

Towards "A Peaceful NAC and the

MARY-JO NADEAU

Ce document donne une analyse féministe du Conseil national d'action de la condition féminine (NAC) sur

NAC responded to the attack on Thobani by issuing a second Press Release, once again affirming its po-

There has been little criticism of the silences in NAC's responses, most notably, the organization's failure to express decisive support for the complex anti-war position outlined by Sunera Thobani.

son engagement actuel pour la paix et les politiques anti-guerre au Canada. Dans le but de renforcer les politiques nationales féministes pour la paix, ce texte est une évaluation préliminaire de la réponse de NAC aux événements du 11 septembre 2002, en particulier de son choix de mettre de l'avant un discours qui prône une « solution pacifique »

"Violence Begets More Violence: NAC Calls for Peaceful Solution to All Terror Attacks." With this Press Release headline, the National Action Committee on the Status of Women (NAC) added its voice to the growing groundswell of opposition to the U.S.-led, post-September 11 "race toward war" (NAC, 2001b; Black Radical Congress). Only three weeks later Sunera Thobani, NAC's former President (1993-96), became the target of a brutal public/media attack. The attack was a direct response to Thobani's timely and hard-hitting anti-war speech at an historic feminist conference. For daring to articulate a complex feminist critique of racism, patriarchy, war and western foreign policy, Thobani was subjected to a sustained media barrage of "racist, anti-feminist, and anti-immigrant epithets" (Nadeau 14).¹

sition that "NAC Upholds Peaceful Solutions to All Forms of Violence" (2001a). The content of this second statement condemned the "media reports unfairly targeting women and racialized people," expressed concern about increasing violations of rights and freedoms, denounced the increasing "suppression of dissent" in Canada, and condemned "military violence." By means of these two statements, released into public circulation after September 11, NAC articulated some necessary and viable political parameters for acting in solidarity with feminists and social movements across Canada.

Despite the onslaught of public attention to both Thobani and NAC in this period, there has been surprisingly little organized discussion of NAC's political position (as it has been articulated in the two Press Releases) from within the women's movement. In particular, there has been very little criticism of the silences in NAC's responses, most notably, the organization's failure to express clear and decisive support for the complex activist-oriented anti-war position outlined by Sunera Thobani. This silence amongst feminists is partly explained by the broad

recognition that NAC is reacting within the context of "the isolation of an already seriously weakened women's movement" (Rebick 2001). Many are rightly sympathetic to this situation, and are acutely aware that the "largest feminist organization in the country" has been particularly impacted by severe funding cuts, conservative backlash and obscurity/hostility in the mainstream media.²

While this broad context of backlash undoubtedly explains NAC's inability to mobilize an effective activist campaign (given its lack of resources), it does not explain how or why NAC came to articulate its current political direction. Why did NAC choose to emphasize "a peaceful solution" as its signature post-September 11 message? What was the range of debate on this decision within NAC? What are the overall range of feminist positions currently mobilizing within the organization in advocacy of (or against) this particular peace discourse? Why was this articulation of "a peaceful solution" emphasized instead of a more direct alignment with an anti-war discourse? Does this position provide clear direction about what might constitute "a peaceful solution"? If this is the solution, what does it reveal about how NAC is understanding the problem? In particular, does this discourse allow NAC to prioritize a concern for the heightened mobilization of racialized citizenship as the terms of intensified exclusion, regulation, and criminalization after September 11? Today, "border panics" are being mobilized with increasing regularity, "national security" is fast becoming the dogma that organizes racialized citizenship, and global capitalism is

Solution” Politics of Engagement

displacing and marginalizing peoples worldwide (Sharma; Wright 2002). Does NAC’s response represent an adequate opposition to these key pillars in “America’s new war” and the accompanying “war at home” (Abdel-Shehid 51; Diaz Barrero and Sztainbok Mazui 40)?

This paper argues that building an effective “feminist, anti-racism, anti-oppression call for peace” is currently urgent, and that it requires an intense and sustained engagement with these questions (Bain, Timothy and Chahal). So, with a view to building a stronger national feminist response in Canada, this paper takes on this task. Specifically, I provide a preliminary assessment of NAC’s response to September 11, particularly its choice to emphasize “a peaceful solution” as its organizing discourse. I begin by providing a description of this discourse and a critical analysis of its strengths and weaknesses. I then outline the broad political context of the peace- and anti-war movements within which NAC’s position is located, including a description of the range of alliances at work in this context. The paper concludes with suggestions drawn from recent feminist anti-war/peace analyses regarding how women’s movements might develop an “engaged” feminist analysis for strengthening both peace and anti-war movements (Arat-Koc 63). I hope my analysis will contribute to emerging activism and, perhaps most immediately, to NAC’s renewed attempt to initiate a restructuring process that

would see the organization come to grips with both its financial and political reality and set the

stage for the revival of a strong, vibrant and independent national women’s organization in Canada. (NAC 2003)

NAC’s Politics of Peace: A Critical Assessment

NAC’s decision to locate Canada’s largest and most widely recognized women’s organization in a peace discourse is, of course, a reasonable response to the current political and social climate. “Peace” is a broad discourse, however, and can encompass a wide range of arguments, not all of which will stand in agreement. To assess the political assumptions and implications of NAC’s particular articulation of a “peaceful solution” then, it is necessary to assess its substantive arguments (all of which are outlined in

particularly vulnerable to racist attacks.... “These attacks are unacceptable....” (2001b)

This anti-racist feminist framework provided a necessary public critical response to combat the spate of racist attacks that took place in the immediate and extended aftermath of September 11. Moreover, it signalled to the broader women’s and social movements that the organization remains politically committed to defining NAC and Canadian feminism through an anti-racist politics and through an acknowledgement that “[w]ar is not the answer.” Despite these important contributions to a public oppositional discourse however, NAC’s politics of peace was mediated through, and ultimately constrained by, its entry into a liberal-democratic citizenship discourse,

NAC’s politics of peace was mediated through, and ultimately constrained by, its entry into a liberal-democratic citizenship discourse, and its tendency towards gender determinism.

its first Press Release).

The strength of NAC’s position is located in its anti-racist feminist analysis:

A crucial concern for NAC is the attacks we have already begun to witness on Canadians and Americans of Arab decent or perceived Middle-Eastern decent and Muslims an Islamic centers. In many reports, women and children in schools have been

and its tendency towards gender determinism.

a) Citizenship discourse

NAC’s call for a “peaceful solution” was addressed primarily as an appeal to “governments and citizens ... to maintain calm.” In choosing to secure its political position within this state-centred discourse of liberal-democratic citizenship, I argue that NAC ultimately undermined and displaced the strength of its anti-

racist position. This position was diluted, in the first instance, by the decision to locate its address around the de-gendered and de-racialized categories of “governments and citizens.” Specifically, this construction interrupts its anti-racist message by rendering invisible the multiple entrenched social hierarchies that characterize the experiences of women/marginalized peoples in Canada and globally. Moreover, this choice of categories constructs a false sense of

the processes of racialized citizenship that have historically (and continue in the present) to define Canada. As a political position, by locating its peace analysis within this language of the state, NAC (as the official national feminist voice) establishes Canadian feminism as a space for working *within*, rather than against, an increasingly regulatory and exclusionary nation-state apparatus. As such, it risks separating NAC from the social movements actively chal-

lenged, and positioned as both categorically victimized by, and opposed to, war:

The women’s movement that is made up of grandmothers, mothers, daughters, and sisters will always uphold a just, peaceful solution because it is women and children who are the largest victims of war. (NAC, 2001a)

By locating its peace analysis within this language of the state, NAC establishes Canadian feminism as a space for working *within*, rather than against, an exclusionary nation-state apparatus.

equivalency between them, and thereby creates an appearance of shared interests and equal access to power. That is, the pairing of “governments and citizens” as a singular term of identification de-emphasizes the unequal power of governments, and obscures the fact that nation-states—not individuals—are responsible for forms of state terrorism, for drastically curtailing civil liberties, and for implementing restrictive and criminalizing border policies through immigration and refugee acts.³

NAC’s anti-racist position is further undermined by its statement that “governments and citizens must not fall victim to backlash against *law-abiding* citizens, immigrants and refugees ... [and] “*innocent* individuals” (2001b [emphases mine]). By adopting this discourse of citizenship-centred legality, NAC implicitly accepts a hierarchy of preferred status based on moral, legal, national-racial belonging. On these terms, its appeal to “law-abiding” and “innocent” “citizens” fails to acknowledge, and actively excludes from its analysis, the racialized, gendered and nationalized processes by which the state *produces* illegal subjects. Indeed, it obscures, rather than makes visible,

lenging an increasingly restrictive and criminalizing state apparatus.⁴ NAC’s distancing from activist movements was particularly evident in its response to the attack on Thobani, which failed to bind the organization clearly and unequivocally with the anti-war arguments of its past president. Instead of advocating collective activism with the burgeoning peace and anti-war movements, NAC launched a website campaign enjoining the public to exercise individual political action by writing letters to denounce “media targetting of NAC” (2001c).

b) Gender determinism

NAC’s current politics of women also needs to be examined as a central discursive thread running through its peace discourse. In particular, it displayed a tendency towards “gender determinism,” a highly contested (and heavily critiqued) politic that positions women as “by their very nature, peace loving” (Mojab 1997: 75; Arat-Koc). As in the following statement, gender is articulated as an overriding or singularly determinant identity in which women (or, the equally problematic coupling, “women and children”) are implic-

One needs only to review the media attacks on Sunera Thobani to see the problems with this position—women, including self-identified feminists, were anything but peaceful in articulating their attacks on Thobani (Nadeau). Indeed, many women voiced absolute support for Canada’s involvement in the U.S. war against Afghanistan, usually in the name of “liberating” Afghani women from the Taliban. As critiques of “feminism and imperialism” and “Eurocentric ‘global feminism’” have shown, victim-based discourses of gendered unity can be easily mobilized either by extremely conservative, anti-woman, imperialist forces or by “liberal” imperialist versions of white feminism (Viner; Arat-Koc 55). This gender determinism also undermines feminist anti-racist arguments by homogenizing the category women (or, frequently, “women and children”) under the sign of gender oppression. On these terms, gender operates as a limiting analytical and political space. As such, it works against more complex gender analyses which recognize the multiple and contradictory hierarchies of oppression/privilege that construct women’s and men’s lives. In terms of gender analysis then, I would argue that NAC’s current politics of peace and its anti-racist politics are limited by this gender determinist tendency.

Peace Activism, Anti-War Coalitions and the Canadian Women’s Movement

It is important to locate NAC’s political position within the range of

social movements, communities, coalitions and organizations active after September 11. The intent here is to map out, for the purposes of critical scrutiny, the state of political alliances which defined the current terrain of peace and anti-war discourses and movements. This kind of analysis, while only preliminary (and certainly not comprehensive) in the current paper, is needed to assess and build on the movements' strengths, and to open a space of feminist critique for addressing ongoing troubles and dilemmas confronting feminist activists in organizing for peace and against war.

It is also important to begin with the recognition that there has been a substantial degree of overlap between movements. In Canada, as elsewhere, collective resistance to post-September 11 war-mongering was immediate and widespread, and positions of oppositional unity reflected a range of political strategies. Two interrelated currents of organized political opposition—the peace movement and anti-war coalitions—eventually emerged as a dominant organizing focus, uniting oppositional voices in a broad common cause of condemning the ongoing U.S.-led “war against terrorism.” Mass demonstrations, public meetings, postering, petitions, and press releases defined the important and significant shared work of both anti-war and peace activists in the months to follow. Feminists from a variety of political persuasions were active in and across both movements.

Notwithstanding these significant and productive convergences, some important political divergences distinguish these two currents of activism, both currently and historically. Most notably, as will be discussed below, the two tend to differ with respect to the mobilization of political identities and in their relationship to the state. It is necessary to comprehend these differences in order to fully comprehend the meaning of NAC's current decision to align itself primarily within a state-based politics of peace, and not predominantly

within an activist-centred anti-war or peace politic.

a) Anti-War coalitions

Anti-war coalitions typically aim to expose and oppose “the extreme imbalances of power” that emerge at particular moments to promote war and prevent peace (McClintock 16). Historically, such movements tend to organize around a politics of autonomy from/opposition to the capitalist state which, to varying degrees, is viewed as “the hidden fist of the free market” (Roy). On these terms, anti-war movements mobilize around direct criticism of the state, and develop a political critique which focuses on exposing the contradictions that inevitably arise in the dynamics of a racist, patriarchal, imperialist (or global) colonial-capitalist nation-state system.

In the current context, for example, anti-war activism was especially vital for drawing attention to criticism of U.S. imperialism in its current and past forms, and for emphasizing the specific brutalities of U.S. foreign policy and corporate globalization. Most, like Toronto's Coalition Against War and Racism (CAWR), connected “war, racism

such brutality and desperation” (LACAR).

In the current politico-discursive context, anti-war coalitions were acutely important in drawing necessary attention to the “war at home” as a mechanism of state terrorism that empowered governments to attack and curtail the rights of refugees, immigrants, people of colour and political opposition (Wright 2001a; Diaz Barrero and Sztainbok Mazui; Nadeau; Sharma; Thobani). The strength of this analysis is attributable to a broad activist and movement base including people who have either experienced the impact of U.S. foreign policy in contexts outside Canada (especially in Latin America, Palestine, the Middle East, Asia, and Africa), or nation-state exclusions inside Canada (especially immigrants and Aboriginal peoples), and/or who have worked closely in solidarity with left/feminist/anti-racist resistance struggles throughout the 1980s and 1990s. As well, ties of international solidarity were further consolidated around touring anti-war movement activists such as Britain-based Tariq Ali (Wright 2001b).⁵

While mainstream national feminist organizations tended not to de-

Anti-racist feminist organizations, some of whose community and political affiliations extend beyond Canada, took the lead in mobilizing a separate anti-war message in the name of women.

and imperialism” and located the current “U.S.-led War of Aggression” in a much longer history of western imperialism and “state-sponsored terrorism” (LACAR). CAWR, for example, positioned the “actions and policies of governments, media outlets and corporations” as thoroughly complicit in the perpetuation of “war and racism.” Analytically, anti-war activists sought “solutions with the historical, social and political understanding of the causes that bring about

fine or emphasize a political location within this kind of anti-war position, many local/regional women's organizations aligned themselves explicitly within the anti-war/anti-racism movement. In particular, anti-racist feminist organizations, some of whose community and political affiliations extend beyond Canada, took the lead in mobilizing a separate anti-war message in the name of women. For example, Grassroots Women (GW), “an organization of marginalized and

working class women,” hosted a post-September 11 bi-weekly speakers series and a large conference focusing on “imperialism, war, fundamentalism, and women’s resistance (September 2001).” GW has also been particularly central in foregrounding a feminist focus on the criminalizing and regulatory politics of state-produced nation/citizenship-based discourses. As well, the Philippine Women Centre (PWC), a Vancouver-based organization of “overseas Filipino workers, women and youth in Canada” organized around the banner of “Filipino Women say no to war.” Their feminist analysis articulated a position around the need to “bring out [women’s] voices as part of the anti-war movement” and called upon women who have experienced war outside Canada “to bring out our history and experiences with war.” This was coupled with a clear call to oppose “racist and anti-immigrant backlash” occurring in Canada.

Despite these strengths, a limited gender analysis is frequently apparent. That is, anti-war movements tend to run the risk of either gender determinism or gender negation, polarized positions that render women’s voices either as essentialized or marginal. On the first point, some feminist anti-war positions tended to invoke a gender determinism within an otherwise potent anti-war/anti-racism message. PWC, for example, in adopting the victimizing discourse of “sexual slavery,” grounded its anti-war stance in the essentializing gender analysis which mobilizes around the argument that “women and children” will “bear the brunt of the impacts of war” (September 29, 2002). Recent feminist scholarship and activism on migrant sex work draws much needed critical attention to the limits of this “traffic in women/sexual slavery construct (Brock *et al.* 89). On the second point, an emerging feminist criticism argues that the broader “anti-war movement here in Canada and elsewhere in the West has a tendency to ignore the gendered nature of this war” (Mojob 2002:

13). As in other contexts, notably the 1991 war against Iraq, “[r]acism was defined as the primary problem while there was silence around the sexism” (Hatem 376). Given the complexities of racialized citizenship, this marginalization of sexism and gender hierarchies establishes both a shared context, and distinct dilemmas, for white and racialized/Otherized women and feminists in terms of organizing opposition to war and building alliances for peace.

b) Peace movement

Historically, the peace movement in Canada has tended to be grounded in the broad arena of liberal- and social-democratic politics of consulting, lobbying, educating, campaigning and (sometimes) institutionalizing relations with the state (Langille). Only in a very broad sense, however, does this characteristic distinguish it from anti-war movements (which, almost always, define a position more definitely outside/against the state). Within the broad rubric of peace, a wide range of activist strategies and ties of solidarity are undertaken by peace activists. These range from the more radical pacifist direct action pressure tactics (e.g., sit-ins, demonstrations, teach-ins) to the more state-oriented mainstream approach of appealing to governments (nationally and internationally) to be morally responsible and to refrain from military responses.

After September 11, appeals for action organized around a mainstream peace discourse tended to call on people to identify their opposition to war through the state-national categories “Canadians” and “citizens.” A peace discourse was notably mobilized to apply pressure to “governments” to avoid a military response and instead act within the international “rule of law.” The September Eleventh Peace Coalition, for example, initiated by the Council of Canadians, is clearly working within this nationally-bound and liberal democratic peace discourse. It framed its call to “Canadians” to organize a

“cross-Canada campaign to oppose military retaliation,” and to “Canada” to “lead the way to build a more just and democratic world that helps create stronger international security for all of us” (Council of Canadians).

Three of Canada’s largest national feminist organizations—NAC, the Voice of Women (VOW) and the Canadian Research Institute for the Advancement of Women (CRIAOW)—also staked out this kind of citizenship/nation-state-based peace position in response to September 11. Their messages and their tactics were similar. Each defined the primary problem as the need to develop a “response to terrorism” and “violent attacks” (VOW). According to CRIAOW, for example, it is most urgent to “identify long-term solutions to terrorism” and “reflect on the root causes of terrorism.” NAC reiterated this focus, centering its appeal for peace around “[a]cts of terror and violence.” Unlike the anti-war movements which emphasized imperialism and *state* terrorism as key problems, these organizations focused on non-state terrorism as the point of departure for calling on governments, especially the Canadian government, not to support a “military response” (NAC) and to avoid joining the U.S. government in any plans for “actions of revenge and retribution” (VOW).

In defining the problem as such, this mainstream feminist peace discourse staked out a lobbying position centred around applying moral pressure to call for responsible, rational action by “elected representatives” (NAC) and “legal institutions” (VOW) to uphold the “rule of law” (VOW, NAC). While important for mobilizing political pressure, this ultimately discourages a necessary deep critical analysis of increased state restrictions by organizing around liberal categories (“governments and citizens”), and essentialized gendered ones (especially, “women and children”). Its feminist politics, therefore, tends towards a limited liberal feminist gender determinism which fails to fully confront and challenge

the hierarchies of racialized citizenship currently being mobilized against women/marginalized peoples across/within national borders.

Feminist Peace and Anti-War Activism: An Historical Assessment

In order to fully comprehend why NAC constructed its position within the terms of a “peaceful solution” as outlined above, it is also instructive to examine its location in a broader historical context. For example, calling on “Canadian women” to identify with a politics of peace is a deeply rooted formative tradition for NAC. VOW, Canada’s largest and most enduring women’s peace organization, was founded in 1960 around an internationalist and gender determinist politic. Its signature message, which has persisted into the present, was “that women the world over, as bearers and nurturers of life, have common concerns for world peace” (Loewen 24; Ball).⁶ It is perhaps one of the best known organizations comprising NAC’s own founding coalition in 1972. Indeed, one of its founding members, Kay MacPherson, was an early NAC President (1977-79) and life-long activist in the organization. Given this long history of alliances with VOW, it is perhaps not surprising that NAC’s current response is shaped around a similar peace discourse. Indeed, it raises important questions about the extent to which a VOW politic is currently influential in NAC.

This history alone, however, does not explain NAC’s current position. NAC also shares a significant recent history with anti-war movements, especially during the 1980s and 1990s. In fact, NAC’s current peace position is quite a stark departure from its explicitly activist anti-war position during the Gulf War in 1991. As Gannage and Huxley have shown, the “women’s movement was one of the first centres of opposition to the war,” and NAC itself took a tough and uncompromising anti-war/peace

position by calling “for an immediate withdrawal of U.S. troops” (308). At that time, as the following statement reveals, NAC emphasized a coalition-based activist politic that was not organized around the language of “governments and citizens,” defining feminist unity as:

Women in alliance with labour, other equality seeking groups, the peace movement and others, to fight against Canada’s military involvement in the Middle East. (Rebick 1991: 1)

And, unlike the current moment, NAC’s position at that time was more distinct from other mainstream women’s organizations, like VOW, who focused on a more traditional “international women’s peace initiative” involving political solidarity with women in the Gulf (Gannage and Huxley 308).

In order to understand why NAC’s current position has shifted so drastically from its anti-war activist position of a decade ago, it is necessary to take into account both of these historical tendencies in NAC itself. Each of these moments represents a particular constellation, and consolidation, of feminist political forces and positions in NAC. As such, NAC’s political direction at any moment is never “innocent”—it is, rather, an expression of these (often competing) political alliances and divisions. Likewise, to understand its current position, it is necessary to understand the complex play of feminist political forces currently operating in NAC.

Conclusion

Except as a matter of making it visible, the question of internal NAC political alliances and forces is beyond the scope of this paper. What can be addressed briefly however, is the possibility of the women’s movement working more closely with NAC to build “the tools of analysis and the principles of feminist action and soli-

arity in the post-September 11th environment” (Arat-Koc 55). Is it possible to mobilize an effective feminist response that can sustain and expand current movements, and which will permit the building of alliances with social movements nationally and internationally? This is no easy task. Sedef Arat-Koc’s recent work is particularly instructive in terms of showing why a feminist response must proceed from clear recognition that “there is no innocence to a position of ‘global sisterhood’” (Arat-Koc 53-54). Likewise, as my paper demonstrates, there is no innocence in any political position emanating from a progressive/feminist political organization. This calls for the necessity to evaluate the meaning, origins and implications of the political positions taken by national organizations, regardless of whether they emphasize a peace discourse (as does NAC) or an anti-war discourse. As the above analysis reveals, a gender determinist Eurocentric global feminist discourse can inhere in either of these positions. Moreover, in both peace and anti-war movements, gender and feminism might be systematically obscured.

One political task ahead for the women’s movement in Canada then, is to steer NAC back to a position of “engaged feminism,” such as was emerging and consolidating throughout much of the 1990s (Rebick and Roach; Robertson; Gottlieb). At that time, NAC was much more prepared to organize around “issues of equality and justice whether women may appear to be implicated in the issues or not” (Arat-Koc 63). Feminism on these terms, as Arat-Koc argues, “is a political project which is not merely about changing women’s place in the world, but about questioning and trying to change the world as we know it” (63). In the current context, I would argue, an “engaged” politic of changing the world must be grounded in an anti-racist feminist analysis which can acknowledge the full complexity of gender relations, as these constitute women, men and

children in complex ways. And, crucially, it must prioritize an incisive politics of borders, citizenship, nation, (im)migration and global displacement of people. Only within these terms of engagement is a truly transformative "peaceful solution" possible.

The author would like to extend deep appreciation to Amanda Glasbeek for providing helpful and insightful comments on an earlier draft of this paper.

Mary-Jo Nadeau is currently writing her dissertation on NAC, nation and Canadian feminism. She lives in Toronto and works as contract faculty at Trent University (Sociology) and at York University (Social Sciences).

¹See the "Controversies" Section in the Fall 2002 Issue of *Atlantis* (27.1) for Thobani's response to her critics, and my own anti-racist feminist analysis of the media attack and the national politics of exclusion it revealed.

²See Rebeck (2002) for a recent account of the enormity of NAC's current funding crisis, its contributing factors, and its implications for NAC's current struggle for survival/renewal.

³For recent analyses of these kinds of nation-state processes at work in both pre- and post-September 11 periods see Sharma; Wright (2001a, 2002); Sherazee.

⁴A political focus on challenging the production of citizenship-based (il)legality has been gaining important momentum in Canadian social movements, especially since September 11. Most notably perhaps, the Noone is Illegal Campaign, based in Montreal, is expanding nationally. STATUS, a Toronto-based coalition has been pivotal in organizing this momentum as has the Vancouver-based coalition Open The Borders!

⁵While it is crucial to recognize the importance of this initial political consolidation under the anti-war/anti-racism banner, it is equally necessary to understand that the struggle for a strong and sustained anti-racist politic has been difficult and fraught

with tensions that cannot be adequately addressed in this paper.

⁶VOW itself has a complex political history, and has vacillated historically between a more liberal-democratic state-oriented approach that seeks "a more 'respectable' image" than anti-war movements (MacPherson and Sears 72), and a more definitive location in anti-war coalitions. In 1963, for example, VOW was central in organizing pressure against the state around a ceasefire in Vietnam (MacPherson and Sears 79). Regardless of these changes, however, a constant within VOW has been its tendency towards a gender determinist internationalist feminism (Ball).

References

- Abdel-Shehid, Gamal. "9/11: Diary of a Suspected Hijacker." *Fuse* 25 (1) (2001): 50-2.
- Arat-Koc, Sedef. "Imperial Wars or Benevolent Interventions? Reflections on 'Global Feminism' Post September 11th." *Atlantis* 26 (2) (2002) :53-65
- Bain, Beverly, R. Timothy and T. Chahal. "Fighting Words in the Political Urgency of Peace." *Fireweed* 77 (2002): 79-92
- Ball, Christine. "The History of the Voice of Women." Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation. University of Toronto, Department of Education, 1994.
- Black Radical Congress. "Letter to Representative Barbara Lee" on *BRC-NEWS* September 28, 2001.
- Brock, Deborah, K. Gillies, C. Oliver and M. Sutdhibhasilp. "Migrant Sex Work: A Roundtable Analysis." *Canadian Woman Studies/les cahiers de la femme* 20 (2) (2000): 84-91.
- Canadian Research Institute for the Advancement of Women (CRIAOW). "CRIAOW Statement." Ottawa, Press Release: September 21, 2001.
- Coalition Against War and Racism (CAWR). "Open Letter to Sunera Thobani" and "Statement of

Unity." Leaflet 2001.

Council of Canadians, "The September Eleventh Peace Coalition is Launched." Press Release, October 5, 2001. <http://www.canadians.org/media/media-011005.html>

Diaz Barrero, Patricia and Vannina Sztainbok Mazui. "The War at Home is Not New." *Fireweed* 77 (2002):40-47.

Gannage, Charlene and C. Huxley. "Preparing the Anti-War Movement for a New Era of Disorder." *It Was, It Was Not: Essays and Art on the War Against Iraq*. M. Briemberg, ed. Vancouver: New Star Books, 1992. 300-314.

Gottlieb, Amy. Ed. "What About Us? Organizing Inclusively in the National Action Committee on the Status of Women." *And Still We Rise: Feminist Political Mobilizing in Contemporary Canada*. Linda Carty, ed. Toronto: Women's Press, 1993. 371-385.

Grassroots Women (GW). "Event Series Features Women's Struggles from the Americas, Asia and the Middle East." Press Release, September 17, 2001.

Hatem, Mervat F. "The Invisible American Half: Arab American Hybridity and Feminist Discourses in the 1990s." *Talking Visions: Multicultural Feminism in a Transnational Age*. Ella Shohat, ed. New York: MIT Press, 1998. 369-390.

Langille, David. "Building an Effective Peace Movement: One Perspective." *Social Movements/Social Change*. F. Cunningham et al., eds. Toronto: Between the Lines, 1988. 189-208.

Latin American Coalition Against Racism (LACAR). 2001. www.latinosagainstracism.com

Loewen, Candace. "Mike Hears Voices: Voice of Women and Lester Pearson, 1960-1963." *Atlantis*, 12 (2) (1987): 24-30

Macpherson, Kay and M. Sears. "The Voice of Women: A History." *Women in the Canadian Mosaic*. G. Matheson, ed. Toronto: Peter

- Martin Associates, 1976.
- McClintock, Anne. *Imperial Leather: Race, Gender and Sexuality in the Colonial Conquest*. New York: Routledge, 1995.
- Mojab, Shahrzad. "Fundamentalist and Capitalist Wars on Women." *Fireweed* 77 (2002): 12-19.
- Mojab, Shahrzad. "Women and the Gulf War: A Critique of Feminist Responses." *Spoils of War: Women of Colour, Cultures and Revolutions*. T. Denean Sharpley-Whiting and R. T. White, eds. Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield, 1997. 61-82.
- Nadeau, Mary-Jo. "Who Is Canadian Now?: Feminism and the Politics of Nation After September 11." *Atlantis* 27 (1) (2002): 14-24.
- National Action Committee on the Status of Women (NAC). "News from NAC." Policy Action Research List, University of New Brunswick, January 27, 2003.
- National Action Committee on the Status of Women (NAC). "NAC Upholds Peaceful Solutions to All Forms of Violence." Toronto Press Release: October 2, 2001a.
- National Action Committee on the Status of Women (NAC). "NAC calls for peaceful solution." Toronto Press Release: September 13, 2001b.
- National Action Committee on the Status of Women (NAC). 2001c. <http://www.nac-cca.ca>
- Philippine Women Centre, BC. (PWC), "Filipino women say no to war." British Columbia Press Release: September 2001.
- Rebick, Judy. "Soaked in Censorship." October 2001: cbc.ca and www.rabble.ca
- Rebick, Judy. "President's Report." *Feminist Action* 5 (3) (1991): 1.
- Rebick, Judy. "Disappearing Act." *Elm Street* (Summer 2002): 74.
- Rebick, Judy and Kike Roach. *Politically Speaking*. Vancouver: Douglas and McIntyre, 1996.
- Robertson, Angela. "Continuing on the Ground: Feminists of Colour Discuss Organizing." *Scratching the Surface: Canadian Anti-Racist Feminist Thought*. Enakshi Dua and A. Robertson, eds. Toronto: Women's Press, 1999. 309-329.
- Roy, Arundhati. "Not Again." *The Guardian* September 27, 2002. Online www.guardian.co.uk/Iraw/Story/0,2763,800015,00.html
- Sharma, Nandita. "Border Panic: White Imperialism and Illegality." Online <http://squat.net/cia/gp/hom/php>
- Sherazee, Amina. "Criminalization of Dissent." *Fireweed* 77 (2002): 20-25.
- Thobani, Sunera. "War Frenzy." *Atlantis* 27 (1) (2002): 5-11.
- Viner, Katherine. "Feminism as Imperialism." *The Guardian* September 21, 2002. Online www.commondreams.org/views02/0923-07.htm
- Voice of Women (VOW). "VOW Statement on the Tragic Events in the U.S.A. on Tuesday, September 11, 2001." Press Release: Toronto, September 2001. www.interlog.com/~vow
- World March of Women. "Appeal of the World March of Women for the Construction of a Just, Equal, Cooperative, Democratic and Pacifist World." Montreal, October 5, 2001.
- Wright, Cynthia. "Open the Borders! Interview with Nandita Sharma." *New Socialist* 37 (2002): 5-9
- Wright, Cynthia. "Who's On Trial? Canadian Immigration and Refugee Policy in the Aftermath of 9/11." *Alarm! Against War and Racism* 1 (2001a): 3
- Wright, Cynthia. "The Wars: Tariq Ali on Building Anti-war Movements, Debating the 'Civilization Mongers' and Narrating the History of Islam." *Fuse* 25 (1) (2001b): 28-40

LE PLUME DU PHÉNIX

Esquisse de paix

comme une âme égarée accrochée à ta plume, douce
colombe,
je veux laver ce sang qui a taché ton aile déjà meurtrie par
les
guerres,
j'ai perdu mon corps dans les dédales des premières
calendes en posant le pied sur la terre souillée du corbeau...
...
explosion d'horreur.
avec un pieu au cœur, j'ai tendu les bras et tu m'as soulevé
pour mieux me protéger .
j'étais en lambeaux, presque oubliée,
la gorge serrée je me suis accrochée à la fraîcheur de ton
souffle et l'espoir au poing
j'ai fracassé les barrières qui emprisonnaient la paix.
ainsi, pour toi mon âme,
dans un ultime cri du cœur, je veux hurler à la face du
monde
et à tous ceux qui peuvent encore la protéger
que ce n'est pas en vain que j'ai libéré son nom.