which violence is happening. Because of boarding schools, we have men and women sexually abused in these schools. We have to address this history. Once we talk about battering, we have to talk about sexual assault, then we have to talk about abuses in our own families. We are just at the beginning of talking about the stigma of sexual violence in our communities. We have to assert our authority in communities of color to determine what is effective for us.

Blanca Tavera

I have worked in domestic violence and teach early childhood education classes. Battered women and e.c.e. students have much in common. They are vulnerable and not valued. We value the care of development of technology than the care of children. I've been working primarily with Spanish-speaking communities. A form of violence I suffered was having my language devalued and I stopped speaking Spanish, and people complimented me for not having too much of an accent.

I was watching a basketball with my daughter. It seemed that the girls from our school were always being fouled while the other team from a private Christian school were usually at fault. I saw how the girls from the other school had been raised to know the rules, how to play them, and to think they're the best. The girls from our team were good, but they didn't have that same sense of being the best. They get scared. My partner said they need training. But what I think they need is a whole different type of training where we can do things from our own frame of reference. And I know that as a woman of color, I get flustered and scared. Whereas when you come from a place of privilege you have the training and skills to not get flustered. I think how we play sports is often how we live life.

I've worked in communities of color since my father helped organize farmworkers. I was telling them to exercise a lot and telling them to not eat too much meat. They said, look, we exercise all day in the fields and if we don't eat much meat, we will die. I was giving the information in a context they could not understand. Sometimes, in our own internalized oppression, we forget what it is like in our own communities.

In my classes, I spend 25% of my time clearing up misinformation about our communities. I tell them they can be teachers, not just teachers aids. When I first say this, they think there is something wrong with me. But I say this over and over again. We have to constantly give them the message they can do it. I talk to them about sexism and how it turns into beliefs and justifications for keeping women down. When this is explained, it makes all the difference in the world. It's also helpful to use lots of humor.

Wendy and Audrey Huntley

We are from the Aboriginal Women's Action Network in Vancouver. It was founded in 1995 in response to the firing of several Native women from in Native organizations. We talked about the sexism in our communities and Native women are silenced everywhere. We are organized to educate Native women. Most Native women live off-reserve. One thing we worked on was the Indian Act which is responsible for the dispossession of our land, particularly women. In 1985, any Native woman who married someone who was non-status (non-Native or Native) lost her legal status as Native and was forced to leave her reserve. We worked on Bill C-31 to amend the Indian act to change this. We used a participatory research model to show the effects of this legislation. We found an incredible internalization of the colonizer's definition of who was Indian. Many women were not able to return or were stigmatized. That's why there is so many Native women in the cities.

A big dilemma for us is that the Indian Act ideology is very internalized by the communities, particularly the male leadership. This ideology impacts the ability to address violence against Native women. Native women who address sexism or are accused of being too white. There's also this prioritization of communal over individual rights, but women's rights get designated as individual rights. So men use cultural arguments to keep women out of the communities.

The issue of restorative justice is very thorny because it is important for our communities to gain control and authority, but not at the detriment of women's safety. Restorative Justice comes from a Mennonite model which looks at crime not primarily as a crime against the state, but one that affects the community, particularly the victim and perpetrator. In 1996, restorative justice models started to be implemented in British Columbia—family-group conferencing, victim-offender mediation, neighborhood accountability programs, and circle sentencing. These models were promoted as being more culturally-sensitive than the traditional criminal justice model, and were promoted as a way to address concerns of the over-representation of indigenous peoples in the criminal justice system. In Manitoba, 68% of those incarcerated are Native.

Circle sentencing is supposed to be derived from Plains tribal cultures, although it is actually more of assembly of components from disparate cultures and then promoted as indigenous. They may be okay for vandalism and theft, they are insupportable for cases of domestic violence. We are concerned about individual police discretion when it comes to arrests. In cases we know, police are diverting cases into these programs at the expense of women's safety.

One Bishop working in a residential school who had been abusing children under his care was given over to circle sentencing, where he just apologized for his crimes. In another rural community, a couple that had repeatedly raped their children were given three years probation within the community. So the victims had no way to avoid the perpetrators in a community of only 400.

There is racism and sexism in all aspects of the criminal justice system, and there is also the problem of communities wanting to be silent on these issues and to keep the community together at all costs. We also have to look at the way violence has been normalized through colonization. Ultimately, the purpose of our project is struggling to have a voice and a gender analysis in the development of these restorative justice programs. We have been conducting workshops on

Aboriginal women and restorative justice programs to educate women about them. We are developing a paper on Restorative justice from an aboriginal women's perspectives.

Adrienne Davis

My research area is in slavery in the 19th century. In doing that work, I began to focus on the need to develop anti-racist responses to sexist violence. Some of the questions I have developed in doing this analysis:

1. How has violence against women been used to perpetuate incarceration as the solution to social issues?
2. What are the implications of being committed to gender equality in a racist society that treats men of color and white men differently?
3. What are the implications of being committed to racial equality in a sexist society that expresses itself through male acts of violence against women?
4. Can women work within the criminal justice system to eradicate sexist violence? What are the costs of doing so?
5. What are the alternatives to addressing sexist violence that do not rely on the criminal justice system? What are the consequences of those?
6. What is the role of the media in perpetuating a racist view of sexual violence?
7. What are the historical factors, legal and social, that influence how society addresses violence against women? How is race involved as a factor?
8. What are barriers faced in trying to eradicate sexism in an anti-racist way? Are there successful models for doing so?

There are multiple kinds of violence against women. They do not call for the same kinds of analysis and responses. Domestic violence in particular is important because a result of unfortunate confluences in the 1980s. One was the rise in anti-sexist theory around violence against women, particularly domestic violence. The public finally listened to the reality of violence against women. This fact is cause for celebration. The unfortunate coincidence I think is the 1980s also signaled the rise of racist, right wing incarceration. Just as the public was finally listening to women, the solution was, great, we have more reasons to lock people up.

I want to talk about why domestic violence is so tricky for women of color to organize around. Domestic violence against women of color in particular falls in the cusp of two distinct privacy histories in the United States. Women of all colors and people of color of both sexes have different histories with what we call the private sphere. These are fraught relationships for both groups. We have systematic violence against women of all races and classes in a sphere that is designated as private in which the state should not intervene. One of the characteristics of the modern state is the inability to see harm against women as harm. Feminist and domestic violence advocates are reluctant to support any of these notions of privacy because it means women will die.

But when we look at people of color of both sexes, we see a very different history. Instead of the state declining to intervene, we see the state eagerly intervening in the private sphere. Examples

include the state intervening in the reproductive systems of women of color. State will intervene in issues of abuse, dysfunctionality, etc in communities of color very aggressively. We have horrible cases of police brutality, which puts women of color in between personal violence on one hand and state violence on the other.

Thus, on one hand we see communities of color asking the state to protect privacy, and then we have white women saying the state should intervene in the private sphere to protect women. Women of color are at the cusp of these two violent histories. The police take our abuse less seriously, and at the same time we are fearful of a police state. What I would suggest is calling on white women and men of color to be in solidarity with us rather than us always having to be in solidarity with them.

First, we need to call on white women to be race traitors. We need to recover histories of white women who have been traitors to white supremacy. One example was the branch of the suffragette movement that broke away with the mainstream movement because it rejected racist notions of white women getting the vote to support the white sovereign state. In the 1930s, a group of middle-class white Southern women founded a group to oppose lynching. They were very bourgeois, but they did understand lynching was racialized terrorism that implicated them as white women. In my experience, there is no one more radical than a Southern white woman when she goes bad.

A more recent example in the 1970s was feminist groups who submitted briefs calling for the end to the death penalty as a remedy for rape. Of course feminists want rape to be taken seriously, but they understood that in this context, the death penalty was being used almost solely against African American men.

We can call upon white women to follow these examples and become race traitors and to put anti-racist strategies at the center of organizing efforts against gender violence.

For our brothers, we must call men of color to break the bonds of patriarchy with white men. I was talking to a friend of mine who does activist work, and I asked him how he addresses violence against women. He said, we haven't dealt with it. But then he quoted Mao to the effect that the tensions between the contradictions between the proletariat and the state must be addressed before addressing male violence against women. But for women, violence is not just from the state, but from the "people."

One concrete thing we can do is demand that every progressive organization have a specific policy on violence against women, sexual harassment, and domestic violence. And to the extent they do not wish to employ the state as a remedy for these forms of violence, then they need to develop other mechanisms for addressing violence against women.

By focusing on these violent histories of privacy together, we see the importance of empowering the women rather than empowering the state. I call on feminists to find ways to combat violence against women while at the same time combating conservative ideologies that are ultimately anti-woman and racist as well.

Audience Discussion

Audience member: I'm a bit frustrated by the way in the conference we keep talking about the specific problems in our communities, but we don't talk about how we can collectively work together.

Blanca: One of the way oppression works that we are forced to collude with the oppressor, and one thing we do is stay in our groups. We need to break out and start making connections with each other.

Audience member: How has Native communities addressed stigmatization around sexual violence?

Eileen: It starts from the women in the community when they begin to come together and speak out about their experience. It forces the stories to come out and forces the men to address these issues.

Audience member: Until we have real alternatives to addressing violence, what do we do when the available solutions force us to participate in our own oppression?

Wendy: I think these models of restorative justice work for crimes of poverty but when it comes to violence against women, we need to keep organizing as women to come up with other ideas that would protect our men and keep women safe.

RELIGION SPIRITUALITY AND VIOLENCE

Ines Hernandez-Avila

I just wanted to make a couple of points about Native American religious traditions in relationship to NAGPRA (Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act) and the New Age movement. They relate to how Native peoples are articulating what Native traditions are about, which are life-encompassing. One of the things Native peoples are beginning to do is move away from easy notions of relationship with the earth, etc. It's not that we don't believe this, particularly the traditional peoples, but Native belief systems are a sacred science that come from a relationship with the land base. The ones who understand our belief systems are a science are the people who are going to Native communities to appropriate these beliefs and market them. So now we are having to understand our beliefs through intellectual property rights. Our beliefs become patented by others. Native understandings of medicine of health are being appropriated but at the same time, Native beliefs are demonized by Christian groups. Native peoples are infantilized by leftists and others who see themselves as very sophisticated.

The other point I wanted to make is about our remains and our sacred objects that need to be protected, which prompted the passage of NAGPRA. It should be understood that legislation passed on our behalf has been because Native peoples have struggled for them. One situation in UC Davis which has baskets in the anthropology department that belong to California tribes. They make it very difficult for California Basketweavers Association to even look at the baskets. The Native community have demanded that there be a respectful recognition of the indigenous people on whose land the university was built. We're calling for a museum for the baskets until they are returned. We want people to get the point that we are not vanished, but that we are a living people.

Another whole big area is the appropriation of Native traditions by the New Age movement. Often the feminist movement, including women of color, have appropriated Native traditions in a mishmash fashion in the name of women's spirituality, thinking it is serving the cause of liberation. I would like to suggest that when you think you can use whatever you think is beautiful or good to you, that's a western mentality based on right of discovery. I saw it; therefore it should be mine.

Traci West

The focus of my work has been on intimate violence perpetrated against Black women. I have worked on analyzing the precise nature of the moral problem represented by the rape and battering of Black women. I would like to point out the way there are moral dichotomies that frame the way we look at these issues which deny the importance of intimate violence that Black women face. I also want to look at how religious theology and church practice collude to demoralize Black women. And finally, I want to look at how spirituality can function as a form of healing. I want to reject the notion that there is the Black women's experience or that we can separate personal consequences from the political consequences. I also reject the idea that religion, Christianity in particular, is only oppressive. I want to reject these simplistic notions.

When we see issues debated on TV, there are only two sides presented. Black women are presented with these simplistic dichotomies. Are you going to be a victim or are you going to be a strong Black woman? The implication is that the strong Black woman is one who keeps all her problems to herself. In the church, all too often the question that is asked, are you a sinner or are you saved? The sinner is wrapped with hurt and pain and who has invited trouble. Someone who is saved has the infinite capacity to forgive. Within the anti-violence movement, are you going to be a Bible-thumping Christian or are you going to be a survivor? Within the broader community, or are you going to be a lackey for the white power structure, or are you going to be loyal to the Black community? The implication is, are you going to be the person who talks to the police or who goes to the white-influenced feminist shelter or are you going to support the Black community by supporting the Black man and making that primary.

For poor women in particular, are you going to be an irresponsible welfare mother or are you going to be a stable, heterosexually married woman? The 1996 Personal Responsibility Act says marriage is the foundation of our society. The irresponsible one is the welfare mother who deserves to be regulated and controlled as compared to the responsible married woman who stays married at all costs.

These rigid dichotomies keep women in a place where they are labeled bad and where they feel bad if they are “irresponsible” or if they really do believe in Jesus, or if they go to the white shelter.

I want to describe how all the connections of oppression work in the lives of Black women. In Christianity, there is an imperative to please and obey what we call in Black Christianity as “our father.” The idea in the faith is that we have to be obedient to this judgmental father. The idea of obedience comes together with the sexist ideology of what it means to be a good girl. Being a good girl means being obedient and doing what she is told to do. A good girl is always pleasing to others. This meshes with the racial necessity of knowing that to get ahead one must engage in behaviors that white people approve of. We have an omnipresent white presence that follows us. So when I walk into a store, I’m constantly aware of the need to walk in such a way that under a white standard I won’t be seen as someone trying to rob them. When I write my check, I stand in such a way as to be pleasing to a white standard so they think my check is good. I’m not talking about white people, but a white standard, because people of color can enforce a white standard. For lesbians, there is the pressure to conform to the norm of compulsory heterosexuality and pass as straight rather than be condemned as queer. I have to play with children in such a way that I won’t be seen as a pervert. All of these things come together with the imperative for us to be pleasing to the oppressor, to the abuser, to please him -- the abuser who wants the dinner on time; the rapist who says I won’t hurt you if you please me, or the child who tries to please her abuser so she won’t be so hurt. The religious message of being pleasing to God comes together with the social message of being pleasing to our oppressors on race, gender, etc. lines.

I want to focus on the idea of self-sacrifice in Christian theology which is central. Jesus sacrifices himself for the humanity. In Black communities, you don’t speak about abuse to whites because it will make the Black community look bad and reinforce white racism. And it

may do that; many white racists will use these knowledge against Black people. The root of this argument, however, is that we need to sacrifice Black women for the cause of racial unity.

At the same time, it is precisely these same ideas in Christianity can also be an anchor to women; can be the thing that helps them to survive. I want to push for a complicated picture of how spirituality functions.

Nantawan Lewis

(note the recording of this talk was barely audible so the summary is very brief)

My area of work focuses on the trafficking of women in Thailand. In recent years I have been going back and forth between Thailand to look at this issue and the role of religion in it. In two more recent visits. A friend called me to inform me there would be a panel discussion organized by a women's foundation. One woman on the panel was contracted as a domestic workers and found she was really supposed to be a sex worker. She managed to escape back to Thailand. A week after that, we went up north. I went to visit a former student who talked about the struggles dealing with the epidemic of AIDS.

In 1961, Thailand introduced an economic development plan. Since then there has been a new plan every five years. The plans are heavily criticized for not assuring an equitable distribution of wealth. In 1970s there was an emigration from the rural areas to the urban areas. The plans have tried to make Thailand an industrialized nation. In the 1990s, Thailand has one of the moral stable economy. Now the economy is completely globalized and export-oriented. In 1998, it was completely under the control of IMF and the World Bank. This economy requires cheap, exploitable labor. Thailand also depends on the lure of tourism which depends upon the lure of sexual tourism.

The mass emigration from rural to urban areas has resulted in a breakdown in family structure and the feminization of labor. Women are 45% of the labor force. Wives and husbands are forced to live apart, which also leads into higher rates of prostitution and extramarital affairs. And then, the cases of AIDS have increased dramatically.

It is a moral imperative for religious institutions to address these issues. My biggest disappointment has been the reluctance of religious communities to speak out against this political hot potato.

Violence must be viewed in the context of economic globalization.

Ngairé Kelly

(note the recording of this talk was barely audible so the summary is very brief)

Spirituality is expressed through song. We are brought up hearing the songs. Our creation stories are in the songs. We are given teachings through songs.[sings]

Everyone is talking big pictures. But I come from a place as of simplicity. As Maori people, we always need to get back to the center, which is our spirituality. We need to understand our roles as women as nurturers which spreads out to the whole tribe. The conference is about a violation of women's spirituality. Spirituality involves a relationship with the land. We have to have healthy spirituality to have a healthy community. We also needs to pass on our teachings to the next generation. Our creation stories talk about passing knowledge to our children.

MEDIA/CULTURAL REPRESENTATIONS OF VIOLENCE

Chrystos

Media and culture means more than just books or television, but has to do with how we are treated, represented and named in society in general. Also, although I am a woman and a lesbian, I do not see myself apart from my tribe. So when violence is inflicted against my tribe (Menominee), including the men of my tribe, it is also violence against me.

One of the most prevalent images of Indians is as “vanishing Americans.” You can still buy \$85 coffee tables with images from Edward Curtis in which he took pictures in order to record “vanishing” Indians. Up to about 200 years ago, media representations of Indians reflected the fear white people had of them. Newspaper headlines read “Indians on the Rampage!” However images changed as lands were taken and Indians were civilized through abduction of children into boarding schools. You might not think of education as a media event, but actually it is actually central to how Indians are represented in media. Children were taken from their homes at very young ages to schools run by Christian denominations. They were tortured; they were sexually abused. If you go to these schools, you can see countless graves of children who died there. In the schools where my father went, children were taught meaningless skills. Girls were taught how to be housekeepers; boys were taught how to make whiskey barrels, shoes, etc. None of the skills we were taught empowered us to function in society other than through menial labor. Schools affected three generations of Indian children. They taught men how to abuse and rape women—to replicate how they had been treated. Abuse was uncommon before colonization. There are different stories of how abuse was treated prior to colonization. For instance the Cheyenne believed that those who abused children should be killed.

The vanishing Indian construct stops the US government from ever being challenged about its policies directed toward Native policies. Related to this construct is the idea of taking over the wild west, which particularly affects California. This notion is code for murder and rape of Native people. In California, there were over 5000 distinct groups of indigenous peoples, most of which were exterminated. California was the place where there was the most amount of genocide performed in the shortest period of time in the most vicious manner as a result of the quest for gold.

These constructs of vanishing Indians is still very popular in PBS channels, National Geographic, etc. This language is how even white liberals describe us. In the US, racism is represented as a white-black issue. Part of the reason has to do with the demonization of Black men. How this affects Indian people is that racism is not seen to affect us. So the construct we have of racism is a white construct, and we need to develop new constructs about racism.

Whenever I go to a conference, I’m always asked by white people, will you do a blessing for us? I try to say as politely as possible, I am not empowered by my tribe to do that. And they always get pissed off. This is part of our stereotype as spiritual gurus. Part of what is interesting to me about racism is how we are stereotyped. Black women are strong matriarchs. Indian women are

stoic in the face of genocide. Asian women are meek and sexy. Then we have to look at ourselves and see how much our actions are governed by our reactions to these stereotypes.

Another prevalent image of Native women is that of exotic sex objects. There are various pornography conventions, and the most expensive forms of pornography are photographs of Indian women that were often taken right after white contact when they were not wearing shirts. They are portraits that were then later pornographicized. Because of these stereotypes, we can never have a genuine relationship with the earth or with our own bodies.

Regarding the movie *Pocahontas*, a white person once told me that this movie was great because it taught white children to respect nature. Let me tell you the real story about her. She was raped by a white man at a very young age, and was abducted and taken to England to help sell tobacco. She died there at 21. Her son also died young; no one knows what happened to him. *Pocahontas* did not sit around with bluebirds braiding her hair. The person who posed for the cartoon image of *Pocahontas* was not even Indian. In addition, all the money that is made from these awful images of us never goes back to Indian people.

Regarding Indian images and sports teams, it is not okay to have a team called the Redskins. You would never have a team called the Whops. There are about 80 teams that use racist Indian names. I would appreciate if you would start writing to these teams and complain about these names, because we seem to be losing every political battle we have with them.

Coupled with these stereotypes is the invisibility of real Indian people in the news. The only time there is coverage is when there is controversy created by white people about us. For instance where I live, there is all this media hoopla about the Makah whale hunting. They covered these candlelight vigils held by white people when the first whale was killed. First, this is a treaty right that white people have no right to intervene in. Second, there has never been a candlelight vigil for a single Indian person who has been killed in the genocide of Native peoples.

Next, we have the New Age spirituality movement. Lynn Andrews, a white New Ager who claims to have been taught by an Cree elder, has sold more books than all Native writers combined. The stuff she describes is complete crap. What is described in these books has no basis in reality.

Red #9 is the make up used by white people to look “Indian” in the movies. One of the most notorious examples is Chuck Norris as Geronimo. Then if you look at “*Princess with Wolves*,” it is still centrally about white people. It is also sad in that it is one of the first (and last) times many Indian actors got jobs.

Finally, I want to address the use of the word “squaw.” It is a very derogatory term, in which I’ve gotten in many fist fights over. There is 103 place names in California that feature the word “squaw.” Stormy Ogden at [<kshyastorm@earthlink.net>](mailto:kshyastorm@earthlink.net) is one of the key people working to eliminate this name, and she needs your support.

Rosa Linda Fregoso

I would like to raise a few issues so that we could have more of a discussion with everyone in the audience. I think it's very important to look at representational and symbolic forms of violence as well as looking at physical acts of violence. They may not impact the body directly, but they do violate the spirit. How do we mobilize against symbolic forms of violence perpetuated by the state and the media—often done in conjunction with each other.

In Mexico, there has been such a sensationalism around women and children killed that the representations of these violence have become a form of violence itself. This puts the communities in a constant of fear, which is then reinforce various state policies. It is inspiring to me that nevertheless, people are mobilizing around this crisis.

I want to call your attention to a grassroots response to the murders in Juarez. They are family members that are demanding justice. Every week, the family members go around town and paint black crosses on telephone poles. It's a way of demanding justice through silence. They don't speak out in the way I would think of, but there are a variety of ways to resist that we should recognize.

Aishah Simmons

I'm very honored to be here. I talk about these issues all the time, but it's so rare that I get to talk within a community of women of color. I'm very overwhelmed by emotion. Listening to Chrystos, I was struck by the similarities in our herstories. The media does such a good job of dividing and conquering us. We have divisions within African American communities. Then we have divisions between communities of color. We are so busy dealing with the racism that white people perpetuate against us, that we don't have time to learn and discuss the similarities and differences between us. Almost from the time we're out of our womb, we hear about racism, racism, racism. So to talk about sexism, homophobia, to talk about rape and incest is to be seen as "breaking ranks" and as being traitors to our communities. Our fathers, our brothers, our uncles, our sexual partners, because so many of them have been brutalized by the criminal justice, by imperialism and by colonialism, we have this great weight to not send another brother to jail. When some of us are brave enough to break rank and speak out, then we are demonized.

In making No!, a video about intra-racial rape in the Black community, I have come across so much resistance. I wish I could say the struggle was about people unwilling to speak out. Instead, the issue has been around economic censorship. White foundations have said, why are you making a video that only focuses on black women? The National Black Programming Consortium sent me a letter saying in print that the fact that can't be denied that a woman shouldn't be a man's room at 2:00 am. It hurts to get a rejection letter, not just because the project needs the money, but because they were so comfortable in saying that the moral position of the Black community is that women shouldn't been in men's rooms at 2:00 am. The importance to me of the conference is to say that yes, we are outraged by racism, by imperialism by colonialism that is perpetuated against our communities. But we are equally outraged by sexism, by homophobia, by rape and incest that is perpetuated within our communities. We will

not choose between these struggles, because to choose is to cut our bodies in half. We will no longer hide the dirty laundry because we are choking on the filth and the stench of that dirty laundry.

These days, there is the attitude that whenever a movie comes out by a Black filmmaker, we have to go out the first weekend to see it to prove to Hollywood that we support Black men. So I get caught up, and then I find myself assaulted by what I see on the screen. In one movie, a woman was doing a lap dance while quoting Audre Lorde, and I ask myself, “what the hell is going on?” There is no discussion in the community about these issues. Here I am trying to support Spike Lee, and here we are being abused in his movies. I’m convinced that Spike Lee hates women, but there is no space to discuss the issues.

There are also Black women fighting me to make my video. What is your axe to grind given you’re a lesbian? Why are you focusing on this issue? We also have to address the women in their communities that encourage us to be silence because they have been silenced. We have to challenge not only the men, but the women in our communities as well. We can’t support anything just because it’s done by a person of color. I live in a city where a Black man, the mayor bombed a community, MOVE, and we didn’t know what to do because a Black man did it. If it had been a white mayor, Philadelphia would have been in flames. Look at Clarence Thomas in the Supreme Court. It’s not just about people of color versus whites any more. It’s about, where are your politics? Where are your commitments?

To do our work, we need to be creative in how we find the resources we need. We may not get the big grant, but we may have friends who can help us do fundraisers, or sponsor us to speak at universities etc. So we are waging our own revolution in creative ways. I wanted to do a shoot with Essex Hemphill who recently passed away. If I had waited for the grant to come in, I would not have been able to include him. But one of the organizers of the conference, Janelle White, had me come to University of Michigan, and from the money raised there I was able to do the shoot. A lot of institutions are built on our backs, so we need to find ways to use these institutional resources for our work.

<shows 8 minute clip of No!>

Audience Discussion

Audience member: I’m sure you’re familiar with the new book out called A Natural History of Rape, which says rape is natural. What was interesting is how this is described as science, whereas angry feminists are seen as arguing against something natural. Are you going to address this book in your film?

Aishah: It’s not my agenda to address the book per se. But I’m intrigued about how much media attention this book is getting. They’re getting the attention the Bell Curve did. Calling rape natural certainly lets men off the hook. I don’t want to give any air time to that book.

Audience member: I have a question for Chrystos, what do you see as the images the US allows for Indian men. They can't be warriors, fishers, or hunters. There is nothing that they are able to be. I think this is where a lot of violence comes from because Indian men internalize their oppression and take it out against them.

Chrystos: We have some images for Indian men, but there are not images that you can really live up to. You can see Dennis Banks with a gun on the Wounded Knee Memorial, but that is not an image you can live on an every day basis. I think healing circles are very important, but they need to have separate ones for men and women. Dealing with this issues is very new in Indian country. The first conference dealing with sexual abuse of Indian children was only about five years ago. Another issue related to this is white families adopting Indian children so they can have their own Indian child in a cupboard.

Audience Member: Being a survivor of various forms of abuse, my biggest oppressors were the women in my life. The people who told me to shut up where the women I trusted my life with. I went through many years of denial and inability to trust women. When my dad started to molest me, my mother told me to live with it until I was 19 years. How do we address this situation in which women are keeping silent around these issues? We are to empower ourselves, but we also have to address how we are oppressing each other.

Aishah: There have been many women I have interviewed who talk about the pain of the silence imposed upon them by other women. The movie is trying to look at how historically the conspiracy has developed. I'm trying to show how complex the dynamics are: it's not just white-black, or male-female. When I was abused, my parents said, are you sure you weren't dreaming. Fortunately, since then I've made much progress with them. My mother know says what she did was a mistake, and fortunately, we've been able to make amends.

Audience member: It's very important that we take this back to our communities, including myself. It's us against them, but it's also us against us.

Audience member: For Rosa Linda, what can we do in the US do to help with violence being perpetuated against violence since they don't have the sources we do?

Rosa Linda: Women are mobilized around violence in Mexico. Many service organizations have developed there. The problem is that the women who have been victims of murder, their murders have not been solved. I don't know that we're that much more fortunate here. Violence is rampant here in this country and in communities of color. We have a lot to do within our own context, but we need to make linkages internationally etc, because violence is global as well.

Audience member: Do you have any strategies for how we can impact the images of women in Spanish-speaking channels.

Rosa Linda: They tend to value bodies that are lighter-skinned. You have to do a grassroots mobilization of the viewership. I worked in one of the stations 20 years ago, and things haven't

changed that much. We need mass mobilization and boycotts. Recently, I saw a Dominican reporter on the channel, but I was very surprised.

Audience member: One of the things that is very frustrating for filmmakers is the way our issues get co-opted by white filmmakers, and who gets funding to do that. The films on women of color are often not filmed by women of color. Does anyone know of any groups supporting women of color filmmaking.

Aishah: There is a group in Washington DC for women of color that has a film festival in May that just formed last year. I also want to speak to co-optation. There's a film being done on the Juarez murders featuring Jennifer Lopez. We have to ask ourselves, how do we stay pure when we get that deal?

Audience member: When we talk about gender-identity, where does trans-gender identity fit in? I was attacked because they thought I was Black man, but when they found I was a woman, they stopped fighting me. So I'm wondering where trans-identity fits in, even in this conference. People have been asking me what I'm doing in the women's bathroom.

Chrystos: It's important to realize that it was colonization that brought a binary gender system into this country. In my tribe, we have five genders. People who were "transgendered" were respected in my tribe, but they now suffer a lot of violence in the mainstream society. I've been in mental institutions for several years, and I found that men were there because they were too sensitive and women were there because they were too angry. I was there because I was a lesbian. Women got shock treatments because they were lesbians. You're an intelligent person. If you were a man, you could undoubtedly find the men's bathroom!

Audience Member: How do you go about getting to the media and getting them to do better stories, particularly about Indian people. There is the movie out now, *The Road To El Dorado*, which we've been boycotting. Barbara Walters also came out in support of using the word squaw in place names.

Chrystos: I think we need to develop a grassroots campaign against the use of the word "squaw" in the media and perhaps all write letters to Barbara Walters. There have been successful campaigns in Minnesota, but we still have a long way to go.

Rosa Linda: I think it's time to stop being nice colored girls, as one of the previous speakers stated. Let's get on the phone and threaten boycotts.

Audience Member: I would have liked to see an Asian woman in the panel. Asian women are not incorporated in these struggles. When is there going to be a conscious agenda to address Asian and Pacific Islander women. We need to look at for instance at how Asian women are imaged in the sex tourism industry.

Chrystos: She didn't come.

RACISM AND HETEROSEXISM

Norma Alarcon

We can look at issues of heteronormativity and homophobia through different frameworks. We can look at it through human rights terms in terms of sexual preference and discrimination. But if we look at it through other frameworks, new possibilities emerge. I want to pursue the issues of intersectionalities of racism and heterosexism. We can look at it in individual terms. For instance the law doesn't respect interlocking forms of oppression. The terminology we use to assess intersectionality is then not inadequate. But the young people I come across are often torn between these identities and have difficulty giving privilege to issues of sexual identity, particularly in the academy. It's important for them to find safe spaces so that they can discuss these issues. They often don't have the space to talk about sexuality at home.

In teaching my classes, I try to teach gender and sexuality as core to ethnic studies, which causes some trauma among graduate students. These issues are trivialized. We have more important things to do, says the male leadership. They don't see gender, race and sexuality as interlocking. One of the most fascinating experiences is how the white students are frustrated that we were not focused on what they thought was the key issues for mainstream queer movements. Students of color who were struggling with giving language to something that has not been spoken or to use language that can't be drawn from the mainstream movement.

Mainstream movement articulates queer politics in terms of rights. People of color who don't articulate queer politics in the same way are not seen as being up to speed on these issues.

Janelle White

I so appreciate that my identities have been recognized so clearly at this conference – woman of African descent, survivor of sexual violence, survivor of colonization through the act of slavery, lesbian, and feminist.

My comments are largely based on my experiences in the anti-rape movement – where I have worked at both an academic and community based level for the past seven (7) years. I thought what I could do today is offer what I believe are some of the issues specific to the oppressions of racism, white supremacy, and heterosexism – especially how these systems of oppression contribute to violence against women of color *and* how these forms of oppression continue to pervade our anti-violence movements. This may deviate some from the description of this panel discussion outlined in the program. Yet, it is my hope that these comments could help us further shape proposed strategies for addressing hate crimes against lesbians and sexual assault and battering in woman-to-woman relationships.

I'll start with making a distinction between racism and heterosexism that is societal or 'out there' – beyond anti-violence movement organizations – and the racism and heterosexism that exists within anti-violence movements. My focus is on the later because the institutionalized and interpersonal

racism and heterosexism within anti-violence organizations debilitates us, making it impossible for us to end violence – since it is oppression that generates violence.

With regards to the anti-rape movement there are specific histories that exemplify the social problems of racism and heterosexism intrinsic to this movement. Perhaps most significant, especially to communities of African descent, is what Kimberle Crenshaw has referred to as the racialization of rape. The stereotypical image of the Black male rapist and white female victim can be found in the early work of Susan Brownmiller when she published her definitive work in the early 70s, which was some of the first to focus on sexual violence perpetrated against women. Brownmiller embraces this stereotype and affirms that while climbing up Mt. Everest may be inaccessible to ‘ghetto inhabitants,’ white women’s bodies are not. This not only silences women of color because we are not seen as legitimate victims of rape – its white women who are victims. But this racist myth also contributes to women of color not wanting to name the violence of men of color because there is fear that existing stereotypes will only be reinforced. This is not a new phenomenon; it has been duly acknowledged by many anti-violence activists. Nonetheless, the problem remains. My question is what have been the contributions of traditional anti-rape organizations in addressing this dilemma? Has there been sustained commitment to addressing this problem? In fact, what would sustained commitment to addressing this barrier to disclosure look like?

Of course, stereotypes associated with heterosexism also silence lesbians experiencing violence in their intimate relationships. And here I think most specifically of how lesbians of color are often ostracized within communities of color, leaving these survivors of violence in a place of having no one to ‘team with’ but the perpetrator.

The suppression of the historical involvement of women of color in the anti-rape movement also exemplifies how oppression pervades this movement. For example, the collective memory of the lynching of Black *women* during the Reconstruction era in the United States has been almost entirely lost. Scholar-activist Elsa Barkley Brown points out that we have come to consider lynching as a specifically Black male oppression. Unfortunately, our collective memory has failed, presenting an inaccurate portrayal. Yet, anti-lynching activists, such as Ida B. Wells, knew that Black women were raped and lynched and they challenged *both* acts of violent oppression. Yet, rarely is Ida B. Wells named as an anti-rape activist.

Arguably this is the experience of lesbians, and particularly lesbians of color, too. And here I think of the Combahee River Collective – a formidable group of Black lesbians addressing violence against women of color in its many manifestations. Yet, contributions of these women were also suppressed, not prioritized, categorized as ‘other’ and not central to ‘The movement,’ or just plain forgotten. That is the power of racism and heterosexism in our movements.

Now I want to shift gears and consider that heterosexism and racism are happening and being experienced in a very specific social context of increased state involvement with anti-violence movements and increased professionalization of anti-violence movement organizations. There are particular outcomes associated with state involvement in our movements. Some of this may sound familiar from last night’s provocative plenary delivered by Angela Davis and response from Kata Issari. Sociologist Nancy Matthews argues that the state is most interested in putting a

‘band-aid’ on social problems, not in radically changing social structures and institutions so that social problems are ameliorated. When our movement organizations take funds from the state, we are asked to carry out their mandate of social service. In effect, the state has molded us into what my sister-friend Jamie Lee Evans terms the ‘rape crisis business.’ Also, state involvement in our movement organizations can mean that we are asked to work in tenuous coalitions with agents of the state, such as law enforcement. Of course, people of color and lesbian and gay communities have a history of distrust of agents of the state – and rightfully so considering that the state has historically sanctioned violence against our communities.

Furthermore, the state often endorses and/or demands organizational hierarchy in order to fund rape crisis centers and/or battered women programs/shelters. Sometimes from this, complex situations arise. For example, white educated women managing mostly women of color with little or no formal education or formally educated women of color managing women of color with little or no formal education or white educated lesbians managing mostly straight women of color with little to no formal education. I could lay out more possible configurations of anti-violence movement hierarchies. But, my point is that hierarchies have a tendency to breed abuses of power and often have a fundamental premise of empowering those with more privilege at the expense of those with less privilege. The state knows this and uses it to its advantage; it can sit back and watch as we attack, target, and abuse each other. It is as if the seeds of destruction have been planted.

These dynamics also are linked to the professionalization of anti-violence movement organizations, where those with advanced degrees earn more money managing those with less or no formal education, but not without lived experience, who work on the ‘frontlines’ – providing direct services to survivors of violence.

It is this social context which shapes the racism and heterosexism that exists within our anti-violence movements. So far, I have put forth historic examples of racism and heterosexism within the anti-rape movement – especially examples specific to communities of African descent – and I have drawn a sketch of the more systemic means through which racism and heterosexism are maintained. Now, I must mention the prevalence of incidents of interpersonal racism and heterosexism that lesbians of color can and do face in anti-violence organizations. Anti-violence organizations must empower staff to interrupt incidents of racist and heterosexist oppression be it coming from staff, community groups we work in coalition with, or even from survivors of violence.

One good model is the taskforce of women of African Descent of the San Francisco Women Against Rape which developed a brochure that critiques police violence and calls the community to hold perpetrators against violence accountable. Ironically, it was funded by the Office of Criminal Justice Planning. So it is interesting that they were able to critique the institution that funded them. The brochure also highlights issues of heterosexism, sexism, and classism.

Before concluding I must emphasize how important it is, especially for straight women of color to be allies to lesbians of color and for all women of color to challenge our prejudicial attitudes regarding other women of color. I use the word ‘prejudice’ here instead of racism purposefully. Racism conveys having both prejudice and power having both an attitude and

means to enforce it. But women of color do not have race-based power; yet, we can internalize and project prejudicial attitudes. Keeping the definition of racism clear and precise is important otherwise everyone becomes a racist and everyone's so called racist acts or sentiments are presented as equally harmful. We can not afford for the difference in power between people of color and whites or between lesbians and straight folks to be lost.

In concluding, for us to be an anti-violence movement with the goal of ultimately ending violence we must have a theory and practice of anti-racism and anti-heterosexism, not to mention an awareness of class based exploitation and anti-Semitism. It is rare that I have a chance to postulate and share some of the things that I did today. The landscape of this movement has changed dramatically and I am aware that in other settings my comments may be viewed as extreme, idealistic, ungrateful, or even as sabotaging existing anti-rape efforts to unify all women. So, I appreciate this opportunity beyond what I could possibly convey. Thank you.

Valli Kanuha

I would like to start off with something controversial. The conference workshop description discusses hate crimes against gays and lesbians of color. However, most perpetrators of gay hate crimes are white men and the victims are gay white men, or white men thought to be gay. However, I think crimes against lesbians and gays of color are primarily race crimes. They're not primarily gender or sexuality-based crimes. I think most hate crimes committed against lesbians of color are primarily about crimes against women, although it may be heightened by the fact she's a lesbian. We don't actually know how many women of color who are abused are also lesbians.

So, I want to know speak to the issue of invisibility of lesbians of color in the anti-violence movement and in progressive work in general. Intersectionality is not an additive concept. That is, you don't just take racism and add sexism to understand the context of women of color. When you put the two together, they change each other and you have a whole new system of oppression. So we are not just looking at racism and heterosexism and adding them together, we need to look at how they transform each other when they interact together.

When you think Asian plus female, you can't come up with anything that is not heterosexual. White have constructed Asian females to be about how they service men—China dolls, geishas, etc. If you are an Asian lesbian, society is unable to conceptualize your existence. Asian women are seen as exotic objects of white men. African American plus female also equals heterosexual. They are single mothers, promiscuous, strong women, etc. Again, white society images them as deviant in terms of their relationship to white men. If you're an African American lesbian, there is no place for you. The same is true for Latina women. They are colonized objects of white men as well and hence necessarily heterosexual. Women of color are seen as objects of men, for men's consumption, for men to colonize, for men's rejection, and primarily for white men.

Thus, there is no place for lesbians of color. We need to find a way to construct race and gender different from how it has been constructed for us by white men. But if we have take intersectionality seriously to see how these oppressions transform and affect each other, we have

to look at racialized sexism that is sexism perpetuated by white men and men of color against women of color. We have to look at sexist racism which is racism perpetuated by white men and white women against women of color.

Pat Washington

I want to mention briefly my paper on homophobia in communities of color. When I wrote this paper, I thought of the Autobiography of Miss Jane Pitman. She suffered all kinds of violence and managed to survive for 110 years because she didn't rock the boat. 110 years of telling other Black people to not rock the boat. People of color movements wouldn't be anywhere without gays and lesbians, and then they turn around and tell us we don't fit.

Re: Norma's idea that academia is a safe place for gays and lesbians: I'm a member of the Gay and Lesbian Student Association on campus, and yet I see more lesbians and gays in my office than I see in those offices. Most campuses are not safe for gays and lesbians or for most people in general.

I disagree that gay hate crimes most affects white people. The problem is who gets news coverage? The white press doesn't cover these crimes, and even our own press doesn't cover these crimes.. We only cover people who are seen to be respectable. Asian men are murdered constantly, but you would never know it. In 1990, an Asian man was murdered brutally in Florida. And the judge joked, you mean you can't beat them up anymore? Was he Asian? Was he gay? I think he was dead. Lesbians who are beaten up don't make the newspapers. Hate crimes is about all the things that make some people say it is acceptable to victimize you.

Finally, about Susan Brownmiller. Her book should have been trashed when it was written. Instead, it is being used as a resource book in South Africa to set up rape crisis centers. Don't mention Brownmiller and expect me to be polite.

Audience Discussion

Norma: I don't want to go on record as saying that I think academia is a safe place for gays and lesbians to come out of the closet.

Audience Participant: It is a challenge to think about how to develop analysis and new approaches to addressing violence given the complexities we face in communities of color. The training I received said I should tell people to call 911 if their life was in danger. But when I tried to say that in communities of color, I would be very challenged, and in fact 911 doesn't work for everyone. Given the police brutality inflicted on women of color, it is also true that you might not want to call the police as they may put your life further in danger. Also, when lesbians of color get harassed, we are called so many different names, it is difficult to sort all these issues out. If a man of color harasses me, I might see that as sexism, but then I might like be acknowledged by a brother in my community.

Valli Kanuha: I did my dissertation on gays and lesbians of color and passing. What are you

passing on and why? For many of us when lesbians and gays of color pass as straight, they do so not because of internalized homophobia or racism, but because of survival, particularly in a racist society. So, passing is not a bad thing, and needs to be done when your survival is at stake. So if you need to call the cops, you don't need to tell them you're a lesbian. The issue is to know when, how and why to do it.

Audience Member: To Val, when you were differentiating between hate crimes, how can you separate between what the particular crime is given peoples' multiple identities. For Janelle, what do you think the investments of the state is in funding such literature such as the brochure you mentioned that was produced by the African American taskforce. For Norma: when you talked about the discourse of rights, how effective is this language in doing work advocacy work for queer communities in violence. What is the impact of using this kind of human right language to guide our organizing work.

Norma: Regarding the use of human rights language: it depends on the context. It also depends on who has access to make human rights claims. The state has already instructed the rhetoric and the form of these languages, so if you don't have the rhetoric, or if you are not considered a proper subject deserving rights, you don't have access. To use this language is like learning a foreign language, a language that has been set by the state.

Pat: If I'm victimized it is impossible to figure on which part is being victimized.

Janelle: I get your point that what I might see as subversive with this brochure might actually be twisted so that this radical group of African American is seen as ultimately colluding with the state. I'm involved in a cutting edge project addressing all hate crimes on a national basis. People can be victimized on multiple identities. So I think this program is a possible model, although I must be truthful that it is state-funded. But within both of these projects, we try to be as subversive as possible. But the contradictions are always there.

Audience Member: I think it's important for people to recognize their investment in privilege. So when I hear that it is not bad to pass, it really pisses me off because I can't pass. So I don't get to be as powerful as others. I think we need to look at investments in privilege as a femme lesbian or as a person of color who is lighter than others. You need to give up that privilege so that others can get to where they want to be.

Audience Member: I think we need to refine how we are thinking about intersectionality. So when we think of racism, it is really racism as defined by male experience that doesn't acknowledge how their racism is masculinized. All of these forms of racism have to do with sexism. Similarly the forms of sexism are also defined by white experience and hence are also racialized as whiteness. So it is a problem to say there is racism and sexism and then we put them together to get a different thing because it assumes that the racism experienced by men is "real" racism and sexism experienced by white women is "real" sexism. Instead, they need to see how they are also affected by sexism and racism respectively.

We often talk about understanding a multiplicity of analysis, but we still function on a single-

issue basis. One model I found helpful was the model of “asking the other question.” For instance, in the hate crime against Vincent Chin, a man who was murdered by unemployed auto workers because they were mad at the Japanese and blamed them for their plight (even though Chin was Chinese), it is easy to see this as a race crime. But we can also ask, where is the sexism in this? (How masculinization is related to violence, for instance). Where is the classism in this case?

Where is the homophobia in this case (if you don’t follow under certain ideas of masculinity, then you must be a fag)? Etc.

Audience Reactions

[Note: The individual filming this workshop interviewed people in the audience for their reactions to the panel. Here is a brief summary of some of their comments.]

I disagreed with many comments in the panel, but that makes me feel better because that shows that we are critically engaging each other. So this thing about superstardom where everyone wants to take a picture with Angela Davis is a problem because we’re all superstars and we need to incorporate this theory into the work we do. How do we take what we are learning, and then apply that to our lives. How do we use the analysis to serve survivors. I also think we need not reify the white male view of lesbians of color. I don’t feel that I’m invisible, because others have struggled to make it easier for me to be able to come out. I don’t want to take that esteem and privilege for granted.

The panel was excellent. There is so much information, my head is full. I was in tears; it was powerful. I just wanted to take it back to the people I love back home.

I really wanted to talk about youth of color. I did a focus group with young Asians and I asked them what was an Asian lesbian. The girls said they are the women in porn films who have lots of sex. If these kids don’t know what queer means or who we are, we have an obligation to say what we are.

I thought the panel was really good and brought up good issues. But I think there are some issues that get dropped. As a biracial woman, I feel we get left out of the support system of the Black community or the gay/lesbian community. We need to look at oppression within the community.

I thought it was an excellent discussion, and it was so great to have so many lesbians of color in the room. Intersectionality is a new term for me. The debate that started to happen about passing really sparked something for me. I’m overwhelmed.

I’m overwhelmed. I’m blown away. I was at the Beijing conference and there were many lesbians but so few lesbians of color. Today we’re a bigger presence here than we were in the whole conference at Beijing. It allows us to get to a depth of complexity in talking about our experiences. The issue of passing is a very critical one in battering relationships. There is literally nowhere to go when you are battered by someone of the same culture. It feels like we can work toward something, but it’s also a reminder that there is literally nowhere to go.

VIOLENCE AND THE GLOBAL ECONOMY

[Note: The session was not recorded. One speaker sent us her notes which follow]

Kamala Kempadoo

Contemporary global Sex trade - concentration of women of color. - few figures, underground sector.

3 main areas in which this is visible:

1. Militarized prostitution

- foreign/US military bases in past and present in Philippines, Japan, Belize, Panama, Vietnam (Thailand) provided their troops with R&R

Extension - peacekeeping troops.

Recent UN release (reported in Washington Post March 17) about concerns of the health of troops in Congo and Sierra Leone about contracting HIV/AIDS because of the extent that the troops visit brothels/engage in prostitution. Also been noted in Haiti.

Sex with local, indigenous women encouraged to maintain health and morale of men away from home.

Women of color being pressed or encouraged into selling sex to service male troops.

2. In context of trafficking.

CIA report November 1999 - around 50,000 women per year trafficked into the US, end up in sex industries, domestic work, sweatshops. Documented in at least 26 cities in US. Primary countries: Thailand, Vietnam, China, Mexico, Russia and the Czech Republic, followed by the Philippines, Korea, Malaysia, Nigeria, Latvia, Hungary, Poland, Brazil, and Honduras.

Large proportion are women of color who end up in the sex trade - work as prostitutes, exotic dancers, erotic masseurs, etc. Debt-bondage (sums up to \$20,000 paid to family), indentureship (woman has to pay off sum of money \$10,000 for travel and smuggling fee/documents, etc), slavery-like conditions - held against their will, forced to have sex, raped).

Bills (sen Brownback R-Kansas, and sen. Wellstone D-Minnesota) currently being considered in House of Representatives (Committee on International Relations) and Senate to address issue of trafficking into US. Also UN Commission on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice - ne convention against transnational crime.

3. In the tourism industry

Issue of sex tourism in "Third World" countries - Western European and North American men (primarily) buying sex in various ways from women, men, boys and girls of color - "encouraged" by local governments to bring in foreign exchange, used by tourism industry to promote the exotic nature of the country.

In short, Global sex trade constructed on /around sexuality and sexual labor of women of color to "develop" 'underdeveloped regions of the world, to sustain variety of industries in "over-

developed” countries, to boost masculinity, and make huge profits for multinational elites and corporations.

Flip side - become so embedded in social relations, also seen as a strategy for women of color to survive, to care for families, households, to feed, educate, house and clothe their children.

Various ways of thinking about women of color in global sex trade, and the kinds of violations that are occurring:

a) as sexual violence to women (typically white radical feminist approach, seeing sex as primary basis for construction of power and authority in our world, Barry.

“Sexual slavery.”

Jeffries quote: “since the 1970s radical feminists have analyzed prostitution uncompromisingly as the ultimate in the reduction of women to sexual objects which can be bought and sold, to a sexual slavery that lies at the roots of marriage and prostitution and forms the foundation of women’s oppression (1997:2).

B) as a consequence of poverty - unequal development/maldevelopment of parts of the world because of capitalism and way it distorts national economies.

Entrance of women from former socialist countries (economies being eroded by globalization of corporate capitalism) - Russia, eastern Europe, Balkans, China, Cuba, seen as striking example. Often combined with an analysis of patriarchy, and of structured gendered inequality in labor markets, in national economies, devaluation of women’s work, women’s sexuality prime commodity.

C) Not all poor women end up in the sex trade . Notions of race, racism and cultural imperialism, also shape the sex trade.

Women of color specifically stereotyped as highly erotic, exotic, sensual. Racialized as highly sexual by nature thus particularly “suited” to sex work.

For centuries positioned as sexual servants to the white world. Brown and black woman’s bodies and sexual labor used and exploited historically to

a) satisfy sexual desires and construct colonial and imperial white male power and privilege outside the confines of marriage and citizenship (in the colonies/under slavery, as concubine, mistresses, sexual servants),

b) to increase the size of the slave/working population (USA, Curacao - breeders, cheap labor),

c) to support plantation economy (British Caribbean - as prostitutes),

d) and today to attract tourists to bring in dollars.

Globalization of the capitalist economy exacerbates these tendencies. All three in operation and are intensifying:

Case of sex tourism in the Caribbean:

Stereotypes of Caribbean women - less like prostitutes, submissive, not demanding, know how to please a man, hot, sexy, any girl can be bought for sex, notion that Caribbean culture is more tolerant of sex.

Evidence of female heterosexual sex tourism - illustrates how race and the global economy are important factors in structuring the sex trade. How middle-class women from global centers of power and privilege are complicit in maintaining global structures of inequality.

How do we talk about addressing the global violence to women of color:

a) abolish prostitution? Radical feminist solution similar to call for abolishing marriage as an institution of male power/violence to women. Call for eradicating sexism - targets prosecuting men who participate in the sex trade, as pimps, clients (Sweden), traffickers, brothel owners, erect laws that will criminalize prostitution.

Maybe inadequate. Need to recognize that sex work is today an integral part of the global economy, is deeply embedded, becomes a part of many women/s survival strategy. Also, not always prostitution itself, but rather the conditions that women work under are being identified by sex workers and sex worker organizations as the key problems (see list from research/Cyndi):

Seek to decriminalize , destigmatize sex work, enable women in the sex trade legal access to workers rights, health care, child-care, education, better conditions in work place. Also pushing for viable alternatives to prostitution while transforming the nature of the sex trade from within.

Strategies being advocated by sex worker organizations in Caribbean - Suriname, Dom. Rep, also India, South Africa, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Bangladesh, Thailand, etc.

Need to listen to these experiences, and perspectives, not condemn women of color in sex trade, but to help empower them to fight for everyday changes that will strengthen their rights as women and workers.

Make their demands a part of our strategy for change.

2. ways the global economy is pushing more and more people into marginality, informal sector work. That in order to address the growth of the sex trade in the global economy, need much larger reorganization of the economy. (problem of the proposals in the senate - only focus on individual traffickers and local governments of sending countries- punitive - not addressing structural global inequalities of wealth and power, the role and interests of corporations in the structuring of the sex trade, or the fact that unless something else is put into place, families will continue to rely on prostitution as an income generator.

I.e. continue pressure on us government, international agencies such as imf, wb and wto to recognize the inhumanities, violence and injustice that their neo-liberal economic policies are creating.

3. Need to continue to examine, expose, and denounce the ways in which middle-class and elite women in wealthy parts of the world are complicit with racial ideologies and practices that are harming both women and men of color around the world. How some notions of obtaining gender inequality can be highly oppressive to poor women of color.

Need to build a strategy where women take responsibility for their position in international relations. How we in these 'developed' nations can work to change the situations for millions of women of color around the world.

HAUNANI KAY TRASK KEYNOTE ADDRESS

At one time, the land upon which the University of California-Santa Cruz sits, as all lands of California, was home to an untold number of Native tribes which, for over 20,000 years, occupied this area.

Who were these indigenous peoples? Of the Native nations we do know in an area from the Northern California border down to the Golden Gate bridge in the west and Yosemite park in the east, an area of 250 miles by 200 miles, there were Tolowa, Yurok, Chilula, Karok, Shasta, Wiyot, Whilkut, Yana, Waintu, Maidu, Washo, Konkow, Patwin, Wappo, Pomo, Paiute, Ohlone, and many, many others.

Few of these tribes remain today. From the 18th century onwards, California Indians were rounded up in Jesuit and Franciscan missions which were, in historian David Stannard's word, "furnaces of death." Mission Indians died as a result of European-introduced diseases, malnutrition and brutal enslavement, fatal forms of punishment, and sexual abuses. An official policy of genocide was enunciated by California Governor Peter Burnett in his 1851 message to the California legislature, in which he argued that the ongoing wars against Native peoples "must continue to be waged between the races until the Indian becomes extinct."

The situation in South America was no different. During the course of four centuries--from the 1490s to the 1890s--Europeans and white Americans engaged in what Stannard calls, "the worst human holocaust the world has ever witnessed." From an estimated population on two American continents of some 75 million Native people at contact, only some 5 million remained at the end of the 19th century.

Colonization was the historical process and genocide, the official policy.

Genocide: any act committed with the intent to destroy, in whole or in part, national, ethnic, racial or religious groups, including killing members of the group; causing serious bodily or mental harm to members of the group; inflicting conditions of life calculated to bring about physical destruction of the group in whole or in part; imposing measures intended to prevent births within the group; and forcibly transferring children of one group to another group. This is the accepted United Nations' definition.

Genocide: European conquest of the Americas.

Colonialism: The historical process of conquest and exploitation.

The United States of America: a country created out of genocide and colonialism.

Today, the United States is the most powerful country in the world, a violent country created out of the bloody extermination of Native peoples, the enslavement of forcibly transported peoples, and the continuing oppression of dark-skinned peoples.

The color of violence, then, is the color of white over black, white over brown, white over red, white over yellow. It is the violence of north over south, of continents over archipelagoes, of settlers over natives and slaves. Shaping this color scheme are the labyrinths of class and gender, of geography and industry, of metropolises and peripheries, of sexual oppressions and confinements.

There is not just one binary opposition, but many oppositions. Within colonialism, such as that now practiced in my own country of Hawai'i, violence against women of color, especially our Native women, is both the economic and cultural violence of tourism, and of militarism. It is the violence of our imprisonments: reservations, incarcerations, diasporas. It is the violence of military bases, of the largest porting of nuclear submarines in the world, of the inundation of our exquisite islands by eager settlers and tourists from the American and Asian continents.

These settlers have no interest in, or concern about our Native people. Settlers of all colors come to Hawai'i for refuge, for relaxation. They do not know, nor do they care, that our Native government was overthrown in 1893 with the aid of the American military; that our islands were annexed in 1898 without even the trappings of a popular vote; that our political status as Hawaiian citizens was made impossible by forced annexation to the United States. Indeed, most foreigners think we should be grateful for the opportunity of American citizenship even if it meant termination as an independent country.

How do terminated peoples understand the color of violence? We look at all the non-Native settlers and tourists around us and know we are subjugated in our own land, suffering landlessness and poverty, consigned by the American government to the periphery of our own country, to its prisons and shanties, to its welfare rolls, hospital wards, and graveyards.

We exist in a violent and violated world, a world characterized by "peaceful violence," as Frantz Fanon so astutely observed. This is the peaceful violence of historical dispossession, of racial and economic subjugation and stigmatization. Our psychological suffering and our physical impairments are a direct result of this peaceful violence, of the ordered realities of confinement, degradation, ill-health, and early death.

Allow me to shock you with a profile of our health statistics. Below one year of age the Hawaiian death rate is more than double the overall state average. Between one and four years of age it is triple the state figure, and so on through early adulthood. In every age category up to age 30 the Hawaiian death rate is never less than double, and is often triple the equivalent mortality rate in our islands. With just under 20 percent of the state's population, Hawaiians account for nearly 75 percent of the state's deaths for persons less than 18 years of age. And while the mortality rate for non-Hawaiians decreased significantly between 1980 and 1990, for both full and part-Hawaiians, it actually increased.

This state of ill-health is, of course, Fanon's "peaceful violence" that kills without a sound, without a passing notice. Indeed, most of the oppression and violence people of color experience is hidden from view. In our case, more Hawaiians live below the poverty level than any other ethnic group in Hawai'i. More of our people are in prison, are homeless, are undereducated. Is

this a violent situation? Of course. Is this a result of American colonization? Of course.

Colonialism began with conquest and is today maintained by a settler administration created out of the doctrine of cultural hierarchy. A hierarchy in which Euro-Americans and whiteness dominate non-Euro-Americans and darkness. That is, a country where race prejudice, in the words of Fanon, obeys a flawless logic. For after all, if inferior peoples must be exterminated, their cultures and habits of life, their languages and customs, their economies, indeed, every difference about them must be assaulted, confined, and obliterated. There must be a dominant culture and therefore a dominant people, and therefore a dominant religion, and therefore a dominant language, and therefore a dominant legal system, and a dominant educational system, and so on, and so on. In other words, there must be dominance and subordination.

In a colonial country such as the United States, white hegemony delineates the hierarchy. Thus, white people are the dominant group, Christianity is the dominant religion, capitalism is the dominant economy, militarism is the dominant form of diplomacy and the underlying force of international relations. Violence is thus normal, and race prejudice, like race violence, is as American as apple pie.

In a racist society, there is no need to justify white racist behavior. The naturalness of segregation and hierarchy is the naturalness of hearing English on the street, or seeing McDonalds on every other corner, or assuming the American dollar and United Airlines will enable a vacation in Hawai'i, my native country. Indeed, the natural, everyday presence of the "way things are" explains the strength and resilience of racism. Racism envelops us, intoxicating our thoughts, permeating our brains and skins, determining the shape of our growth and the longevity of our lives.

It is normal that hierarchy by color exists, that mistreatment by color exists, that income by color exists, that life expectancy by color exists, that opportunity by color exists, and all the other observable hierarchies documented by scholars over the years. The sheer normalcy of white dominance underpins the racist assertion that white people and culture are superior, for if they were not, how else explain their overwhelming dominance in the United States. Dominance is the cause and engine of racism. Power over peoples and land and economies. Power to take and consume. Power to define and confine. Power to maintain power.

There is no escape from origins: colonial countries are racist countries. The United States of America exists because centuries of extermination campaigns were waged to rid the continent of millions of Native peoples, by some estimates, 100 millions. And after taking the continent, the United States took Hawai'i and Guam and Puerto Rico and the Philippines. Born in conquest, the United States continues in conquest.

Let me tell you about my own country. Like most Native peoples, Hawaiians lived in our mother's keeping until the fateful coming of the *haole*--Western foreigners--in 1778. Then our world collapsed from the violence of contact: disease, mass death, and land dispossession; evangelical Christianity; plantation capitalism; cultural destruction including language banning; and finally, American military invasion in 1893, and forced annexation in 1898. During the

course of little more than a century, the *haole* onslaught had taken from us 95 percent of our Hawaiian people, 99% of our lands and waters, and the entirety of our political sovereignty. As the 20th century dawned, we were but a remnant of the great and ancient people we had once been.

During the long suppression of our Territorial period (1900-1959), Hawaiians lived under martial law for seven years throughout the Second World War. We suffered increased land confiscations for military bases, and fearfully watched as the vicious process of Americanization created racist political, educational and economic institutions. By the time of my birth in 1949, being Hawaiian was a racial and cultural disadvantage rather than a national definition. The Federal American government had officially classified our people by blood quantum in 1921: those of us with 50% Hawaiian blood quantum were Native, those of us with less than 50% were not Native. "Fifty-percenters," as they have come to be known today, have some small claims to live on what amounts to reservation land; "less than fifties" do not have such rights. In this way, our nation is divided by race, a concept and reality foreign to our way of thinking. Thus was I born into captivity, a Native person in a racist, anti-Native world.

And so it is for people of color on this continent. We are non-white in a white universe. We are different, and therefore inferior, categorically. And we are marked by captivity: economic, political, and cultural captivity. Indeed, "captivity" is the condition of all the peoples of the Pacific region. Covering half the earth's surface, the Pacific is home to 32 countries and many nations. We are the largest nuclearized region in the world. And we know one thing for certain: until the Pacific is decolonized, it cannot be demilitarized.

Let me frighten you with some statistics. On O'ahu, the capital of our state and the most densely populated island, the military controls 25% of the land area. Statewide, the combined armed forces have 21 installations, 26 housing complexes, 8 training areas, and 19 miscellaneous bases and operating sites. Beyond O'ahu, Hawai'i is the linchpin of the American military strategy in the Asia-Pacific region. It is home to the largest portage of nuclear fueled ships and submarines in the world. These ships are received, cleaned, and refashioned at Pearl Harbor, where workers are called "sponges" because of their high absorption of radiation during cleaning.

Regionally, Hawai'i is the forward basing point for the American military in the Pacific. The Seventh Fleet, which patrols the world from the Pacific to the African coast, is stationed at Pearl Harbor. Planes and ships which test nuclear weapons in the Pacific leave from Pearl Harbor or other military installations in Hawai'i.

This kind of "peaceful violence" results in land confiscations, contamination of our plants and animals and our peoples, and the transformation of our archipelago into a poisonous war zone. Additionally, many of the lands taken by the military are legally reserved lands for Hawaiians.

In the southern and eastern Pacific, American military violence has taken the form of nuclear testing in the Marshall Islands, nuclear waste dumping on Christmas Island, siting of electronic facilities vital to nuclear war, and construction of air bases with nuclear capabilities including airborne delivery of weapons. To the east of Hawai'i, in the Marianas Islands and Guam, there

are airbases with nuclear capabilities.

The violence of nuclearization and militarization has included nuclear testing in the Marshall Islands where over 66 bombs have been detonated. We must all remember that the world's first hydrogen bomb was tested on Bikini Island. The force of this weapon of destruction was 1,000 times stronger than the Hiroshima bomb. Marshall Islanders were used as guinea pigs to test the effects of contamination. They were never told of the bomb's effects nor were they removed before testing.

Predictably, cancer is now widespread among the Marshallese. They have one of the highest rates of severely deformed children, including "jellyfish babies" who have no heads, arms, legs or human shape. Native women from these islands have given birth to babies they describe as "octopuses," "turtles" and "apples." Such babies are born not only on islands declared radioactive by the Americans, but on all atolls and five major islands in the Marshalls archipelago.

Before such tests, Marshallese people enjoyed incredible longevity, with many of their people living over 100 years. Today, they have young women with a life expectancy of 40 years of age. The United States tested 23 bombs on Bikini Island and 43 on Enewetak. Now, the Marshallese know that their nation has been damaged forever as a result of the United States of America.

In our part of the world, the color of violence has been the color of white countries, the United States and France, testing nuclear weapons, deploying nuclear ships, and basing military forces in every part of the north and south Pacific.

Nuclearization is a unique kind of racism. The kind that produced famous Nazi doctors and forced sterilization of Indian women in America. The kind that produced centuries of genocidal campaigns against the rest of the Third and Fourth Worlds. The kind that continues to produce and reproduce a psychology of subjugation.

For racism is not only history and sociology, economics and politics. Racism is also the psychology of subjugation. The inferior must be made to feel inferior every day, to suffer their subjugation, to be dehumanized in accordance with the colonizer's rules. Thus, as Frantz Fanon so eloquently argued, colonized people, like colonized cultures, are no longer open, dynamic, and fertile. Once colonized they become moribund, oppressed, segregated, closed, or apathetic. They must negotiate a hostile world and a menacing daily reality with great care lest they suffer increased injury. Is it any wonder that white Americans, on the whole, live longer than Black people, and Native people? For the colonized, the colonizer is a killer; literally, a killer.

Like the physical attributes of killers, the culture of killers becomes bloated, disfigured, and vulgar. Such cultures celebrate their vulgarity, as American culture celebrates Christopher Columbus. And these celebrations follow from the center to the periphery, so that the whole is permeated with the thrill of cruelty.

Is it possible to rid the United States of racism? In light of the history of Native people in this

country, I would say no. In light of the history of Black people, I would say no. In light of the current fight in the United States regarding affirmative action, I would say no. Racism has never ended in the United States. And it never will end.

Only the dismantling of the United States as we know it could begin the process of ending racism. Look to history. After the genocidal campaigns against American Indians came the confinements of reservations, and the slow attrition by early death, by starvation, by infant mortality, by FBI infiltration and murder.

After the freeing of slaves came lynching campaigns, segregation, ghettoization, discrimination and now police wars and vicious imprisonments. After belated and half-hearted Federal attempts at ameliorative programs in the sixties and seventies, Black people in this country still die younger, make less money, suffer poor housing, inferior community services, low educational attainments, tremendous police brutality, and of course, the everyday injuries of race.

What better evidence do we need to illustrate that America is a white country for white people. As Malcolm X repeatedly said, America is irretrievably racist.

Given this, what can be done, what should be done? Fanon believed that revolutionary action was the only answer in Algeria and in Africa as a continent. Malcolm X believed that total separation of Black people from white people was the only answer in the United States. I believe that my own people need separation in Hawai'i. A separate land base, economy, educational system, language base, and on and on.

Sovereignty is what we call this in Hawai'i. And what the Maori call it in Aotearoa, otherwise known by the West as New Zealand, and what African people call it. And what Indians call it here on the continent. Sovereignty on *our* land base, with *our* rules, in *our* language, for *our* people.

Who could dare deny that sovereignty is preferable to the white racism we now suffer? After all, we are separated and segregated under white rules now. Why not acknowledge the falsity of alleged American democracy, equality, and liberty? Why fight to get into white society when it so imprisons us now? Why not create our own base of power rather than be ghettoized according to white power?

How much more honest and historically accurate to acknowledge that racism prevents us as people of color from living together with white people as equals. Under the current violent hierarchy, there is only daily pain and fear. Fear because violence breeds hatred which, in turn, breeds more violence. Not the revolutionary violence that cleanses victims, as Fanon so honestly argued, but the violence of racism.

Can America afford violence, revolutionary or otherwise? For it is everywhere now. The violence of a police state protecting itself, and its white citizens. The violence of a political system dependent on mass exploitation. Looking into the heart of whiteness, I do not see a willingness to change, only a ferocious determination to keep the black masses at bay.

So be it. If we must be kept at bay, then let it be in our own place, on our own land, with our own people. And let white people and their police and their tourists and their segregated schools, stay away from us. Let us return to the political status of many nations. Not one sovereignty, but many sovereignties. Not one path, but many paths.

You may ask, but how can we do this? How can we be separate? Let me answer that first, we are separate now, separate and unequal and hostile. We are ghettoized by a hierarchy where people of color, and particularly indigenous people, occupy the bottom strata and where white people occupy the top.

Secondly, it is not separatism that white people oppose but the dissolution of their intimate and raw power over our lives. To have our own nations is what the white powers oppose simply because they don't want to give up their dominance over us and our resources, especially our labor and lands. Separate sovereignties is what white people oppose, not separatism per se.

As Native peoples all over the world know--as the Irish and the Kurds and the Palestinians and the Maori know--it is a never-ending struggle to be both separate and sovereign. Because of millennia of resistance, the Irish people remain, and the Kurdish people remain, and the Palestinian people remain, and the Maori people remain. Resistance and the legacy of resistance to incorporation, to disinheritance, to disappearance is what has kept these nations alive.

So I leave you today with a message of remembrance and resistance: we are not one people, and it is racist to believe that we are one people. I join with Toni Morrison, one of the finest writers of our age, in asserting that I am not American. Nor, I might add, do I want to be American. Those who believe as I do, especially those who did not become part of the United States voluntarily, will surely nod in agreement.

For in the ugly and violent history of the United States, indeed, of the Americas, you will find that many peoples and many nations occupy these lands, not under the Christian God or the United States Constitution, but in the diverse humanity of peoples, in the many-colored family of nations.

SPEAKER BIOGRAPHIES

Keynote Presenters:

Angela Y. Davis

Angela Y. Davis (Professor of History of Consciousness, UC Santa Cruz) is known internationally for her ongoing work to combat all forms of oppression in the US and abroad. Professor Davis rose to national prominence in 1969, after being removed from her teaching position in the philosophy department at UCLA as a result of her social activism and her membership in the Community Party USA. In 1970, she was placed on the FBI Ten Most Wanted List on false charges and was a subject of an intense police search that drove her underground and culminated in one of the most famous trials in recent US history. During her 16-month period of incarceration, a massive international Free Angela Davis Campaign was organized, leading to her acquittal in 1972. Professor Davis's longstanding commitment to prisoners' rights dates back to her involvement in the campaign to free the Soledad Brothers, which led to her own arrest and imprisonment. Today she remains an advocate of prison abolition and has developed a powerful critique of racism in the criminal justice system. She is a member of the advisory board of the Prison Activist Resource Center and the steering committee of Critical Resistance: Beyond the Prison Industrial Complex. She is the author of numerous essays/articles and the author of five books, including, *Angela Davis: An Autobiography*, *Women, Race and Class*, *Blues Legacies and Black Feminism*, and *The Angela Y. Davis Reader*.

Haunani-Kay Trask

Indigenous nationalist, political organizer, and poet, Haunani-Kay Trask is professor of Hawaiian Studies at the University of Hawaii-Manoa. Author of three books, including a book of poetry, *Light in the Crevice Never Seen*, and a collection of political essays, *From a Native Daughter: Colonialism and Sovereignty in Hawai'i*, Professor Trask co-produced the award-winning documentary, *Act of War: the Overthrow of the Hawaiian Nation* in 1993. Currently a member of Ka Lahui Hawaii, the largest sovereignty initiative in Hawaii, Professor Trask has represented her nation at the United Nations in Geneva, and at various gatherings throughout the Pacific and the Americas. In 1998-99, Professor Trask was a fellow with the Pacific Basin Research Center at the Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University.

Speakers:

Norma Alarcon

Norma Alarcon is Professor of Ethnic/Chicana/Women Studies at U.C. Berkeley. She is the publisher and editor of Third Woman Press. She is the author of many books and essays, including a book on the Mexican writer Rosario Castellanos. She is co-translator into Spanish of *This Bridge Called My Back* and is co-editor of *The Sexuality of Latinas* (along with Cherrie Moraga and Ana Castillo) and *Between Woman and Nation* (along with Minoo Moallem and Caren Kaplan).

Bernadine Atcheson

Bernadine Atchison is a Dena'ina from the Kenai Peninsula and a Kenaitze Indian Tribal member. She is a mother of three children, ages 20, 17, and 11. Since 1985 she has been researching social and Health issues of the Indigenous people of Alaska, in particular, the mass inoculation program of the Hepatitis B vaccine on Alaskan Natives.

Roma Balzer

Roma Balzer has been involved in the movement against violence against women since the late 1970's. She was a foundation member of a local Refuge and in 1986, became the first Maori woman National Co-ordinator for the National Refuge Movement. She was part of a group who implemented parallel development within the National Refuge Movement (recognition of Maori as first nation, Non-Maori as second nation and the unique status Maori would be afforded because of their first nation status). Balzer co-ordinated the development and implementation of a national pilot project on family violence intervention and remains as the project manager to this today. Roma is a mother of 4, foster mother of 1, and grandmother of a beautiful four-month-old granddaughter.

Elham Bayour

Elham Bayour was born and raised in the Dbayeh Palestinian refugee camp in Lebanon. She graduated from UCLA in Cultural Anthropology. Currently she is writing her Master's thesis in Anthropology/Women's Studies and Oral History at California State University at Long Beach. She conducted her thesis research in three Palestinian refugee camps in Gaza. Her research focuses on Palestinian women who are former Israeli political prisoners, including the psychological effects of torture the women experienced at the hands of Israeli military soldiers during imprisonment, and the social and political conditions surrounding women's post-imprisonment. Next year she will begin working on her Ph.D. in Anthropology and Women's Studies at the University of California, Santa Cruz. Bayour is a board member of Amnesty International and Women's League for Peace and Freedom Women's Rights Committee. She has toured nationally and internationally to present papers at various conferences on Palestinian refugees and on the conditions of Palestinian women.

Rajani Bhatia

Rajani Bhatia completed graduate work with a specialization in international population policy at the University of Bremen, Germany. She participated in a collaborative study with women's organizations against population control in Germany and India. She has engaged in international woman and health activism as a member of FINRRAGE (Feminist International Network of Resistance to Reproductive Technology and Genetic Engineering), and most recently as a coordinator for CWPE (the Committee on Women, Population, and the Environment).

Anannya Bhattacharjee

Anannya Bhattacharjee is a co-founder and former Executive Coordinator of Sakhi for South Asian Women. She is a co-founder and member of SAMAR Collective (a South Asian Left media resource) and is the former Executive Director of Committee Against Anti-Asian Violence: Organizing Asian Communities. She has also been involved, over the years, in organizing South Asian household workers in the New York metropolitan area. In 1998, she was awarded the Activist-in-Residence fellowship from the Asian/Pacific/American Studies Program

and Institute in New York University. She is also a Board Member of the Committee on Women, Population and Environment (CWPE). She is currently working with the American Friends Service Committee (AFSC) and CWPE on an initiative around violence against women and law enforcement.

Kum-Kum Bhavnani

Kum-Kum Bhavnani is Professor of Sociology, Women's Studies and Global Studies at UC Santa Barbara. As of July 1st, she will be at Smith College, MA, where she will be the Founding Senior Editor for *Meridians* - a new journal focusing on feminism, race, and transnationalism. She has been active in many anti-racist and feminist campaigns, including being the first Chairwoman of the Asian Women Community Workers' Group in London, UK in the late 1970's and early 1980s, an organization which set up the first refuge for women of color fleeing domestic violence.

Peggy Bird

Peggy Bird is sun clan from Santo Domingo Pueblo. She has two sons, Jake and Henry, and two grandchildren, Diandra and Johnathen. She is a former battered woman and survivor of sexual assault. Peggy is a member of the Mending the Sacred Hoop-Technical Assistance Project faculty and is a consultant/attorney at law, licensed to practice in New Mexico. She formerly served as project director for the Native American Family Violence Prevention Project for DNA-People's Legal Services, Inc. and is a member of the Navajo Nation Advisory Council Against Domestic Violence. Currently, she is the co-chair of the Coalition to Stop Violence Against Native Women, an organization composed of representatives from tribal agencies and non-profit organizations who provide services to native battered women in New Mexico and Arizona. Bird is experienced in developing the domestic violence training curriculum for law enforcement officers of the Navajo Nation, training Navajo Nation law enforcement personnel on domestic violence, and developing policies and protocols on domestic violence for Navajo Nation law enforcement.

Sandra Camacho

Sandra Camacho is the Co-Chair of the National Latino Alliance for the Elimination of Domestic Violence, an organization dedicated to eliminating domestic violence particularly within Latino communities. Camacho is also the Director of Services for the Violence Intervention Program, the first Latina operated bilingual/bicultural domestic violence program in New York State, founded in 1984. She was formerly co-director of New York Women Against Rape and Associate Director of La Casa de las Madres, two prominent organizations that helped lay the foundation for the violence against women's movement. Ms. Camacho has produced and collaborated on various videos, CD roms and bilingual manuals and curricula, highlighting issues of women of color, bilingual communities and other underrepresented groups. She has received several awards for her activism work, most recently from the Office of Children and Families, Health and Human Services Department in Washington, D.C. Ms. Camacho was the principal writer for the Latino Coalition for a Healthy California's 1998 policy report titled "Ensuring Health Access for Latinas."

Chrystos

Chrystos is a Menominee activist, poet, and writer. She is the author of several books, including *Not Vanishing*, *Dream On*, *In Her I Am*, *Fire Power*, and *Fugitive Colors*. She is a long-time Native rights and prison rights activist.

Coatlicue Theatre Company

Elvira and Hortensia Colorado are Chichimec/Otomi storytellers, playwrights, performers and community activists. They are founding members of Coatlicue Theatre Company. Coatlicue is the Aztec deity of the earth/creation. They have performed throughout the country at universities, reservations, cultural centers, festivals, and conferences. Their work has been published in magazines, theatre journals, and anthologies. “A Traditional Kind of Woman—Too Much, Not ‘Nuff”, received Best Documentary Award at the Red Earth Film and Video Festival in 1998. They are members of the American Indian Community House in NYC, the Women’s Wellness Circle, the Native American Writer’s Circle, and Cetiliztli Danza Mexica. As founding members of the N.Y. Zapatistas, they support the indigenous communities in Chiapas through teach-ins and fundraisers.

Kimberle Crenshaw:

Kimberle Williams Crenshaw (J.D. Harvard; L.L.M. University of Wisconsin; B.A. Cornell University) is a Professor of Law at UCLA and at Columbia Law School. She has lectured and written extensively on civil rights, Black feminist legal theory, and race, racism, and the law. She is the founding coordinator of the Critical Race Theory Workshop, and the co-editor of a volume, Critical Race Theory: Key Documents that Shaped the Movement. Her articles have appeared in the Harvard Law Review, National Black Law Journal, Stanford Law Review and Southern California Law Review. She has facilitated workshops for South African judges and her work on race and gender was influential in the drafting of the equality clause in the South African Constitution. Crenshaw also assisted the legal team in representing Anita Hill. She is co-founder of the African American Policy Form, a group of Black women and men working together to highlight the centrality of women’s issues in the Black community, and is a founding member of the Women’s Media Initiative.

Adrienne Davis

Adrienne Davis is a Professor of Law and Co-Director of the Gender, Work, & Family Project at the Washington College of Law at American University. She joined the faculty in 1995. Prior to that, she taught law for four years in California. Professor Davis’s scholarship examines the interplay of property and contract doctrine with race, gender, and sexuality in the nineteenth-century. Drawing on legal, literary, and historical sources, Davis’s work shows the gendered elements of American slavery and its current influence on and implications for law and social norms. She teaches property, contracts, and a variety of advanced legal theory courses, including courses on feminist legal theory, law and literature, race and the law, and reparations. Professor Davis is active in academic organizations and legal practice, including serving as a consultant with a litigation project seeking reparations for African-Americans. She is a frequent lecturer on the topic of legal history and legal theory, and appears on radio and television talk shows.

Rosa Linda Fregoso

Rosa Linda Fregoso is an Associate Professor in the Women and Gender studies program at UC Davis. She is the author of the *Bronze Screen: Chicana and Chicano Film Culture*; *Miradas de Mujer* (co-edited with Norma Iglesias); and *The Devil Never Sleeps and Other Films by Lourdes Portillo*. Fregoso is completing a book project on Chicana/Latina cultural and political representation.

Yoko Fukumura

Yoko Fukumura is from Okinawa. She is a member of Okinawan Women Act Against Military Violence. She is also a member of East Asia-US Women's Network Against Militarism (The network consists of participants from activist organizations in Okinawa, mainland Japan, Korea, the Philippines, and the United States working to change the negative effects of US military operations, budgets, and policies in these countries), and Okinawa Peace Network in Bay Area. Fukumura is a graduate student at UC Santa Cruz in the history program. Her research focuses on the history of Okinawa with respect to US imperialism in East Asia and Japanese colonialism in East Asia. She is currently working on a paper that analyzes the transformed status of Okinawan women (equal gender partner to patriarchal subject) under Japanese colonialism and nationalism.

Ruth Gilmore:

Ruth Wilson Gilmore is an activist working with Critical Resistance, Prison Moratorium Project, and other California and national organizations that are dedicated to the abolition of criminalization and imprisonment as all-purpose solutions to social problems produced by political-economic crises. Gilmore is assistant professor of Geography at U.C. Berkeley, where she works on race and gender, uneven development, and politics & culture.

Inés Hernández-Ávila

Inés Hernández-Ávila is Associate Professor of Native American Studies at the University of California, Davis. She served as Chair of the Department from 1996-1998. During her tenure as chair, the department completed and submitted a successful proposal to establish an M.A. and Ph.D. program in Native American Studies. This graduate program, officially approved at the systemwide level in early November 1998, is the first of its kind in the country with a hemispheric perspective. Hernández-Avila has recently finished the following manuscripts: *Dancing Earth Songs* (poems) and an edited volume of essays by Native American women titled *Critical/Creative Representations by Native American Women*. She is working on a collection of essays titled *Notes from the Homeland: Essays on Identity: Community and Culture*, and a collection of poetry titled *Spirit Light: Honoring Songs for the Americas*.

Eileen Hudon

Eileen Hudon (Anishinabe) is from the White Earth reservation in Minnesota. She works with the Mending the Sacred Hoop Technical Assistance Program in Minneapolis. A domestic violence activist for over 20 years, Hudon was a co-founder of the Women of Nations battered women's shelter in Minnesota.

Audrey Huntley

Audrey Huntley (Anishinabe) works with the Aboriginal Women's Action Network in Canada around issues of restorative justice and violence against First Nations women.

Lisa Ikemoto

Lisa Ikemoto works with Asians and Pacific Islanders for Reproductive Health in California.

Kata Issari

Kata Issari, M.S.W., is currently the director of a domestic violence program (PACT Family Peace Center) in Honolulu, Hawai'i. She has been doing anti-violence work for over 15 years as a community activist, therapist, educator, fundraiser and administrator. She has served on the boards of the Women's Funding Alliance of King County and Seattle's Advocates for Abused and Battered Lesbians. She is the former president of the National Coalition Against Sexual Assault. Kata has lectured through out the U.S. on a variety of issues related to ending sexual and domestic violence.

Jamie Jiménez

Jamie Jiménez, MA, currently coordinates the Zero Tolerance for Sexual Assault–Education and Prevention Program at Northwestern University. She has been working to end violence against women and girls for 18 years, as an advocate, educator, therapist, and trainer. She currently resides in Chicago, her hometown.

Maria Jiménez:

Maria Jimenez is the founding director of AFSC's Immigration and Law Enforcement Program, which she has directed since 1987. Prior to ILEMP, Maria worked as a union organizer in Texas and for ten years as a community organizer and adult educator in Mexico. She is a member of the Advisory Board of the Texas Coalition to Abolish the Death Penalty and on the board of directors of the Houston Immigration and Refugee Coalition, the Center for Third World Organizing (Oakland), the Center for Human Rights and Constitutional Law (Los Angeles), among other organizations. She has received numerous awards and fellowships including a Charles Bannerman Fellowship in 1994. Jiménez has given formal testimony before numerous government agencies and legislative bodies, including the Civilian Advisory Panel of the Immigration and Naturalization Service and the U. Civil Rights Commission. Currently she is working on the campaign for legal status for former class members of the CSS and related IRCA legalization cases, as well as the inquiry into the Death of Esequiel Hernandez on the U.S. Mexico border.

Isabel Kang

Isabel Kang currently works at Asian Community Mental Health Services in Oakland, California. She is a founding member of Korean American Women in Need (KAN-WIN), a Korean battered women's hotline in Chicago. She worked for several rape crisis centers in Chicago as a counselor and community educator. Fluent in four languages, Kang is 1.5 generation Korean-Brazilian.

Valli Kalei Kanuha

Valli Kalei Kanuha, M.S.W., Ph.D. is Assistant Professor at the University of Hawai'i at Manoa, School of Social Work. Dr. Kanuha has worked as an activist, clinician, administrator, and consultant with community health agencies, HIV/AIDS organizations, and other social service settings in the continental U.S. and Hawai'i for over 20 years. Her professional interests include gender violence, feminist theory, lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender issues, and HIV/AIDS, all areas in which she has published and trained.

Ngairé Kelly

Ngairé Kelly has worked in the Refuge movement in New Zealand for the past 15 years. She was a foundation member of her local Refuge and implemented parallel development (services for Maori and non-Maori women) within the organization. Kelly has run training programs on advocacy, community organizing, building alliances with key agencies, policy development when working with/for Maori. She has vast experience in facilitating women's programs on family violence and sexual abuse for Maori women. Kelly is currently practicing as an advocate for Maori women and Maori children who are victims of violence. She is from the Tainui and Te Arawa tribes; she lives in a small, rural community which is heavily populated with Maori. She is a mother of four and grandmother of six.

Kamala Kempadoo

Kamala Kempadoo is an Assistant Professor in the Women's Studies Program at the University of Colorado at Boulder. She has a Ph.D. in Sociology with an emphasis in Race and Ethnic Studies. She teaches classes on intersections of gender, race and class as well as on Third World feminisms and global development. She was active for several years in the Black and Migrant women's movement in the Netherlands, and more recently worked with the Caribbean Association for Feminist Research and Action to develop a Caribbean-wide research project on sex tourism and prostitution. She has published two books on the global sex trade: *Global Sex Workers: Rights, Resistance and Redefinition* (1998), and *Sun, Sex and Gold: Tourism and Sex Work in the Caribbean* (1999).

Mimi Kim

Mimi Kim has been working in women's services since 1988. She is currently Project Coordinator of the Multilingual Advocate Program at the Asian Women's Shelter in San Francisco where she has been a staff member since 1991. Before that, she worked as a community educator and counselor in a sexual assault services program in Chicago. She is also a founding member of Korean American Women In Need (KAN-WIN), a domestic violence hotline in Chicago serving the Korean community. Asian Women's Shelter is a battered women's shelter in San Francisco primarily targeting the Asian immigrant and refugee communities. Services include safe shelter; food and clothing; peer counseling; advocacy and referral to legal services, public aid, housing and other resources.

Nantawan Boonprasat Lewis

Nantawan Boonprasat Lewis, a native of Thailand, is Professor of religious studies and ethnic studies at Metropolitan State University, St Paul/Minneapolis, Minnesota. She has been actively involved with women's concerns in religion and society. Her several publications includes "Towards an Ethic of Feminist Liberation and Empowerment: A Case Study of Prostitution in Thailand" in Shin Chiba et al eds. *Christian Ethics in Ecumenical Context* (Eerdmans, 1995)..

She is co-editor of *Sisters Struggling in the Spirit: A Women of Color Theological Anthology* (Women's Ministries Program Area, Presbyterian Church (USA), 1994); and *Remembering Conquest: Feminist/Womanist Perspectives on Religion, Colonization, and Sexual Violence* (Haworth Pastoral Press, 1999). She is currently completing a manuscript on the impact of sex tourism and AIDS in South East Asia and its implications to Asian feminist theology (Eerdmans, forthcoming).

Lourdes Lugo

Lourdes Lugo is the co-director of the Puerto Rican High School and works at the Puerto Rican Cultural Center in Chicago. She is the niece of Oscar Lopez and has been working for the freedom of all US political prisoners, particularly Puerto Rican political prisoners for the past twenty years.

Leni Marin

Leni Marin is Associate Director for Rights and Social Justice at the Family Violence Prevention Fund (FUND), a national organization dedicated to preventing domestic violence, where she has worked since 1983. She directs the FUND's Battered Immigrant Women's Rights Project and is a co-founder of the National Network on Behalf of Battered Immigrant Women in the United States. An immigrant from the Philippines, she has served as an advocate and educator to improve the lives of abused immigrant women and children for fifteen years. She has developed public policy to improve the rights of immigrant women, including a major provision within the Violence Against Women Act of 1994. She provides technical assistance to shelter workers, immigrant women's rights activists and social workers to make services more accessible to battered immigrant women.

Stella Marr

Stella Marr has spent eleven years in Refuge, was a foundation member of the Whakatane Women's Refuge, and worked in all areas of the agency as an advocate, administrator, counselor and group facilitator. Marr also worked for 8 years as a sexual abuse therapist specializing in work with Maori women and child victims. She has a history in political activism in land and Maori Women's rights issues often working in the background of direct political action. Marr lives and works in her tribal areas of Te Arawa and Tuwharetoa and is also directly connected to Te Ati Awa. She is currently an outreach worker for women's refuge covering rurally isolated areas providing direct services for battered women in those areas. She is a mother of two grown sons.

Mary Ann Mills

Mary Ann Mills is Denai'ina which is a branch of the Athabascan, or Navajo, or Dena Peoples. Her ancestral land is Yaghanen, "the good land," located in South Central Alaska, where she reside today. She served as a counselor for the Anchorage Urban Native Center and has served as an advocate of indigenous and human rights for thirty years. She has been an advocate of subsistence and its relation to health and human rights. Mills has served as presenter at several health conferences and served as chair of the international health conference held in Anchorage. She has been active internationally with documenting the hazards of certain vaccination abuse. Her primary interests are her family, human rights, subsistence, and living in according with

Dena'ina culture, which includes working for peace through respect and proper behavior to Earth, Creator, and all things. She is the mother of five and grandmother of four children.

Kelly Mitchell-Clark

Kelly Mitchell-Clark is a Program Manager with the San Francisco-based Family Violence Prevention Fund (the FVPF), a national non-profit that focuses on domestic violence education, prevention and public policy reform. She manages an exciting new, culturally-specific initiative called *It's Your Business*, which seeks to prevent and reduce domestic violence among African Americans through individual and community activism. *It's Your Business* has developed a unique public service radio campaign, produced innovative awareness materials, and devised organizing strategies to help individuals and communities stop domestic violence.. Additionally, she is working on efforts aimed at improving services for families affected by both domestic violence and child abuse, and for low-income domestic violence victims/survivors who also face substance abuse and mental health issues.

Faith Nolan

Born in Halifax, Nova Scotia, Faith's parents and extended family were coal miners in Cape Breton. She later grew up in Toronto's working class Cabbagetown. Her commitment to social justice comes from her life experiences and the people she grew up with, and she works through the cultural tool of music. Her music is her political work, a politics firmly rooted in her being working class, a woman and African Canadian. Nolan, a composer and guitarist whose style varies from blues and folk, to jazz, with a taste of funk and reggae, is a seasoned performer who has built a strong and faithful audience. Nolan uses original compositions are strongly rooted in the cultural language of Black North American music, spiritual, gospel, jazz and blues. An accomplished musician who plays slide guitar, tambourine and harmonica in the earliest blues tradition, Nolan also possesses a silky voice that wraps itself around a song. Her lyrics voice a concern for the world of the common people.

Stormy Ogden

Stormy Ogden is recognized as a member of the Tule River Yokuts tribe. She is also Kashaya Pomo and Lake County Pomo. Ogden, a former prisoner of the California Rehabilitation Center at Norco, was instrumental in the forming of the prison's first American Indian women's support group, along with the first sweat lodge at a women's state prison in California. Upon release she worked within the Bay Area American Indian community as a community organizer, drug and alcohol counselor, and a foster care worker. Ogden has worked with the American Indian Movement of California and the Center for the S.P.I.R.I.T. in exposing those that would exploit and commercialism of American Indian religious ways and ceremonies. She is currently involved in the Squaw Name Change Committee and volunteers at the women's federal prison at Dublin. Her focus and commitment is always towards supporting the American Indian women within the prison system.

Margo Okazawa-Rey

Margo Okazawa-Rey, a Professor of Social Work at San Francisco State University and its Director of Institute for Multicultural Research and Social Work Practice; is currently Jane Watson Irwin Co-Chair in Women's Studies at Hamilton College. She is currently involved in

the Institute for Multiracial Justice, San Francisco, organized to bring together communities of color to define and promote a progressive politics. She is also a member of the Bay Area Okinawa Peace Network, and a founder-member of the East Asia -U.S. Women's Network Against Militarism. She has been an activist since the 1970s. She was one of the original member of the Combahee River Collective, a member of the Coalition for Women's Safety, organized to deal with murders of Black women in Boston in 1979, and served on first steering committee of ASIA (Asian Sisters in Action). Her recent publications include Women's Lives: Multicultural Perspectives, co-edited with Gwyn Kirk (Mayfield, 1998) and Beyond Heroes and Holidays: Practical Guide to Anti-Racist, Multicultural Curriculum and Staff Development, co-edited with Enid Lee and Deborah Menkart (Washington, DC: Network of Educators on the Americas, 1998). She is currently working on a special issue of Social Justice, addressing globalization and militarism and an anthology of multiracial alliances for social change, both co-edited with Gwyn Kirk.

Beth Richie

Beth Richie is a sociologist who has been an activist and advocate in the movement to end violence against women for the past twenty years. She is a nationally known lecturer, trainer and technical assistant to local and national anti-violence organizations. Dr. Richie is on the faculty of the Departments of Criminal Justice and Women's Studies at the University of Illinois at Chicago, and the Senior Research Consultant with the Institute on Violence, Inc., She is the author of numerous articles and books, including Compelled to Crime: The Gender Entrapment of Battered Black Women (Routledge), a study of Black women in prison. She is a board member of Chicago Legal Aid to Incarcerated Mothers, the National Network for Women in Prison, and the National Clearinghouse for Battered Women's Self-Defense..

Dorothy Roberts

Dorothy Roberts is a professor at Northwestern University School of Law, with joint appointments as a faculty affiliate of the Department of Sociology, a faculty fellow of the Institute for Policy Research, and a faculty affiliate of the Joint Center for Poverty Research. Professor Roberts has written and lectured extensively on the interplay of gender, race, and class in legal issues concerning reproduction and motherhood. She is the author of *Killing the Black Body: Race, Reproduction, and the Meaning of Liberty* (Pantheon, 1997), which received a 1998 Myers Center Award for the Study of Human Rights in North America, as well as the co-author of casebooks on constitutional law and women and the law. She has published more than fifty articles and essays. Her influential article, "Punishing Drug Addicts Who Have Babies: Women of Color, Equality, and the Right of Privacy" (*Harvard Law Review*, 1991), has been widely cited and is included in a number of anthologies. She serves as a consultant to the Center for Women Policy Studies in Washington, D.C., and as a member of the board of directors of the National Black Women's Health Project, the National Coalition for Child Protection Reform, and the Public Interest Law Center of New Jersey.

Loretta Ross

Loretta Ross is the founder and Executive Director of the Center for Human Rights Education (CHRE) in Atlanta, Georgia, a training and resource center for grassroots activists on using human rights to address social injustices in the United States. She is an expert on human rights,

women's issues, diversity issues, and hate groups and bias crimes. She is a political commentator for Pacifica News Service, and has appeared as a political commentator on *Good Morning America*, *The Donahue Show*, *The Charlie Rose Show*, CNN, and BET. She was one of the first African-American women to direct a rape crisis center in the 1970s. Ms. Ross is presently writing a book on reproductive rights entitled, *Black Abortion*.

Luana Ross

Luana Ross (Salish) is Associate Professor of Women Studies at the University of Washington. She was raised on the Flathead Indian Reservation in Montana and is an enrolled member of the Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes. She was the first scholar in the nation to conduct a study on imprisoned Native American women and the first to research the Women's Correctional Center in Montana. Her several publications from this research include her groundbreaking book,

Inventing the Savage: The Social Construction of Native American Criminality (University of Texas Press). She is also a film producer and helped produce the documentary, *White Shamans, Plastic Medicine Men*.

Lourdes María Rafaela Santaballa-Mora

Lourdes María Rafaela Santaballa-Mora is U.S. born of mixed race Caribbean/Latino parents from Cuba. A formerly battered woman, she was born and raised in the Washington, DC area, lived and worked in Minnesota for 9 ½ years, and is currently the Director of Coordinadora Paz para la Mujer, the Puerto Rican coalition of feminist organizations and battered women/sexual assault service programs. Although she graduated from college in 1990, she largely credits her knowledge as an advocate and administrator to her experience of oppression, survival of battering, and nine and a half years of direct service to battered women and their children. Through this experience, she believes wholeheartedly that professionalism and hierarchy are not conducive to the liberation of women, children, and people of color who are facing violence. She will continue to work for the liberation of all people through the constant integration of anti-oppression work in organizing, political activism, civil resistance/disobedience, and direct services. ¡Fuera la Marina de Vieques!

Renee Saucedo

Renee Saucedo currently serves as Youth Law Attorney for La Raza Centro Legal in San Francisco. She represents youth in education, immigration, public benefits and criminal cases. She also currently serves as coordinator of INS Watch, which facilitates organizing in immigrant communities around raids and arrests conducted by the Immigration and Naturalization Service. She is the former executive director of the Northern California Coalition for Immigrant Rights. In addition, she serves as chair of the San Francisco Immigrant Rights Commission, and served on the Mayor's Task Force on Welfare Reform from 1997 to 1998. She is the recipient of numerous awards, including community service awards from the Mexican American legal Defense and Education Fund, the National Association of Chicana and Chicana Studies, and the Minority Bar Association. She was also the recipient of the Women Who Make a Difference Award from the San Francisco Commission on the Status of Women in 1997.

Aishah Shahidah Simmons

Aishah Shahidah Simmons is an award-winning African-American feminist lesbian independent film/videomaker, curator, activist, and writer based in Philadelphia, PA. She is currently producing, writing and directing, *NO!*, a feature length documentary on intra-racial rape and sexual assault in the Black community in the United States. An incest and rape survivor, her internationally acclaimed shorts, *Silence...Broken*, and *In My Father's House*, explore the issues of race, gender, homophobia, rape and misogyny. Simmons has lectured on the impact of the intersection of oppressions on African-American women's lives in Spain, Mexico, South Africa, England, France, Canada, The Netherlands, and at many colleges/universities, film festivals, and conferences across the United States.

Gail Small

Ms. Gail Small is a member of the Northern Cheyenne Indian Tribe from Lame Deer, Montana. Her tribe gave her the Cheyenne name, "Ve-hon!-naut," meaning Head Chief Woman. One of ten children, she was born and raised on the Northern Cheyenne Indian Reservation by her parents, Horace Small and Mabel Wooden Legs. She earned her law degree in 1982 at the University of Oregon. Small is the founding director of Native Action, a national model for citizen empowerment on Indian reservations. Native Action has established national precedents in federal banking law, environmental policy, Indian voter discrimination, and youth law. Small has served as an elected member of the Northern Cheyenne Tribal Council and she remains very active in national Indian policy issues, as well as international indigenous issues. She serves often as a guest lecturer and speaker, including the recent congressional oversight hearings on "The Changing Needs of the West," before the Committee on Natural Resources. Gail's work has earned her a number of awards, including Ms. Magazine's 1995 Gloria Steinem Women of Vision award. She was also recognized in 1995 by Montana magazine as one of the state's most influential leaders in the past 25 years.

Andrea Smith

Andrea Smith (Cherokee) is the former Women of Color Caucus chair for the National Coalition Against Sexual Assault. She was a co-founder of the Chicago chapter of Women of All Red Nations and serves on the steering committee of Critical Resistance: Beyond the Prison Industrial Complex. She is the former coordinator of Committee on Women, Population, and the Environment. In 1992, Smith was honored as one of 100 outstanding women activists in the city of Chicago. She is the author of several articles, including "Sexual Violence and American Indian Genocide," and "For All Those Who Were Indian in a Former Life."

Wendy Stewart

Wendy Stewart is from the Shuwasp and Carrier Nation. She grew up in Bella Coola on Nuxhalt territory. She has been involved in anti-violence work for the past eight years. Her commitment to doing this work arises from the level of violence she witnessed in her family and community against the women in her life. It is her belief that violence and oppression are not conditions that need to be tolerated in our lives. She believes in working together to create a better world for women and girls. Stewart completed a bachelors in art and cultural studies at Simon Fraser University.

Julia Sudbury

Julia Sudbury is a member of the Critical Resistance Organizing Committee and an Assistant Professor of Ethnic Studies at Mills College, with a specialism in the African diaspora. She received her BA in modern languages from Cambridge University, and her MA in Race and Ethnic Studies and PhD in Sociology from the University of Warwick, England. She is the author of "*Other Kinds of Dreams*": *Black Women's Organisations and the Politics of Transformation*" (Routledge 1998). Before coming to the US, Julia was the Coordinator of Osaba Women's Centre; she co-founded Solace, the first domestic violence project for African Caribbean women in Coventry, England; and was Director of Sia: the National Development Agency for the Black Voluntary Sector.

Alexandra Seung Hye Suh

Alexandra Seung Hye Suh is a part-time staff member at the Rainbow Center in Queens, New York City, a shelter and center for Asian immigrant women, particularly Korean women formerly married to U.S. military servicemen, facing homelessness, mental illness, prostitution, domestic violence, substance abuse, poverty, unemployment, and other issues. She is also an instructor in the Department of Women's Studies at Barnard College, where she teaches in Asian and Asian American women's studies. She is a founding member of Nodutdol for Korean Community Development and a member of the Korea Exposure and Education Program.

Neferti Tadiar

Neferti Tadiar is Assistant Professor at the Department of History of Consciousness at the University of California, Santa Cruz. She has written extensively on the relations between political economy and gender, particularly in the contemporary context of the Philippines, and is at work

on two book projects. Her published work includes articles on the Philippine prostitution economy, overseas Filipina domestic workers, the feminization of labor, and gendered forms of cultural empowerment. She also teaches at the University of the Philippines.

Blanca Tavera

Blanca Tavera has an M.A. in Social Work and a B.A. in Women's Studies. She has extensive experience building and directing community based agencies in the non-profit sector and developing broad based community coalitions. Tavera is a recognized expert in the field of domestic violence and in cultural competency training. A life long activist, her work is rooted in her experiences as a migrant worker, a Latina, and a community organizer. Tavera is the Principal of Matrix Consulting Institute, a consulting firm dedicated to educating and motivating individuals, groups and communities to effectively define and achieve their goals, with a particular focus on social justice issues. Along with her associates, she leads seminars for women and provides consulting on organizational development, domestic violence, cultural competency, parent training, team building and other areas. She also teaches part-time at Cabrillo College in Aptos, California.

Winnie Te Are

Winnie was a founding member of Whanau Awhina Women's Refuge 11 years ago. She has had been involved with Maori political action groups for over 20 years and currently works as a

specialist advocate with battered Maori women and their children. She has also been caregiver for displaced children, has worked in Child and Family Services, been a facilitator and counselor for sexual abuse programs specializing in sexual abuse of Maori children. Her tribes are Ngaitai, Te Arawa, Tuhoe and Ngati Porou. She lives and works in the heart of her tribal area. She is a mature student returning this year to do studies in Matauranga Maori at Te Whare Waananga O Raukawa (Maori University). She is a mother of three and grandmother of four.

Sharon Todd

Sharon Todd (Muscogee) is a co-founder of the Women's Health Education Project in Chicago. She is a former board member of Chicago Abortion Fund. She served on the working group for the health care linkage project of Chicago and served on the board of the West Side Sexual Assault Services Network. Sharon also served as an advisory board member and volunteer for Quetzal Center (formerly Rape Victim services) of Chicago. A long-time Native rights activist, Todd has worked with Women of All Red Nations and the Institute of Native American Development. She currently lives in Chicago with one son and two ferrets.

Urvashi Vaid

Urvashi Vaid is an attorney and community organizer whose work in the gay and lesbian movement spans more than 20 years. Since 1997, she has been the Director of the Policy Institute of the National Gay and Lesbian Task Force (NGLTF Policy Institute), based in New York City, a think tank dedicated to research, policy analysis, strategy development and coalition building to advance the equality of GLBT people. Vaid is a columnist for *The Advocate*, the national gay and lesbian newsmagazine and author of *Virtual Equality: The Mainstreaming of Gay & Lesbian Liberation*, which received the American Library Association's 1996 Gay Book Award, and was a finalist for the 1996 National Lambda Literary Awards. She is former executive director of the National Gay and Lesbian Task Force (NGLTF), and a former staff attorney for the National Prison Project of the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU), where she co-founded the Project's ongoing work to support inmates with HIV and AIDS.

Audrey Warren

Audrey Warren is executive director of Jefferson Youth Foundation, Inc., a non-profit organization that provides social services for children who are at risk for social and/or academic failure. She also facilitates a parent support group that incorporates art therapy into strategies for reducing stress and improving discipline. Audrey is a survivor of sexual assault and domestic violence. She writes poetry as both a healing tool and as a way to offer hope to others who have been victimized. Her work appears in several anthologies, the most recent being, *From a Bend in the River, 100 New Orleans Poets*, by Runagate Press.

Patricia Washington

Patricia Washington is an assistant professor of Women's Studies at San Diego State University. A sociologist by training, she uses a gendered lens to examine social stratification in the U.S. and abroad, with an emphasis on social inequalities and efforts to eradicate those inequalities. She is specifically interested in how social location (race, class, gender, sexual orientation, etc.) impacts access to, and the quality of, services provided by U.S. social institutions. Her current research

focuses on hate and bias-motivated violence and the revictimization of lesbian and gay sexual assault survivors of color.

Traci West

Rev. Dr. Traci C. West is currently an Assistant Professor of Ethics and African American Studies at Drew University Theological School in Madison New Jersey. She is an ordained elder in the United Methodist Church who has previously served in parish and campus ministry in Connecticut. Besides several articles on race, gender, religion and social change, she is the author of Wounds of the Spirit: Black Women, Violence, and Resistance Ethics (New York University Press, 1999).

Janelle White

Janelle recently relocated to New Orleans and works with the YWCA's Rape Crisis Program, coordinating medical advocacy support services for sexual assault survivors. She also holds a part-time position as Volunteer coordinator with the Hate Crimes Project, a program of the Lesbian & Gay Community Center of new Orleans. White worked previously with San Francisco Women Against Rape (SFWAR), where she established the Women of African Descent Taskforce. From 1995-1997, while a graduate student at the University of Michigan, she served as a staff person with the University's Sexual Assault Prevention and Awareness Center, coordinating their Peer Education Program. She has published several articles, including "Anti-Oppression Theory," "Survivors of African Descent," and "Because Rape is a Weapon of Oppression, Anti-Rape Must Mean Anti-Oppression." She remains committed to challenging all forms of oppression – be they rooted in her, society, or within the anti-rape/anti-violence movements.

Sherry Wilson

Sherry Wilson directs the Domestic Abuse Shelter program of the Ho-Chunk nation of Wisconsin. She is an activist with Women of All Red Nations and has been an active in struggles against racism and sexism, particularly in the lives of American Indian women, for over 20 years.

Pat Zavella

Patricia Zavella is an anthropologist, Professor of Community Studies, and Director of the Chicano/Latino Research Center at UCSC. She is interested in the dialogues between Chicana/Latino, feminist, and Latin American studies, particularly regarding the relationship between women's wage labor and family life, sexuality, poverty, and the multiple changes brought about by the transnational migration of Mexicana/o workers to the US and US capital to Mexico. Her new research investigates the gendered cultural construction of the Mexican body, sexuality discourses and practices, and their relation to women's vulnerability to sexually transmitted diseases. Her most recent publication is *Latina Feminist Testimonios: Papelitos Guardados*, co-authored with members of the Latina Feminist Group (Duke University Press, in press).

**INCITE! WOMEN OF COLOR AGAINST VIOLENCE
COLOR OF VIOLENCE RESOURCES**

Video Tapes of the Color of Violence: Violence Against Women of Color (April 28-29, 2000 at University of California-Santa Cruz) conference now available
(Expect to wait 4-6 weeks for delivery. Prices include shipping)

of copies \$20 per tape

- ___ Tape #1: Angela Davis keynote presentation; Opening performance

- ___ Tape #2: Respondents to Angela Davis's presentation: Urvashi Vaid, Kata Issari, Gail Small, Lourdes Lugo, Roma Balzer, Kimberle Crenshaw

- ___ Tape #3: Plenary Session #1: Beth Richie, Norma Alarcon, Ines Hernandez-Avila, Dorothy Roberts. Poetry reading by Audrey Warren

- ___ Tape #4: Plenary Session #2: Luana Ross, Anannya Bhattacharjee, Margo Okasawa-Rey, Loretta Ross, Rosa Linda Fregoso

- ___ Tape #5: Workshop on Heterosexism/Racism: Norma Alarcon, Val Kanuha, Patricia Washington, Janelle White

- ___ Tape #6: Workshop on Law Enforcement (poor quality): Beth Richie (partial); Renee Saucedo, Peggy Bird, Stormy Ogden

- ___ Tape #7: Workshop on Religion/Spirituality: Ines Hernandez-Avila, Nantawan Lewis, Traci West, Ngaire Kelly

- ___ Tape #8: Workshop on Colonized Bodies of Women of Color: Dorothy Roberts, Mary Ann Mills/Bernadine Atcheson, Lourdes Lugo, Rajani Bhatia, Lisa Ikemoto

- ___ Tape#9: Workshop on Colonialism and Violence: Luana Ross, Lourdes Santaballa, Winnie Te Are/ Stella Marr, Neferti Tadiar, Elham Bayour

- ___ Tape#10: Workshop on Challenging the Depoliticization of the Anti-Violence Movement: Loretta Ross, Kata Issari, Mimi Kim, Andrea Smith

- ___ Tape #11: Workshop on Organizing Against Violence in Communities of Color: Eileen Hudon, Blanca Tavera, Wendy Stewart/Audrey Huntley, Adrienne Davis

- ___ Tape #12: Workshop on Media/Cultural Representations of Violence: Aishah Simmons; Rosa Linda Fregoso, Chrystos

___ Tape #13: Haunani Kay Trask Keynote Presentation; Performances by Chrystos and Coatlicue Theatre Company

___ Tape #14: Performance by Faith Nolan

___ **Conference Proceedings (\$20)**

___ **Color of Violence T-Shirts (L, XL, XXL). \$15 each**

Name: _____

Address: _____

City, State Zip: _____

Phone: _____

Total Enclosed: _____ (make checks payable to Center for Human Rights Education)
Expect 4-6 weeks for delivery

Send forms and payment to:

Andrea Smith
123 Felix Street #4
Santa Cruz, CA 95060

Interested in receiving Incite!'s newsletter and information on upcoming events and conferences!
Write Incite! Women of Color Against Violence PO BOX 6861 Minneapolis, MN 55406
or email <incite_national@yahoo.com>

Resources Available from other Organizations

Women of Color Resource Center - Berkeley California
National Directory of Women of Color Organizations and Projects
\$19.95
Contact www.coloredgirls.org for more information.

SPECIAL NOTE: IF ANYONE HAS AN AUDIO OR VIDEO TAPE RECORDING OF THE COLOR OF VIOLENCE WORKSHOPS ON (1) LAW ENFORCEMENT; (2) GLOBALIZATION AND VIOLENCE; (3) MILITARISM, WE WOULD DESPERATELY LOVE TO HAVE A COPY!!!

Please contact Michelle Erai at <merai@cats.ucsc.edu> 831-459-6861.