

TRANSCRIPT - EPISODE 3

Feminist Development Policy: Intersectionality, gender & the economy

[OVOC Jingle] Our Voices, Our Choices

[Narration]: Our Voices, Our Choices, the feminist podcast from the Heinrich Boe II Foundation

[Samie]: Hey, I'm Samie Blasingame and welcome back to "A Pathway Towards Feminist Global Collaboration". This is episode 3 of our 5-part series which seeks to iron out what exactly Feminist Global Collaboration can look like and what needs to be addressed.

In our first two episodes we discussed various critiques of international development, the importance of knowing the sector's origins and its history, as well as the ways in which a dominance of Western knowledge paradigms upholds power imbalances in developmental practice. All incredibly important things to consider as we move toward more Feminist Global Collaboration.

So, what next? As several of our guests including Désirée Acholla and Saranel Benjamin have pointed out, a massive shortcoming in the development sector (among others) is the failure to embed an intersectional approach.

In this episode we want to discuss intersectionality as it is commonly understood and also use it to take a closer look at our current economic systems in relation to gender justice.

In episode one we mentioned the concept of intersectionality as a term coined by legal scholar Kimberlee Crenshaw and popularised in recent years. Though Crenshaw's paper came out in 1989, the concept is actually rooted in Black feminist thought and experiences, which can be traced back as far as abolitionist Sojourner Truth's speech "Ain't I a woman" in 1863.

As it is commonly understood and put to practice, intersectionality allows us to visualize the multiple oppressions an individual may face in a world shaped by race, gender, class, caste and other social categorizations, which are all interconnected and often overlap in the current interdependent systems of discrimination and disadvantage.

Our first guest, Sanyu Awori, can help us elaborate on the benefits of practising intersectionality within the development sector. She is the Building Feminist Economies Manager at the Association for Women's Rights in Development known as AWID - she joins us from Kenya.

[Sanyu]: So, my name is Sanyu Awori and I'm an African feminist based in Nairobi. I work and agitate with many other feminist activists and movements in calling for economic justice. And at AWID I manage the Building Feminist Economies Initiative where we work with other movements in mobilizing on economic and climate justice, as well as amplifying the demands of feminist labour movements and unpacking the deliciousness of feminist economic alternatives. So that's a bit about my work.

Being an African feminist is really about challenging systems of power, about recognizing the interconnected ways power bears down on women and gender diverse people's lives. So, it's not even just patriarchy, but we are gonna be looking at colonial systems of power and extractive systems of power. We're gonna be looking and are interested in the ways fundamentalist religious systems of power bear down on women. I think one of the most important offerings that the intersectionality framing gives us is that there is no hierarchy of issues, right? So, we are paying



attention to patriarchy and gender stereotypes and how that connects with one's migrant status and what that means for how they can access public services and so I think intersectionality allows us to sharpen our analysis and bring to fore realities that tend to be deliberately silenced.

[Samie]: When it comes to development practice, an intersectional analysis of mainstream approaches - or even certain feminist narratives - provides a meaningful pathway towards achieving genuine impact.

So, as Neha Kagal and Lia Latchford write in their research, limiting intersectionality to a simple technical tool in international development, or reducing it to a 'tick-box exercise' of 'how-to-do-international-development-through-an-intersectional-lens' risks co-opting the meaning of the term and reducing its inherent political edge.

We must instead insist that international development is practised through the lens of intersectionality as a way to help us understand and disrupt systems of power, hierarchy, and inequality - as a tool that enables us to respond to the complex ways in which inequalities and oppression manifest themselves.

I'll let Sanyu continue with an example...

[Sanyu]: One of the first things I want to, um, raise is the insidious ways feminist narratives are being co-opted by corporations and market fundamentalists. So, this instrumentalization of women by the market, and so kind of like if we bring women into the market, then are they empowered? And the narrative says yes, but actually what's missing is interrogating the structures and systems of what women are being absorbed in to. What we don't want is a neoliberal feminism that doesn't recognize or acknowledge that the market is an unequal place, designed to favour those with power and resources. And so, I think that's one of the first things we need to be unpacking.

[Samie]: Our next guest, Veena Singh, is a feminist development practitioner, consultant, and strong advocate of 'shifting powers to create positive change'. Her lived experience speaks strongly to the importance of an intersectional lens, both in interpersonal exchange and in developmental practice.

[Veena]: Hello and Bula Vinaka to everyone listening in. I'm Veena Singh I have worked in the area of women's human rights and community development for more than 15 years, and I am very passionate about progressing gender equality and trying to work within different spaces in connecting the dots and trying to at least work towards creating and influencing a world that is safe and equitable for all. I am from Fiji, I live and work here and this is my home. I am of mixed ethnicity, My dad is a Fiji Islander of Indian descent and my mum is an Indigenous Fijian woman.

[Samie]: Veena and I talked a long time about identity - about how important hers is in the Fijian context, but also, in general the ways certain parts of ourselves influence how we show up in and experience the world.

[Veena]: It is important to highlight who I am and of my rich heritage because there are some great lessons, teachings, way of life and way of doing, way of knowing and way of being that we can adapt in our current times and in progressing gender equality. This is who I am, this is where I am from and what I represent are equally powerful and carries weight and if we all spoke and shared about the multiple layers of who we are as people, as humans, then the world would be a slightly better place to live in and be in.

[Samie]: And in connecting to Sanyu's points on how intersectionality allows us to sharpen our analysis, so too does highlighting the diversity of our various lived experiences. Which helps to



ensure we are addressing the needs of the most marginalised. When we improve the situation for those surviving on the margins, we automatically improve the situation for everyone else. For example, Veena shares a shortcoming within the international development sector, which in practice, fails to include people at the margins.

[Veena]: The first problem remains that gender only equates to women and girls - like this is incorrect. We should always make sure that when we talk or mention gender, that we are emphasising that it is inclusive of all people in all their diversities. Like for us in the Pacific, it's not like a simple thing of just being a man, a boy, a girl, a woman. It's so much more than that. And the roles that we play within these spaces.

You know, and that's why it's so important for those who are in the development sector to keep on making or highlighting this and to emphasise, and that we are not only talking about women and girls.

[Samie]: Of course it is vital to strive for women and girls to access their basic rights and needs since they make up around half of the human population and are more likely to be disproportionately impacted by poverty or in times of conflict or crisis, but who are we ignoring if gender-focused initiatives only address women and girls?

As mentioned before, intersectionality allows us to understand the multifaceted ways that power oppresses and silences certain individuals. If we merely look at gender as women and girls, we perpetuate cis-centrism (the centering and normalising of cis people - or people who have a gender identity that aligns with the sex they were assigned at birth). When we do this in our attempts to dismantle sexism, we miss addressing the needs of trans and nonbinary people, who are equally affected by patriarchy and heteronormativity. Take the Sustainable Development Goals, or the SDGs, for example:

[Veena]: It's basically a call to action by member states and governments globally to end poverty and inequality, to protect the planet, to ensure there's access to health services, there's infrastructure in place, there's justice and prosperity. But how can you have this as a call to action, you know, when we are still looking at things from a very, like a non-feminist, uh, non-intersectional lens, uh, and that's the question that I ask myself. The minute we look at things from a very one-sided view that is largely patriarchal, dominant, and biased. How are we to achieve the commitments we have made?

[Samie]: And the commitments we've made are to ALL people – The SDGs are under the motto “leave no one behind” but by lacking an intersectional approach such as addressing racism, transphobia or criticising a binary perspective, there will always be people who we will be leave behind. For example, one of the objectives of the SDGs is to „ensure the full and effective participation of women and equal opportunities for leadership positions at all levels of decision-making in political, economic and public life“. But as Johann Redl writes in the SDG Blog of ETH Zurich, what good is this goal for those women who are unable to make use of these supposedly equal opportunities? Systemic barriers are often invisible, so if the UN's understanding of gender does not intersect with race, ability, caste or any other part of one's identity, the goal of gender equality cannot address the problems of every person who suffers gender discrimination.

In our last episode about Knowledge as Power we touched on how these shortcomings manifest themselves. Our guest Ayisha Siddiqi shared with us that she felt that many of these spaces where decisions about policies or strategies like the SDGs are made, do not feel like a space which is welcoming nor accessible for people from historically marginalised communities. This is what Veena has to say about it:

[Veena]: We are not being real and honest when we are having these conversations. You know we are missing the people. We are missing soul and life in these conversations and discussions. We are



missing kindness. We are missing the lived realities in these decisions and discussions and most importantly, those people who are largely affected by a lot of these global issues. The same people who are part of these critical discussions are the very ones who are contributing to a lot of inequalities, the injustices, and wars that is happening. They're the biggest contributors to pollution, yet they are the ones making the decisions and they're the ones in these rooms, in these spaces and the very people who are suffering aren't even part of the design or planning or implementation.

You know, for example we have this tendency of viewing women's economic empowerment as only a matter of access to employment or access to funds for them to carry out income generation activities or projects or even to provide additional trainings or support or capacity development. But we really need to, you know, to stop and reflect on these existing ways of work and, and reflect on what more we could be doing.

We need to connect the dots and ensure that we have an enabling environment, that we have the right policies in place that will ensure women, trans women, sex workers, migrant women... just marginalised people... are able to get work and get a decent living just wage, you know, that they're able to access services, that they have, social protection.

[Samie]: So while the tool of intersectionality can and should be used to understand the barriers placed on individuals with identities that exist outside a status quo, what Veena just shared leads us to the core of what we want to explore with you this episode: using the tool of intersectionality to explore the intersections of certain topics, namely the interconnectedness of gender and the economy.

The narrative in the spaces that Veena and Ayisha speak about is still very much how can we improve “development” or make it feminist instead of critically reflecting on what development means and how countries of the Global North benefit from structural issues, especially by not talking about them.

I mean, have you noticed that in many development spaces there seems to be an elephant in the room? We speak about poverty or the need for economic empowerment, but we don't stop to question the mechanism which produces global inequality in the first place. We thus invite you to put on your intersectional glasses as we look at the capitalist economic model through a feminist lens.

Our third guest, Natalia Carrau - a labour rights and environmental justice advocate from Uruguay addresses some of these issues in her work. She joins us now to share an intersectional analysis of economic approaches and narratives.

[Natalia]: My name is Natalia Carrau. I am a member of the national network, Friends of the Earth Uruguay, which is part of Friends of the Earth International. I've been working for many years with trade unions from the perspectives of environmental justice and economic justice, and more recently, integrating gender justice into these perspectives as well. Here in Latin America, we are discussing a little bit the waves of feminism and we could say that we are in the fourth wave. Where feminism is more established, grows bigger and incorporates different intersections as well. I'm 41 years old and I am a daughter of the third wave of feminism and it was very enlightening putting on the gender lens and to see my past life, my work, who I am, the bonds I build with people, through the lens of feminism. It made me be a different woman and made me notice inequalities, violence, that I wasn't as aware of before - in all areas, in my personal life, in public life, as a political woman, because I consider myself a political woman - in my work, in the ways I express my beliefs. There has been many advances because of feminism. And at the same time we are witnessing this pink washing everywhere where a company dresses in pink and marches on the 8th of March or a company hangs posters on their facades defending Women's equality or they advertise flying the diversity flag that they hire LGBTQ+ people in their offices. Is that positive? Of course, it is.



It's positive that more people have access to a better job no matter their gender. But behind that, there's also a business opportunity to show an interest with an issue that has gained a lot of visibility. So, I think we have to reply in a critical manner to this business opportunity and capture of feminist's struggles. To me, feminism is in the streets and there is not just one feminism there are many feminisms – but a feminism that is not class feminism, that is not intersectional, that is for instance transphobic, is not feminism. It can never be feminism because feminism advocates for egalitarian inclusive societies - for a transformation that overcomes the status of chronic violence that is reproduced. A feminism that denies trans people and that excludes them, in my view, is never feminism and I would never advocate for such a feminism.

[Samie]: This intersectional feminist perspective allows Natalia and other activists like her to keep a pulse on the most pressing, and genuinely impactful strategies to fight against global inequalities.

[Natalia]: I specialise in transnational corporations, free trade agreements, investment agreements, and how these drivers of the capitalist system impact people's rights. And these issues strongly link to development, they can be analysed as the other side of the same coin. And that's one of the things that made me very interested in being able to do this podcast. That people in Europe can hear about perspectives from the Global South that challenge the privileged position of global North countries.

[Samie]: Yeah, let's dive right into that. You may remember our guest from episode one, Prof. Dr. Aram Ziai, pointing out that if the colonial structures present in the international division of labour, trade policies or debt structures did not become a core concern of feminist development policy, then this endeavour could be added to the long cycle of development “fig leaves” as he called it. In her work with unions, these concerns are some of Natalia's main focus points.

[Natalia]: So, development has a lot to do with the place certain countries occupy in the international division of labour. And those positions are given by the type of goods that we trade and the rules that are made to trade goods or anything else globally. I think that if the discussion on development and inequality does not incorporate the asymmetries between South and global North, it doesn't really address the concern about global development. To really address that concern and effectively deliver equality among societies, we should be able to discuss ownership of technology for instance, or intellectual property rights, or the right to industrialise and how global trade rules established at the World Trade Organisation or through the hundreds of Free Trade Agreements signed around the world, prevent Global South's development. So, if we don't discuss the foundations of the economic system and we don't come up with answers that are structural, we will be crystallising the privileges business has over human rights. If we don't discuss those terms, we are not discussing development, nor will we be able to end inequality.

[Samie]: The dominant narrative wants us to believe that colonialism ended with the independence of formerly colonised countries of the Global South. In fact, some even argue that our current economy is a meritocracy - meaning that every country has the ability to overcome poverty through the existence of strong institutions and markets. The assumption that we are all on one even playing field underpins many of the dominant perspectives found within the field of international development.

But as many of us now know, colonialism never ended, it was just transformed. And we are definitely not on an even playing field. As Natalia just explained, we see it most prominently when we look at who is producing certain goods versus where they are consumed. The amount of raw materials, land, energy and human resources extracted from the South has been estimated at over 10 trillion US dollars per year – enough to end extreme poverty 70 times over. In fact, this loss of natural and human resources incurred by countries of the Global South often outstrip the amount they receive in aid by a factor of 30.



Considering this status quo, we asked our guests whether they believe it is enough to address poverty reduction through a sole focus on increasing employment numbers amongst women, gender diverse people or youth within the current economic system. Here is Sanyu with some thoughts on this...

[Sanyu]: So, for example, we can look at global supply chains and so often countries in the Global South, we are told we need this investment because it gives us employment, but there's no scrutiny around the conditions of that employment.

So, for example, looking at either like flower farms in East Africa, that export flowers to Europe or garment workers working in global supply chains in Asia, there are no living wages. They are unequal power dynamics between the workers and the brands at the top of this food chain. And ultimately, it's a profit seeking model that will abandon workers at the sign of crisis. So, in the pandemic, we all of a sudden see fashion brands cancelling their orders, and that triggers a humanitarian crisis for workers, mostly women, because in global supply chains over 80% of the workers are women and women are overrepresented at the bottom of supply chains, right?

And so it's acknowledging that this market system, the economy, has such unequal power dynamics and the rules are set up to benefit a few and not the masses. It's absolutely ridiculous that during the Covid pandemic we had millionaires increasing their wealth at unprecedented levels, when we have the masses facing austerity, unemployment and multiple crises. And so, this is the way the economy is currently designed and that's why we need an overhaul, because right now we still don't have tax justice, wealth is getting hoarded and that wealth could be used to fund systems of care.

[Samie]: These systems of care that Sanyu is referring to include the nurses, supermarket workers, teachers, transport and waste management workers we all called "essential" during the pandemic, but we haven't seen this reflected in economic policies now that the pandemic is, hopefully, coming to an end, nor have we made systemic shifts to look after these 'essential workers' better.

This type of work falls under the umbrella of care work - work that is "essential in sustaining a functioning society" - just like cooking, cleaning, caring for the sick or for children and our elders. This type of work is often performed at no cost or under precarious conditions, and it has historically been performed by and expected from women. It's also known as reproductive labour – versus productive for the economy – and so the key demands of feminist movements around care work is for it to be recognised, redistributed, reduced and remunerated. Here's Veena again, with how the existing system should be transformed:

[Veena]: The system has been created to benefit and support an existing way of life, an existing system or a group of people within our society who make up the minority but holds so much wealth in terms of financial and also political power. We need to make sure that the system works for all people rather than, you know, work against them by reinforcing current systems of disadvantage. I mean like eliminating poverty or ending poverty has been on the discussion table for many years now. I mean, like long before the MDGs, long before the SDGs, like for, for the longest time. But then poverty needs to be defined, um, and contextualized. How can we end poverty when the definition in itself is not inclusive of how we define poverty? Because how the Western society defines poverty is around finance. You know, it's in economic terms, monetary terms.

I think it should be much more than the money and the, you know ensuring services and the facilities and the infrastructure is so, so important, but we need to also place emphasis on time how we use time. And that's also a currency.

[Samie]: Time for rest, for dreaming, for community and for just being. These things are all extremely important, and, one could argue, aspects of one's wealth - but ensuring that time for these things is accessible to people may be left out when development chooses to define poverty solely by economic terms.



And as all our guests have pointed out, telling a story only with numbers as we do with unemployment statistics, doesn't allow us to see the full scope of people's lived realities. If you are employed, but don't make a living wage, can't access affordable health care, or lack resources to advocate for yourself, that isn't an employment statistic anyone should be boasting about. For people who aren't able to form unions or feel otherwise disenfranchised, working conditions can be exploitative, degrading, and downright dangerous.

On this note, let's hear again from Natalia, who shares an example concerning this contradiction

[Natalia]: Today we are not generating the jobs that people need, not only because of digitalisation and the impact that this is having on the labour market and on working class. Especially because the system pushes out the decent part of the jobs. It's looking more and more as exploitation. The system reproduces exploitation, it reproduces precarious, informal, badly paid jobs, that have a series of impacts on the way we traditionally knew work - an eight-hour job, a job with rights, a job with social security with social protection, a job with freedom of association and collective bargaining. A job where unions played a big and important role. These things define dignified work.

So, if we are talking about Intersectionality, well, we need to bear in mind that class is a very important aspect that we should consider. It's not that it's most important, it's that it should be addressed in an intersectional way, as well as race or gender identity. The worst paid jobs, the most informal and precarious ones are carried out by women, poor women, Black poor women, they suffer worst working conditions but also moral, labour and sexual harassment. The LGBTIQ+ population is also discriminated in their access to decent work.

[Samie]: So, what we know, and what many critiques of development have outlined for quite some time now, is that poverty cannot be overcome through a focus on economic growth in and of itself. Gross Domestic Product, or GDP, is the key indicator of economic output. With the focus on GDP growth we focus on monetised economic activity, independent of whether that activity is useful or destructive for society and the environment.

Let's take the example of how in the 1950s many newly independent countries of the Global South pushed to reverse the extractive policies of colonialism and improve human welfare. Jason Hickel talks about this in his book "Less is more. How degrowth will save the world." He says tariffs were established to protect domestic industries; which helped improve labour standards and raise worker's wages. The average income at this time, in the Global South, actually grew at 3.2% per year during the 60s and 70s.

This meant the loss of access to cheap human labour and raw materials for the Global North. So, in return Global North countries leveraged their power as creditors and used their influence over the World Bank and International Monetary Fund to impose what we know today as structural adjustment programmes across many parts of the Global South.

What happened next was the opening of protective tariffs, slashing of wages and environmental laws and privatisation mixed with austerity measures, which meant less investment in the much-needed social services our guests have been talking about. The focus on GDP growth for the Global North came at the expense of human welfare and economic independence for the Global South. Income growth rates thus plummeted to an average of 0.7% in the 80s and 90s.

Here's Sanyu again, explaining how a development policy tied to GDP has not lead us to achieve our social justice nor sustainable development goals.

[Sanyu]: For so long when we think about development, whose idea of development are we running with? It's focused so much on GDP and the economy and an extractivist approach. It's also important for us to recognize that—African feminists and feminists from the South have been



critiquing these economic approaches from their inception. Also, because the set of ideas are and have been so undemocratic in even how they've been shaped by a handful of governments not even sitting in the context in which these policies are going to be implemented.

And what we have seen over time and what feminists and social movements have been documenting is the systemic failings of this approach, and I think what the Covid pandemic brought to bear is the limitations of looking at the economy as just GDP. Because actually we need to be thinking about the economy in terms of how does the economy center and pour care into societies, and especially to those on the margins.

We need water. We need education, we need housing, we need health to remain public so that it can reach the most vulnerable, those most living on the margins. What actually has happened is the approaches and decisions of international finance institutions pushing structural adjustment programs have instead put us in conditions of austerity and left our governments with very limited fiscal space to even make decisions for our collective welfare and so what feminists are really trying to do is expand what we mean by the economy and move it from the very reductionist, Western neoliberal idea of just GDP to a much more people centered, environment centered approach that looks at systems of care, that looks at accountability, that looks at workers being able to collectively organize, that looks like food sovereignty and quality housing for all, that looks like people being able to access public services and those services still being public. So, it's the shift.

[Samie]: Vandana Shiva puts it into sad but truthful words. She says, "In effect, 'growth' measures the conversion of nature into cash, and commons into commodities. People who do care work such as housework or childrearing do not fit into the paradigm of economic growth; a flourishing and living forest does not contribute to growth, only once the trees are cut down and sold as timber. If people have access to free water resources, this will not create growth. Only once a company privatizes water access and sells the water to people does this bring growth.

Even the development sector has assigned more value to productive labour rather than strengthening the value of reproductive labour and pushing against the privatisation of public services such as water, electricity, health or transport which makes people spend more money on services that are necessary for survival. Natalia shares with us who is most impacted by such policies.

[Natalia]: So, the privatisation or commodification of public services, public companies or the deregulation of state monopolies is going to have more impacts on poor and marginalised communities. Because women are mainly responsible for reproductive labour, we tend to demand more public services than other sectors of the population, clearly more than the upper classes but also more than men.

This type of analysis is what helps us understand the dimension of impacts on economic, environmental, social and gender justice that come from free trade agendas. Free trade agendas impose clauses and commitments to countries that prevent them from implementing and designing regulations for general public interest - these are aspects of life in society that are being negotiated and transacted in international trade and that have a direct impact on our lives but we don't see it in that way because the mainstream present these free trade agendas as the "path towards development". So, privatisation of public services affects everybody, but the upper classes have the possibility to solve their needs for water, health, education, transport in the market. So, if they have to pay for their education or for their children's education, they can pay for it. If they have to pay for access to health care in a hospital, they can, but what about those of us who can't?

[Samie]: Natalia makes a really strong point here about how these international economic policies affect the development sector's ability to truly dismantle inequality. To reach this goal, we all need to learn from this intersectional analysis of how the current global economic system impacts the way society is structured, especially the lives and agency of the lives of those on the margins.



In implementing feminist global collaboration, we would love to see more actors devoted to creating a feminist economy through an intersectional lens. So as our incredible guests continue to push for this shift, we wondered what they believe the development sector needs to start talking about and practising if we want to move towards this. In her work, Veena talks about ‘building an economy of kindness’ - let’s start with her definition of what this would entail.

[Veena]: So, this is something that's close to my heart. For me, building an economy of kindness is about creating a space where we are all equal, yet we recognize the power and the privilege that we do bring into spaces, acknowledging it and trying to find ways that we can move together to that one goal. Number one is to have more honest and serious conversations. Having some of those hard conversations for us to be real with what the situation is and actually be open to allow other people to come in, be part of that conversation. We need to change our rules of engagement, and we really need to hold each other accountable and be transparent in terms of how we work and who we work with, because we can't continue working this way. And every 30 years or so, developing frameworks to end poverty or to progress gender equality and things like that. When we are not having some of these real hard conversations.

[Samie]: Those real hard conversations, require some real hard questions to reflect on. Here’s Natalia again with some suggestions

[Natalia]: So, we should ask ourselves, well, what are the international economic policies, the trade or development policies that are in place currently, which promote, restrict, or prevent us from achieving gender justice. Social movements have clearly been established against free trade agreements because of how they prevent countries from delivering public policies, regulations, human rights, economic, environmental, social and gender justice. And within these transitions, we should think about dignifying work as a concept AND as a reality. We should think about ensuring that all people have a decent work, with a dignified remuneration that compensates it’s labour force, with labour rights, with social protection and guarantees of an environment free from harassment. We should be able to work less hours for the same salary and this one should be dignifying; we should be able to enjoy our family and social life in balance with our working hours, but this discussion is very difficult to have right now even if it’s the type of discussion we should be privileging now in the context of the pandemic, in the context of enormous challenges we are going to face every soon. This discussion should be a priority.

[Samie]: I know we’ve thrown a lot at you this episode, so thanks for sticking it out and being open for the work that implementing a truly feminist development policy will entail. So, no matter where you are positioned within the development sector, and especially for those of us based in the Global North, let's keep listening, asking those hard questions, reflecting and moving in kindness. Each of those suggestions will help move us toward more feminist global collaboration.

Hopefully this episode has inspired you to apply an intersectional lens in new and important ways. A set of recommendations for practical action will follow this episode, so look out for that on the Heinrich Boell Foundation and Fair Share websites early next year.

As we do for each episode, we would like to end with a quote by an activist, scholar or practitioner. Today, that’s with words by Anna Karpf, author of the book “How Women Can Save the Planet”:

“We are told that the systems, which assault and degrade nature, are natural. Margret Thatcher famously proclaimed that "There is no alternative", and neoliberal economies nod their heads in agreement: It can't be other than this. Anything else would be worse, or against human nature. Instead of recognising that our damaged planet is dystopian, they dismiss radical visions of change as utopian.”



[Samie]: This has been a podcast of „Our Voices, Our Choices“ in the series “Feminist Development Policy: A pathway towards Feminist Global Collaboration”. You can find this and other episodes on the podcast app of your choice, and if you could help us spread the word or by rating us or recommending us to others, we would be very grateful. We’d also love to hear from you! You can also send us feedback and suggestions at podcast@boell.de

Audio for this podcast was produced by the incredible Gretsch and directed by me, your host, Samie Blasingame, in collaboration with the Audiokollektiv. Thanks so much for listening and see you here next time!