

City University of New York (CUNY)

## CUNY Academic Works

---

Publications and Research

CUNY Graduate Center

---

2015

### **Feminism, Psychology and Social Justice: A possible meeting? An Interview with Michelle Fine**

Karla Galvão Adrião

*Universidade Federal de Pernambuco*

[How does access to this work benefit you? Let us know!](#)

More information about this work at: [https://academicworks.cuny.edu/gc\\_pubs/595](https://academicworks.cuny.edu/gc_pubs/595)

Discover additional works at: <https://academicworks.cuny.edu>

---

This work is made publicly available by the City University of New York (CUNY).

Contact: [AcademicWorks@cuny.edu](mailto:AcademicWorks@cuny.edu)

---

## **INTERVIEW**

### **FEMINISM, PSYCHOLOGY AND SOCIAL JUSTICE: A POSSIBLE MEETING? AN INTERVIEW WITH MICHELLE FINE**

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/1807-03102015v27n3p479>

**by Karla Galvão Adrião**

*Universidade Federal de Pernambuco, Recife/PE, Brasil*

---

Michelle Fine is a Feminist Psychologist Researcher and has contributed strongly in the past two decades to the Qualitative and Participatory Methodologies field, with special attention to Participatory-Action-Research (PAR). Her research in Social Psychology and Education puts into question the positions of power and privilege, concepts such as social justice/injustice, the intersectional reading of gender, class, race, generation, and the notion of solidarity.

Fine completed her undergraduate degree at Pennsylvania State University, where she enrolled in one of the first women's studies courses in the country. Her PhD is in Social Psychology from Teachers College, Columbia University. Fine has worked as a visiting scholar at the University of New Zealand in Auckland and was a Fulbright scholar at the Institute for Arab Studies at Haifa University. She is currently a distinguished Professor of Psychology and Urban Education at the Graduate Center of the City University of New York (CUNY), and co-founder of the Public Science Project (PSP), a participatory community based research organization that produces critical scholarship in social policy, social movements, educational equity and human rights.

Although she has countless books and articles published, only two are translated into Portuguese: "Para quem? Pesquisa qualitativa, representações e responsabilidades sociais" (Fine et al., 2006), and "A prática da liberdade: pesquisa de ação participativa da juventude para a justiça na educação" (Fine & Fox, 2014).

Among other awards, Fine received the 2013 American Psychological Association Award for Distinguished Contributions to Research in Public Policy, the 2012 Henry Murray Award from the Society for Personality and Social Psychology of the APA, the 2010 Social Justice and Higher Education Award from the College and Community Fellowship for her work in prisons and the 2011 Elizabeth Hurlock Beckman Award for her mentoring legacy over the past twenty-five years.

The following interview takes place in May of 2015 at the CUNY Graduate Center in New York City. Fine talks about the intersection of Psychology and Feminism and their relation to social justice and qualitative methodologies. In the Brazilian context, it is rare to define a field as Feminist Psychology. Yet within the field of Social Psychology there is work that focuses on social justice, critical Social Psychology and research as a right (Appadurai, 2006). Fine talks about her research and work with the Public Science Project ([www.publicscienceproject.org](http://www.publicscienceproject.org)) in the United States and, specifically, the concepts and experiences related to both Psychology and Feminism such as solidarity, democracy, injustice and community activism.

**KGA** Feminist psychology emerged as a distinct area of research and practice in the 1970s. Although many psychologists made feminist contributions before this time, the field was formalized in the wake of second wave feminism, both in England and in the U.S. How do you think these two fields of Critical Psychology and Feminist theory work along side one another?

**MF** Let me tell you the pieces of Feminist Theory that I rely on to do Critical Psychology and how it relates to my upbringing. My mother is the youngest of 18 and I'm her youngest. When I was growing up, she was very depressed. I think that from an early age, I learned that silence and sadness have a lot of wisdom and that different people have different contributions to make. In many ways, I felt it was my job as the baby in the family to make sure everybody's voice was heard, as it was easy to think my father knew everything. He was wonderful, but him and my mother had a very traditional relationship. I think that from an early age I felt like the translator, advocate, critic and lover of both. When I went to college and got exposed to feminist ideas, then there was a number of light bulbs that went off. One of them was that we could rename everyday experiences as injustice. It was amazing to me that we could talk about marital rape, date rape or oppression of women as though those weren't just natural conditions, but that they were unacceptable.

I used to laugh to think if my grandmother, whom I never knew and who had 18 children, that if she ever heard of marital rape, would she just laugh? Like, “that’s what marriage is, right”? So, Feminism was amazing there. From a combination of Marxism and Feminism, it was very important to realize that, over time, we all have a situated perspective; we see the world from where we sit. If you’re lucky, you can move over and see it a little differently, but where we sit matters. Science had been produced from what Donna Haraway (1988) calls, a “God side view.” That is, from above as though it were objective. I started to understand that multiple perspectives matter and that some points of view were privileged as objective and some were demined as subjective. Actually, they were all informed and naïve. Furthermore, the privilege of the God’s eye view was a problem: to view people in poverty, women, immigrants or any marginalized group from the perch of privilege is to distort and also to do violence, which we would call epistemological violence (Teo, 2008); to see mostly damage instead of energy, possibility, laughter, irony and humor. I became friends with Paulo Freire in 1980’s through education, and I began to understand his work on critical consciousness. Specifically, his work on the word and the world, as well as our obligation to do work beside and with people rather than on or about them. A lot of feminist commitments to epistemology are very central to our work. We have a situated perspective, the notion of participation of various points of views matters intimately, in terms of the questions we ask, the methods we use and who owns the data and that reflexivity matters. Who I am, why I’m asking these questions and thinking hard about what I’m not asking, who I’m not seeing, who’s being excluded as well as humility. There are different ways to have knowledge. People in different positions have knowledge. The more oppressed you are, the more you know. You might not have a specific language for it, but you know that something is wrong with the systems in which we live. The more privilege you have, like myself, the harder it is to see what’s wrong. I can walk through the world with few obstacles and so it’s hard for me to see why so many people are tripping unless I spend time talking to them about how they were born with their shoes tied together so that they would trip. I reflected on the relationship between my privilege and their dispossession, and then I reflected on my obligation to both speak about injustice and to think about the collusion of privilege and injustice. In those ways for me, Feminism, Postcolonial Theory, Queer Studies and Critical Psychology are all one piece. I can do quantitative or qualitative work, that’s not the distinction for me. For me, it’s who shapes the

questions, whose knowledge counts and where can we trouble the material that we gather? Who owns the information afterwards and how can we create products that are of use, both to theory and to local social movements or communities? I don’t think feminist methods are appropriate solely for questions about women. However I do appreciate that, in the movement, questions of women’s lives and their bodies, oppression and laughter all got lifted up.

**KGA** There is a Project called “Psychology’s Feminist voices” ([www.feministvoices.com](http://www.feministvoices.com)) that is coordinated by professor of History of Psychology, Alexandra Rutherford and team, at York University, Canada. It shows Feminist Psychologists in U.S. and Canada, and their influence to the Psychology field, including an interview with you and others. Besides, in the handbook “International Feminisms Perspectives on Psychology, Women, Culture and Rights” (Rutherford et al, 2011) they ask if Psychology and Feminism as different fields, can help each other, and if one influences and helps one more than other. What do you think about these reflections? Do you think it’s necessary to define a field of Feminist Psychology?

**MF** I’m not sure which word is being questioned. The mainstream field of Psychology has done a very poor job looking at questions of power and difference. Many of us have tried to intersect the field with a critical lens around personhood, politics, subjectivity, epistemologies and methodologies, and the activism and the practice. I think within Feminist Psychology, all of those coming together can happen. Within Feminist Psychology, hopefully there is a critical look at power and gender, yet it’s not just about gender. It becomes a placeholder for intersectionality, for thinking about subjectivity, politics and subaltern epistemologies. I think in the beginning, feminist psychology was adding content: violence against women, childcare, reproduction, abortion, and sexuality. Now it has really emerged to be taking a critical look at power, method, epistemologies and the relationship between politics and activism. In this way I think it is an important placeholder. Feminist Psychology is different from Feminist Sociology or Feminism because we are interested in subjectivities, relationships and actions as well as Feminist Theory. I don’t always love the way it’s operationalized or implemented. Sometimes it seems a little too categorical and not challenging gender, sexuality, race and politics. Yet I think it’s an important placeholder that signifies an interest in feminist methodology, epistemology and activism.

**KGA** In the context of the United State and England for example, we nominate a field as Feminist Psychology. On the other hand, we know that in Latin

America as in Brazil, we don't call it that. What do you think about this naming difference?

**MF** I think politics and disciplines grow differently based on the context from which they emerge. I think in Brazil or in Latin America, there's been much more liberation psychology or community psychology and within that, Feminism, race and sexuality emerged as spaces of critiques and opportunities. Unfortunately in the United States, Psychology has reproduced fantasies and ideologies of individualism that in turn produce categories of race, sexuality and feminism, but not so much community. I think the Liberation Psychology, Theology and other liberation movements in Central and Latin America, begin from a more collective space. Feminism, race, sexuality, disability, class, indigenous struggles happen then within communities. I think the United States is too categorical and population based, and we don't have a good embodied sense of community, except for people who are really impoverished. There's a perversion in US capitalism that makes you grow out of community, you're mobile out of it rather than staying connected to it. So I think politics have become community for many of us.

**KGA** The influence of authors such as Gloria Anzaldúa, Paulo Freire, Fals Borda and W.E. B. Dubois have been important to your work. From these readings (and from other authors that you want to comment), I wonder: how you relate Feminism and Psychology epistemologically speaking, and within the context of research?

**MF** Well, to go back to my upbringing, I had immigrant parents who were Jews from Poland. They came in war and struggle in the 1920s, just before the concentration camps. Later my father's family was tragically killed in the camps. I understand the importance of multiple points of view and interdisciplinarity. I'm always suspecting of the right answer or the United States as the center; for example, having the idea that the US as more advanced or whiteness as the standard. I'm suspicious of that because I know that privilege tends to represent itself as if it is correct. Having been around privilege, I know it has lots of lies that it tells itself about itself and about other people. I try my best to read very broadly. I read South American and South African literature. I was a student of Morton Deutsch, who was a student of Kurt Lewin, both social psychologists. There was a real appreciation of interdisciplinarity and the wisdom of people who move between countries, languages, communities and disciplines. We refuse what is now being called 'disciplinary decadence', where people say, "oh that's not Psychology" or "that's not

Sociology," as if though there is a purity of a field. I'm always very worried about purity because I don't believe in it. I don't believe there is a pure white race; I don't believe there is a pure America, that's just desperate decadence. There's not a pure Psychology. It has always had people thinking critically about race, power and gender, but they often get written out of the history books. Gloria Anzaldúa was very much a psychologist, she was thinking psychologically about hybridity and complexity. Fals Borda and Paulo Freire, they understood that people are fluid and complex, and interact within their context. They speak from what Judith Butler (2009) would call "Social Ontology." That is, we are not just in our skin. We are connected to others and if we try to cut that, we all die. The biologist Jeanine Benyus (1997) looks at nature and asks, "how does nature solve problems and can we bring that knowledge to humans?" She looks at how forests survive hurricanes when the winds come in. She says there are some sacrificed trees, the ones that fall first. The ones that stand tall are the Oaks, they look like they're standing alone, but underground they have deep roots that are tangled with other trees' deep roots. I think that is a good model for Psychology. We can look autonomous but really be deeply entangled and snuggling with one another. If part of our ecosystem is suffering, we all suffer. It's in the air and it travels, like environmental racism and Ebola. Bad things travel faster than good things, and so the only social medicine is for us to imagine a more solidarity-orientated approach to our work. I think Psychology has had that history, although, as I said, it gets written out the more corporate, individual or neoliberal psychology tries to be. It seems sad to me, as it doesn't feel like 'scientific progress'. It means we're running away from the messy complexity of human life in search of a variable or an intervention rather than contending with the existential weight of poverty, violence, laughter, hard times, good times and inequality. That's the soil in which we live. We can act like it's not there, but it is everywhere. For me the question is, what's our obligation as psychologists? How do we think about complex people in the midst of toxic soil where some beautiful things grow no matter what? What I love about Psychology is that it still takes people and complexity seriously. I don't like when we try to study about a group, a variable or an intervention alone, as though precarity and uncertainty are fictional. They're not, they're very much part of our lives. Psychology has unfortunately become very much a technical science, taking large encrusted or tangled problems, what some people call wicked problems, and trying to make them solvable. Like if only they had a condom, they wouldn't be poor. Well, probably not in the same way. On the other hand,

it's better to have safe sex than not safe sex, but that's not going to undo racism and colonial exploitation of people, poverty and homophobia. I like to work with what I call critical bifocals, focusing in on lives on the ground, the applied work we do, but also focusing on the history and theory so that big ideas can move across places.

**KGA** Can you bring more details about your relationship with Paulo Freire? How did you meet him, how had you been connected with his work? His great influence comes from the Pedagogy field, but we know that his work is very important to reflect on social justice/injustice in an interdisciplinary way, as you have pointed before.

**MF** I was just very lucky. I entered my first job in a University of Pennsylvania's School of Education and was working at the intersection of Education and Psychology. There was a group of critical pedagogy scholars and activists who were very connected to Paulo, people that were just a little bit older than I. They brought him to the United States. He and I met to talk about Pedagogy of the Oppressed, Pedagogy of Freedom and his deep appreciation of literacy as liberation for people as agents in limited situations. I got to know him and his wife and, when he became Commissioner of Education, he and I would have long crazy talks. I would say: "what do you do about policy?" He'd say, "I sit on the steps and I talk to a child". And I'd think, "Paulo, what are you going to do about policy?" He had big ideas, it was like he could understand the entire beach but his preference was to sit with a grain of sand and understand the beach though a grain of sand. His ideas mobilized and energized so many people to rethink participation and literacy in prisons, schools, favelas, barrios and community centers. The work that happened, for example, the literacy campaign in Cuba, was really fueled by some of those same powerful Latin American ideas about the power of the people. I had been miseducated in the United States about the power of privilege rather than the power of the people. I love that so many of those participatory ideas are just built into the fabric of Education and Psychology in Central and South America. I worry when people look north to the United States as though we have a more quote "advanced version of Psychology." Besides, here in the U.S. it is so stripped of context, power, possibility, and participation; stripped off in the way that we are now seeing. With you being here, you can see the grotesque consequences of unregulated greed in capitalism. In New York, you don't see many people of color in Manhattan, in the center part. It used to be much more diverse but with corporate money, privilege and corporate apartments, they've

made a large influence. Karl Marx was right, it just has gotten so extreme and our Psychology follows that. It's as though if you work hard, good things will happen, as though individuals are autonomous and not rooted, not in a place, not in a context, not in a history. I like that Ignacio Martín Baró, who is another really important Salvadorian psychologist, refused to publish in English because he said wasn't talking to us; he was speaking to people in El Salvador. I really appreciate the commitment in using Psychology and Education to de-ideologize and create critical consciousness in individuals and communities; in thought, behavior and social movements.

**KGA** Yes, this is one of the reasons why I am having this conversation with you about your experiences in the United States and using it as a counter hegemonic story.

**MF** Yes, to the hegemonic story that is being told. The other thing I think is happening in the U.S. is that, in the academy, Feminism has left the ground. There's not that much activism anymore, there's not that much participation. There's a lot of fabulous theory but not a lot of grounded work. One of the things I love about many Latin American critical scholars is that you never leave the ground. You think a lot about ideas, theory and movements but it's always in a place with a history and a project. I think that's not so much true here. One of the costs of making it in the academy in the United States is to leave behind participation, the critical dirty beginnings.

**KGA** Do you think it is important for social movements and academia to work together?

**MF** I think we are at a turning point now, where all over the world there are critical scholars engaged with social movements to try to create both research and practice that can speak from multiple points of view. Good critical academics need allies because in particularly oppressive places like Israel and South Africa have been, those connections are vital. It feels to me that South America has always remembered its roots, although I know there certainly is a growing upper class and widening inequality gaps, and this scenario is a code for class, race, color and disability. It's the price of assimilating into the global capital marketplace: to dissociate from one's history. That's terrible, it makes us crazy and violent. I was in a conversation with Palestinian and Jewish Israeli friends in Israel. These were two men who were friends. The Jewish man said, "*I'll give you Jerusalem and the West Bank, I just don't want to talk about history!*" The Palestinian guy said, "*Really? I don't even want those places! All I want to do is talk about history.*" I feel like in Latin America,

and the indigenous Maori of New Zealand, there is a greater understanding of how history and place matter. Here in the U.S., particularly in cities, the dominant ideology maintains that: everybody is cosmopolitan, place doesn't matter, history doesn't matter. You could change it and it'll be different tomorrow, and that's a really important fulcrum I think to recognize. I think Feminist Theories have tried to take history and the rootedness of relations with mothers for instance, seriously. Once I had a discussion with Paulo Freire when we were at a meeting with Henry Giroux, who is a Paulo Freire scholar and also a friend. Henry had written a piece about Paulo and how important his work was; how he carried his ideas, always leaving home to take his ideas elsewhere. Madeleine Grumet (1988), who is a feminist educator, talks about how we make home sound like a place that just holds us back. We need a feminist reading of how ideas move, but not to abandon where we come from bell hooks (2000), a well known black feminist adds that not everybody's home is such an easy place to stay in. It was a really beautiful and hard discussion about home, a gendered idea and a commitment to place. I think people whose places have been taken from them understand place in a way that my parents did, but that I don't, at least not in my belly. My parents had to leave Poland or they'd be killed. I was raised in the United States with the fantasy that I could move anywhere. It didn't quite matter where I lived, as long as I had my phone. This notion of place is a really important feminist idea, and the tentacles that connect us to mother, father, place, people and community. If we just take ideas and lift them off the ground, I think we lose those roots that I was talking about before with the trees.

**KGA** You talked about the importance of the intersectionality as an analytical concept and discussed about the works developed from important scholars in Latin America. This debate makes me thinking about your work in the Public Science Project (PSP). Can you talk about that and Critical Participatory Action Research (CPAR) as a methodology and as an epistemological way to research?

**MF** The Public Science Project ([publicscienceproject.org](http://publicscienceproject.org)) is a research collective that tries to develop research between communities, universities and social movements. It is research for the public good; research that documents what is but also what could be. We've done research in prisons, in communities and in between communities, both very wealthy and very poor. Our work comes from a set of key principles. The first is that expertise is widely distributed but legitimacy is not. The second is that the most valid research is done by and with the

people who most understand injustice. Third, is that by building what Maria Torre (2008) calls "contact zones" of differently positioned people, where we can share different kinds of knowledge. Fourth, is that research is not an extraction industry. We don't take data; we cultivate it like a garden, and with an obligation to the project with people for a long time. We leave the project behind to let it grow and value relationships as more important than proof. We've done work on violence against women, on college and women's program and its impact on the women and their children. In all of these projects, like on that one, half of the researchers are women in prison and half are those of us not in prison. We now have a project on LGBTQ youth of color, looking at creativity that grows in the cracks of social oppression. We're working with young people who live at multiple fracture points, whether they are undocumented and queer or African American and transgender or disabled and lesbian. We're looking for how critical consciousness, radical marginality, sadness and solidarity can grow at these wonderfully excited and bold intersections. The Public Science Project is really dedicated to activist, theoretically grounded, historically informed research for the public good. We produce documents that go to court, to policy makers, to theory, that become performances and newsletters.

**KGA** I'd like to talk more about the concept of community, specifically from your article "Global Provocations, Community Psychology and Glocal Perspectives", published in *Community Psychology in Global Perspective* Journal (2015). You talk about how to situate communities within structural intersectionalities, the relations between global and local and how to work with the participating communities. I hear from you about the consequences of this work and if you think activism, social justice and democracy are vital to Feminist Psychology.

**MF** I feel like right now, both politically and in the academia, we are at a very fractured moment. Because it's such a structurally and physically violent world, people are going to their corners, their homogenous corners, or they're just escaping. I don't see a future in democracy and public life unless we also work and find some common patches of struggle where we can come together. It's not to say groups shouldn't be organized around their own issues. It would just be white privilege to say we should only all work together, and ignore the fact that groups need to mobilize within in times of existential and structural assault. And yet, I like to imagine where movements come together; how activist research can find common grounds with justice. I love when we design projects, with activists, so that research, practice and

action bring people together around a justice not yet imagined; for instance, the struggle to access higher education is today a shared struggle among formerly incarcerated people, immigrants without documents, people of color, youth with disabilities and low-income people. These solidarity projects are powerful, but in the midst of intense structural violence, trust is low. I don't know how many more black men we can watch being shot by white police officers and feel like we should be trusting each other. It feels very important, particularly for people of privilege, to hold out the possibility that we can work together toward justice rather than reproducing privilege. But these are tenuous times – when the need for, and suspicion of, solidarity is high.

**KGA** You started our conversation talking about your experiences. We know that experience is a relevant concept for both feminist theories and to Psychology. What can you say about the importance of this concept?

**MF** I think there are two different ways I'm hearing you ask about experience. One is our biographies and the other, reflectivity. To what extent do the lives that we have led and do lead shape the questions we ask, the posture we have about dignity and respect or hierarchy and expertise? And the other is whether experience matters as an object of inquiry in Psychology or whether we mistrust it. Right?

**KGA** Yes, that's right.

**MF** So first, I think experience is crucial to a feminist psychology. The reason I love our graduate program is that people bring such diverse and wildly different experiences to the question: what does it mean to be a human in a profoundly unfair world? We have students who come from privilege, from prison, who come from other countries, from disabilities, queer and radical politics. All of that *experience* matters as well as the wonderful quirky questions we ask. It matters how we read traditional literature and whether or not it does violence to us. A second commitment concerns *reflexivity* in research; thinking hard and writing about who we are in the research. Reflexivity signals a rejection of research as 'detached' or perched from a "God's eye view." And yet only a few groups talk write on reflexivity, and it tends to be feminists. I worry because then other groups, particularly people who represent themselves as objective and positivist, act as if they have no experience. I worry that it's only women talking about experience/reflexivity and then it gets used to undermine the "credibility" and "objectivity" of their research, and I put that in quotes. I'm a big advocate of what Donna Haraway (1988) calls

"strong objectivity," which is that we all are situated and have subjective points of view. Part of the work and research is to really interrogate our subjectivities and from my point of view, to rub against yours and for me to see what I'm missing. We then see what we can build together, to labor through our perspectives together rather than act as if we don't have any.

A third contribution of feminist psychology is the focus on narratives and embodiment – which change the conversation about justice. Let me give you an example: When I go to court, I'm an expert witness in a lot of lawsuits about race and gender discrimination in public education. I often gather a lot of qualitative material from children who go to inadequate schools. I report on what children have told me, in response to simple questions like: "*Tell me what your ideal school would be*" A little girl once said, "*every toilet would have a seat and you'd have enough paper to clean yourself.*" This is in the United States, in California. The lawyers don't want to hear that because the words pierce and cut through our defenses. Narrative Psychology pierces the dissociations and sensibilities of those of us who want to believe the world is fair. Those who don't want to look at the homeless man on the street and the eyes of the veteran with a sign that says, "I've done two tours in Iraq". You look into their eyes and you see nobody, it is like they've been evacuated and you don't know where they went to. We have to confront ourselves with our own history of war and greed, the deprivation of those lives, and those stories. Psychology sometimes replaces what we consider to be "objective" measures as superior to subjectivities. For instance, Professor Sara McClelland was a student here and now professor at the University of Michigan, and she does work on women's sexual satisfaction ([www.progresslab.info](http://www.progresslab.info)). There are all these studies that measure women's sexual satisfaction by how lubricated a woman is. A woman could be lubricated and say "I'm not aroused." Yet the researcher says, "she is aroused because she's lubricated," and it's like, really!? Then conversely, a woman will say, "I am aroused" but they'll say, "No, you're not wet. You're not aroused." Feminist psychology restores the integrity of subjectivities – from James to the present, there has been a struggle in our field about whether we will attend to the sweet delicacies of experience.

**KGA** You've been to Recife, Brazil in 2012. Tell me, what it was like to be for the first time in Paulo Freire's home city and at the V JUBRA - Simpósio Internacional sobre as Juventudes Brasileiras (International Conference of Brazilian Youth) in the Federal University of Pernambuco (UFPE)?

**MF** I felt so privileged to be invited to speak with young people, scholars, activists and community workers in the land where Paulo Freire walked. He was a friend of mine and we knew each other well. I saw him here but had never seen him in Brazil. To know his words and his ideas were circulating through those trees, those buildings, in those books. Then, to go to the JUBRA and meet young people who were struggling for justice, education and economic justice as well as a justice of recognition, whether it was black Brazilians, young people with disabilities or young people who are lesbian, gay, bisexual or trans or indigenous. It felt like JUBRA opened a space for radical inclusion and contestation. In the middle of my talks, young people spoke about feeling excluded as black Brazilians. That's never easy for them to do and for the organizers of the event to hear. Yet it's those eruptions that produce a very different tomorrow, a tomorrow of inclusion. I felt like Paulo was speaking through and with those young people. To say that we always have to be self critical of our work, even as we're bringing young people in and stretching the borders of university and community. To always think who's not here and what knowledge we've lost because they're not in the room.

**KGA** Well, thank you so much. Do you want to tell me something that I didn't ask you?

**MF** Well, what I love about having you here as a visiting scholar at the Graduate Center, is to build relations between different and always changing versions of Feminism and Psychology across countries, histories, languages; across North and South – challenging the dominance of Northern hegemony, attending to the sweet spaces of critical dialogue across. The United States is so messed up now and there is much to be critical of. We advertise ourselves as so advanced; yet we are so grotesque to poor people, people in prisons, to immigrants, the stories we are not telling. There's much we can learn from and with people in Latin America who have a different history by being colonized and resisting colonization. Here in the U.S. we try to erase our colonization as though it didn't happen. We barely talk about natives and slavery. The U.S. started with very violent roots and we haven't faced that history or confronted it in our research in Psychology. To reproduce the fantasy of the human by dissociating and extracting all those more difficult elements is creating epistemological violence. Critical Psychology, in conversation with Feminism and Postcolonial Theory, is a way to rejoin all the pieces of our history and all the possibilities of our profoundly unequal world and imagine what we can contribute towards a different tomorrow.

## References

- Appadurai, A. (2006). The right to research. In *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, 4(2), 167-177.
- bell hooks. (2000). *Feminism is for Everybody. Passionate Politics*. Cambridge, MA: South End Press.
- Benyus, J. (1997). *Biomimicry: Innovation Inspired by Nature*. New York: Harper Perennial.
- Butler, J. (2009). *Frames of War: When is Life Grievable?* Brooklyn, NY: Verso.
- Fine, M. (2015). Global Provocations: Critical Reflections on Community based Research and Intervention designed at the (Global) intersections of the global dynamics and local cultures. *Community Psychology in Global Perspective*, 1(1), 05-15.
- Fine, M. & Fox, M. (2014) A prática da liberdade: pesquisa de ação participativa da juventude para a justiça na educação In J. Araujo, M. Costa & T. Cristina (Eds.), *V JUBRA: Territórios Interculturais de Juventude* (pp. 365-380). Recife: EdUFPE.
- Fine, M., Weis, L. Weesen; S, Wong, L. (2006) Para quem? Pesquisa qualitativa, representação e responsabilidade social. In N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln (Eds.), *O planejamento da pesquisa qualitativa teorias e abordagens* (pp.115-139). Porto Alegre: Artmed.
- Grumet, M. (1988). *Bitter Milk: Women in Teaching*. Amherst, MA: University of Massachusetts Press.
- Haraway, D. (1988). Situated knowledges: The Science Question in Feminism and the Privilege of Partial Perspective. *Feminist Studies*, 14(3), 575-599.
- Torre, M., Fine, M., Alexander, N., Billups, A., Blanding, Y., Genao, E., & Urdang, K. (2008). Participatory action research in the contact zone. In J. Cammarota & M. Fine (Eds.), *Revolutionizing education: youth participatory action research in motion*. New York: Routledge.
- Rutherford, A., Capdevila, R., Undurti, V. & Palmari, I. (Eds). (2011). *Handbook of International Feminisms. Perspectives on Psychology, Women, Culture, and Rights*. New York, London: Springer.
- Teo, T. (2008). From Speculation to Epistemological Violence in Psychology. A Critical-Hermeneutic Reconstruction. *Theory & Psychology*, 18(1), 47-67.

## Acknowledgements

The author has received support from CAPES to carry out her postdoc, case no. 1783-14-9, from September 2014 to August 2015. Acknowledgements to Hannina Hansay (translation into Portuguese and English text revision) and Rachel Chapman (audio transcription and English text revision support).

Submitted: 05/27/2015

Accepted: 06/11/2015

*Karla Galvão Adrião* is a professor at the Department of Psychology and at the Postgraduate Program of Psychology at the UFPE, working with the interface between the fields of clinical and social psychology from post-structural feminist framework and postcolonial theories. She works with the subjects of sexual and reproductive rights alongside groups and youth. E-mail: [galvaoadriao@gmail.com](mailto:galvaoadriao@gmail.com)