A Radical Journal of Geography
ANTIPODE

Interview Series: "Global Deportation and Detention Regimes"
Organized by Cemile Gizem Dinçer and Eda Sevinin

Interview with Francesca Esposito

In this interview, our conversation with Francesca Esposito moves from the dilemmas of doing research as a feminist, to the feminist movement's street resistance in Italy, to the resistance, joy and solidarity of migrant women in detention.

Francesca Esposito is a researcher at the Università di Bologna's Department of Psychology "Renzo Canestrari". She completed a PhD in Psychology at ISPA—Instituto Universitário in Lisbon, and from 2019 to 2020 was a British Academy Newton International Fellow at the Centre for Criminology at the University of Oxford. Before moving to the University of Bologna, from 2020 to 2024 she was a researcher at the Institute of Social Sciences of the University of Lisbon (ICS-ULisboa).

Francesca's research focuses primarily on immigration detention and border violence. Mixing qualitative/quantitative interviews and field observations, she studies (and has published on) the daily life and lived experiences of people inside detention centers. She is currently an Associate Director at Border Criminologies at the University of Oxford, the President of the European Community Psychology Association (ECPA), and a member of the Editorial Board of the international journal *Community Psychology in Global Perspective*.

Cemile Gizem Dinçer and Eda Sevinin: Francesca, thank you for accepting an interview with us. So, our first question is a bit general, but it's something we've been thinking a lot about. As we know, since the 2000s, there's been a lot of literature on detention and deportation. But when we look closely, there are actually very few studies that take a feminist perspective. Some include women or gender, but a feminist approach is still quite rare, even within migration studies. Why do you think we're still in this position when it comes to knowledge production in academia?

Francesca Esposito: This is a great question, and I don't have a clear answer to that. You are right that studies on detention and deportation, particularly those adopting a feminist or transfeminist lens, are certainly fewer in number. I wonder whether that is an issue feminists have not been so concerned about, though I am not sure this is the only reason. Certainly, the field has been dominated by cis-male academics who are unconcerned with feminist and transfeminist politics and struggles. Feminist scholars, meanwhile, have largely directed their efforts elsewhere. Looking at the Italian feminist movement, for instance, historically, migration and detention were not central concerns. More recently, however, transfeminist movements such as *Non Una Di Meno* (Not One Less) have begun to foreground border violence within their political agenda, extending the scope of transfeminist struggle to include struggles for the freedom to move and the freedom to stay. So, I would say that there has been a meaningful shift in the way feminist and transfeminist movements are now engaging with detention, deportation, and border violence. This change has taken place over the last 15 years or so. It is in this period that, in Italy for instance, we begin to see feminist and transfeminist movements placing the nexus between gender violence, securitization, confinement, and border control at the center of their agendas and struggles. Shifts in discussions within academia have mirrored those within social movements, as they usually do: the way struggles have developed on the ground have found reflection and resonance in critical academic scholarship. Recently, I have noticed a growing number of early-career researchers and PhD students with connections to social movement struggles who are approaching border violence from feminist and transfeminist perspectives. In the past couple of years alone, here in Italy, I have encountered several young researchers beginning their PhDs who are engaging with detention and deportation through a feminist and transfeminist lens, from legal, socio-legal, and psychosocial standpoints. So, something is changing, and I am glad to see this change happening. Academia is usually slower than grassroots movements, but new feminist and transfeminist perspectives are emerging in critical scholarly analysis, particularly thanks to new generations of activist-scholars.

Cemile Gizem Dinçer and Eda Sevinin: Yes, absolutely—research in this area is clearly increasing. Rather than only including women and LGBTQ+ as demographic variables, more studies are now genuinely grounded in a feminist perspective. That's exciting. It also helps us deconstruct one of the stereotypes about feminist research—the idea that it is only about studying women or LGBTQ+ communities. In fact, it is also a way of seeing and a methodology for understanding social reality itself.

Francesca Esposito: I agree, and to be honest this is something I sometimes struggle with myself too. My research has never focused exclusively on the experiences of those who identify as women, or, as Sara Ahmed puts it, "those who travel under the sign *women*" (*Living a Feminist Life*, Duke University Press, 2017, p.14); yet, in the past few years, this has undoubtedly been one of my defining interests. So, I have often wondered whether this risks reinforcing the very idea that, as you said, we seek to challenge: that feminist research is only research that concerns women or LGBTQ+ communities. And that is obviously not the case—as you said, feminism is a lens for understanding the world we live in, a methodology and, more importantly, a political project: a way of looking at society and its constitutive power relations, as well as our subjective experiences of them. At the same time, it is important to acknowledge that the majority of those targeted by detention and deportation apparatuses are, broadly speaking, men—though this picture is complicated by the presence of queer and non-binary people whose numbers remain unknown, given that official detention statistics do not capture self-identification beyond the male–female binary. It is nonetheless accurate to say that the large majority of those detained and deported are men. This demographic reality, compounded by the fact that border and detention scholarship has been historically dominated by cisgender white men, itself a reflection of the gendered power dynamics constitutive of academia, has meant that the experiences and perspectives of women and LGBTQ+ people trapped within these systems are frequently overlooked. So, the result is a systematic silencing of these experiences and perspectives—most acutely in the case of

LGBTQ+ people, but also, significantly, in the case of women. With significant exceptions, this silence persists across different registers of scholarship: in theoretical bird's-eye analyses as much as in empirically grounded work that claims to accompany or speak with those subjected to these systems. In neither case does one frequently encounter sustained reflection on the intersecting power relations constitutive of the detention industrial complex, nor the kind of attentiveness to the diversity of experiences and differential exposure to organized violence that such an approach demands. This is a tension I find myself continually navigating. On the one hand, I am wary of reproducing the assumption that research on women and LGBTQ+ communities is the natural province of feminist scholarship—a framing that risks ghettoizing such work rather than recognizing it as central to any critical analysis of society and existing systems of power. On the other hand, the silencing of these experiences is real, and the failure to engage with them represents a genuine gap—one that feminist and transfeminist analyses meaningfully fill, enabling a more comprehensive understanding of how these systems operate and offering tools to challenge and dismantle them.

Cemile Gizem Dinçer and Eda Sevinin: One of the bases is always having dilemmas while you are accepting being a feminist researcher. It is very important to focus on those experiences, you're right! On the other hand, what you're saying isn't mutually exclusive. Focusing on women and LGBTQ+ experiences typically excluded from narratives provides a means to critically engage with social reality and transform existing power relations.

Francesca Esposito: Yes, exactly. Critical feminist and transfeminist scholarship have shown precisely this.

Cemile Gizem Dinçer and Eda Sevinin: For instance, one of the studies you conducted with your colleagues is a great example of this: "Voices from Inside: Lived Experiences of Women Confined in a Detention Center" (https://doi.org/10.1086/699344). In that

research, you offered a deep discussion of the experiences of detained women. What was particularly striking for us was your analysis of how the distinction between acceptable and unacceptable women is constructed, and these women are, at the same time, racialized subjects. This then leads to the creation of a narrative where the good/acceptable woman is the victim, while the bad woman deserves detention—what Ruth Wilson Gilmore calls "the problem of innocence" (*Abolition Geography: Essays Towards Liberation*, Verso, 2022, p.471). Considering the hierarchies created by the borders operating within the heteropatriarchy, can you clarify a little bit more this how you end up there? And how do you see this hierarchy being created by the borders in relation to patriarchy?

Francesca Esposito: I understand borders as constitutive of a heteropatriarchal racial capitalist system that operates through the production of divides. In the context of border regimes, these divides manifest as distinctions between the "good" and the "bad", the "citizen" and the "non-citizen", the "victim" and the "criminal"—categories articulated through intersecting hierarchies of race, class, and gender. Mainstream media and public discourse have long circulated and reproduced these figures: the "genuine" versus the "bogus" asylum seeker, the "good" versus the "bad" migrant. These figures are not only racialized and classed but also gendered and sexualized. Consider, for instance, how migrant and refugee women are frequently depicted as victims in need of saving and protection—protection, notably, from Black and brown or Muslim migrant men, cast as dangerous, threatening, and criminal. This is, of course, a colonial and nationalist trope, one with a long and violent genealogy, routinely mobilized to justify policies of organized abandonment and organized violence. A particularly pervasive iteration is the figure of the poor, vulnerable migrant woman who must be saved from traffickers, invariably cast as Black and brown migrant men who exploit her. This racialized and gendered logic operates not only in media representations but in political discourse too. A recent and striking example is that of Italian Prime Minister Giorgia Meloni, who, seeking to drum up public support for a judicial reform proposed by her right-wing

coalition, ultimately defeated in a popular referendum, deployed the rhetorical figure of the illegal migrant as rapist, calling on feminists to take a stand against judges who, in her words, were blocking deportations. This femonationalist discourse is by no means a unique Italian phenomenon; it has been mobilized across a range of Western contexts, including Germany, Sweden, and the United Kingdom. In each case, feminist themes and the language of gender equality are instrumentally appropriated and exploited to justify intensified repression, criminalization, and border enforcement. This is what scholars have termed the sexualization of racism: the process by which racism operates through a distinctly gendered and sexualized register. According to this logic, migrant and Muslim men are depicted as a threat not only to migrant women, but also to native women, who are portrayed as being at risk of sexual violence because these men are inherently dangerous, sexist, and predatory. This is, for instance, the rhetoric mobilized by the so-called "Pink Ladies" in Britain, an anti-immigrant movement backed by far-right and white supremacist groups, whose members have staged demonstrations across the country, particularly outside hotels housing asylum seekers and refugees, shrieking about the dangers they claim migrants pose to women and girls.

Returning now to my own work, and specifically to the article you mentioned—"Voices from the Inside"—what I came to understand from years of accompanying detained women held in Italian detention centres and entering these carceral sites in multiple capacities (as a feminist activist, researcher, and member of civil-society monitoring groups) is that the reality on the ground is more complicated than the dominant framework suggests. While it is true that a gendered divide operates to portray migrant women as victims to be saved, passively and subalternately included in the white body of the nation, and migrant men as criminals to be detained and deported, inside detention it becomes clear that not all women are considered the same. Hierarchies of deservingness/undeservingness come into play in everyday life inside these custodial institutions, being produced and reproduced through discourses, practices and interactions. While some women are recognized as deserving of compassion and protection, typically those who conform to the racialized figure of the victim; others are

not. Here, the "figures of race", mobilized and constantly rearticulated across colonial and postcolonial times, come into play (on this point, see Gaia Giuliani, *Race, Nation and Gender in Modern Italy: Intersectional Representations in Visual Culture*, Palgrave Macmillan, 2019). So, unsurprisingly, detained women most readily deemed "acceptable" or "good" are oftentimes white women, such as Eastern European women, who more easily fit the "victim" category than their Black counterparts. These women are typically described by detention staff as passive, docile, and untroublesome. In Rome, for example, staff members frequently described Russians, Ukrainians, and Georgians as calm and disciplined detainees—respectable women who had come to Italy to perform domestic and care work that many Italian women either no longer chose or were able to do, owing to their increasing participation in the productive labor market. Nigerian women, by contrast, especially those who made their living through sex work, were described as aggressive and hypersexualized, evoking the enduring racist tropes of the Angry Black Woman, or Sapphire, portrayed as unintelligent, aggressive, and emasculating; and of the Jezebel, figured as hypersexual, manipulative, animalistic, and uncontrollable. Roma women were also often described by staff as troublesome, unreliable, and potentially implicated in criminal activity—theft being the most commonly cited example. Alongside women who had been transferred to detention from prison, they were frequently cast as "deviant" and "undeserving" of compassion. In transgressing traditional gender and sexual roles, or by refusing to comply with detention rules, they refused to embody the status of "inferiorized victims" and were consequently recast as "dangerous subjects", rendering their confinement and deportation not only legitimate, but morally justified.

These examples show how the mechanisms of recognition operating inside detention were deeply selective, shaped by racialized and gendered constructions rooted in colonial tropes that determined, in highly unequal ways, whose suffering was rendered visible and legible, and whose was not. Only women who had no criminal records, who passively complied with detention rules, and who did not challenge staff authority were deemed worthy of release. They fit the imaginary of the ideal victim, and this was

reflected in the discourses circulating among detention staff, who insisted that authorities should be detaining criminals, not carers and domestic workers: "Poor woman! She has no blame because she was working, she gained the bread for her children, she comes here [in detention] and she spends here three months. Three months. She is not a criminal. She's a caregiver. She's a lady." No such empathy or compassion was extended to women with experience of imprisonment and/or sex work, regardless of the violence that had marked their life trajectories. Their experiences and suffering were rendered invisible, as their narratives did not fully conform to state-sanctioned victimhood requirements, excluding them from the status of "victim" (e.g. victim of trafficking or of torture) and, with it, from any claim to protection or release.

These mechanisms are not arbitrary; they are structured by racialized and gendered symbolizations and hierarchies rooted in colonial tropes. What my sustained engagement in this field makes clear is that racialized, class-based, and gendered constructions of "victimhood/criminality" and "vulnerability/dangerousness" are constantly rearticulated in the fabric of everyday life, determining what I call a *hierarchy of detention deservingness*—one that is primarily moral, not legal. These constructions play an important role in normalizing detention and structuring everyday life within these sites. Yet they are often reproduced on the outside, even among those who are critical of detention; for instance, those who advocate for the release of "vulnerable" detainees or those who have not committed any crime, while leaving all others behind. This, I would argue, resonates with what Ruth Wilson Gilmore calls "the problem of innocence": the tendency to build claims around the figure of the "innocent", "deserving" subject, rather than challenging the legitimacy of carceral systems as such. By drawing a line between "deserving" and "undeserving", "innocent" and "guilty", structural processes and histories of inequality are eclipsed in favour of individual moral judgement—ultimately working to reinforce and further legitimate detention rather than to dismantle it.

Cemile Gizem Dinçer and Eda Sevinin: This is a selective victimhood and, as you said, is deeply racialized. On the other hand, despite all these representations, you point to a

"feeling of sisterhood" among the women in detention. As an example of this solidarity, you mention the "freedom song". This tells us something important about joy and resistance, while also showing that the very condition of possibility for resistance is solidarity among women. Yet at the same time, women continue to be portrayed as passive subjects, even when they resist through their bodies and through collective solidarity. How can we interpret this? And what do you think about the persistence of such representations?

Francesca Esposito: In any context, and particularly in contexts as violent and oppressive as these, solidarity constitutes one of the primary resources and weapons of resistance. Detention centers are sites of profound isolation: as Angela Davis has poignantly argued, prisons, and, by extension, detention centers, "disappear human beings". They remove them from their communities, isolate and segregate them, severing the bonds and ties that connect them to the wider citizenry. This is, in many ways, their primary function. These sites are often geographically remote and deliberately difficult to access, making it hard for family members, loved ones, activists, and solidarity networks to visit and maintain contact with those held inside. As a result, detained people find themselves profoundly alone: deprived of key information, emotional support, and material resources. This isolation is not incidental; it is strategic. It is deployed to facilitate the exercise of violence, control, and domination, rendering those inside more vulnerable and less able to resist. What detained women do have, however, are the relationships they forge amongst themselves; precarious but vital forms of mutual support that emerge precisely in the spaces that the institution cannot fully colonize.

For instance, when women are brought to these centers—often in the middle of the night or early morning—their phones are confiscated upon entry, leaving them unable to notify their lawyer or their loved ones. No one knows where they are. They have, in every meaningful sense, disappeared. Disoriented and distressed, they often do not know how to communicate or what steps to take. It is in these moments that the solidarity of other detained women becomes most tangible: welcoming the newcomer, offering their

phone to contact a lawyer or a family member, sharing the contact details of support organizations, providing information about detention rules and procedures, and about strategies to challenge confinement. In a context where contact with the outside world is deliberately obstructed, and where institutional walls are designed precisely to undermine solidarity and sever support networks, this peer-to-peer support is not merely comforting; it is indispensable. Indeed, what detained people have above all else in these sites is each other. The forms of solidarity and mutual support that unfold on a day-to-day basis—information and strategy sharing, pooling resources such as phones, food, and cigarettes, emotional support, gathering together to draw strength from one another—constitute some of the most powerful resources available to them. Religion, spirituality, and faith also play a significant role, with collective prayer offering a source of resilience and sustenance that the institution cannot easily extinguish. This is not, of course, a romanticized picture. Conflicts and divisions also exist among detained people, and it would be misleading to suggest that solidarity is seamless or all-encompassing. The institution itself actively exploits these tensions through a classic divide-and-rule strategy: grouping detainees by nationality, separating them, and amplifying inter-group conflicts in order to weaken collective resistance. Beyond institutional manipulation, it is also important to acknowledge that not all people who end up in detention are politicized, and not everyone is a comrade—they come with different histories, different subjectivities, different political views, and different ways of navigating confinement. Prejudices and forms of discrimination can and do emerge. All of this is further compounded by the extreme psychological distress of finding oneself confined, stripped of autonomy, and facing the prospect of deportation—conditions that place enormous strain on even the most solidary of relationships.

It is also worth reminding that these are not ordinary social contexts in which people freely choose to be present and are in a position of relative wellbeing. The people inside these custodial sites are under enormous stress—living in a state of profound uncertainty and anguish, not knowing what will happen to them, whether they will be deported, whether they will lose contact with their friends, family, and loved ones. The

psychological distress is, in many cases, overwhelming, and this inevitably affects people's emotional availability to bond with others and to sustain atmospheres of mutual support. Indeed, many critical scholars have characterized these centers as "torturing environments"—sites governed through necropolitical regimes of uncare and structural neglect that, in some cases, lead to death. And yet, despite all of this, the solidarity I have witnessed inside these sites is remarkable. Time and again, the women and people I have spoken with described mutual support among those detained as a key resource—not only for surviving detention, but for resisting it.

One particularly powerful expression of this collective solidarity is what became known as the "freedom song"—sung by detained women at Ponte Galeria detention center in Rome, Italy, whenever one of them was released. All the women would gather outside their cells and erupt into song, dance, and celebration, sometimes throwing water at those who had regained their freedom. It was a ritual of joy—and something more than joy. The release of one woman was experienced collectively as a reminder that freedom was possible: if she could leave today, others could leave tomorrow. It was a practice of hope. I witnessed this on several occasions. It was particularly associated with Nigerian women, who led the celebrations with extraordinary energy and exuberance, though women of many other nationalities would join in. Sometimes, while speaking with women in the library or common areas with fellow BeFree activists, we would suddenly hear singing and shouting from outside—and learn that someone was being released. Everything would stop. People would rush outside to celebrate together. It was, in every sense, a collective experience: a refusal to let the institution have the final word, and an assertion, however brief, that joy and freedom were not beyond reach.

Cemile Gizem Dinçer and Eda Sevinin: You were lucky to encounter that. Since you started talking about solidarity among detained women, maybe you could also say a bit more about solidarity between citizens and non-citizens. As you mentioned at the beginning of the interview, there was a moment after 2015—following the so-called "refugee crisis"—when feminists also began to pay more attention to these issues. So

how do you see the situation today? How would you describe the response of the feminist movement in Italy, particularly in relation to migrant self-organizations and migrant women?

Francesca Esposito: As I said previously, the Italian movement *Non Una Di Meno* has continued to include these issues within their political agenda, including border violence and solidarity with those affected by it. This remains an extremely important political struggle—one that deserves far greater centrality within feminist and transfeminist movements worldwide. As the issues we have been discussing make clear, gendered violence is consistently instrumentalized to justify ever more repressive measures against migrants. This has been a persistent pattern in Italy, and it is equally visible in other Western countries, such as the United Kingdom, where in recent years there has been a marked intensification of racist attacks targeting asylum seekers, refugees, and migrants more broadly. Whether similar dynamics operate in contexts outside Europe and the Global North, Turkey being one example, this is an issue that transnational feminist movements urgently need to engage.

In the United Kingdom, asylum seekers are frequently housed in what are officially referred to as "hotels"—a term that obscures the reality of these accommodations, which typically consist of old, repurposed buildings where people are placed in cramped rooms without access to basic facilities such as a kitchen. Far-right and nationalist, suprematist movements have seized on this terminology to claim that asylum seekers are being given preferential treatment over British citizens, arguing that public resources are being directed toward migrants while the poorest members of British society are neglected. Under this banner, they have staged threatening demonstrations outside these buildings, where women, men, and children are living, intimidating residents with the explicit or implicit threat of violence. These demonstrations have frequently been framed around the protection of "our women and girls", mobilizing the language of gender safety and rights to advance a virulently anti-migrant agenda. This is precisely the rhetoric of femonationalist movements backed by far-right and white

supremacist groups that instrumentalize the language of gender equality and women's rights to legitimize and embolden anti-migrant violence, such as the "Pink Ladies" movement I mentioned before.

This is, I would argue, precisely why sustained engagement with these issues remains so urgent. As transfeminist scholars and activists, we need to sharpen our analytical tools and strategies, at the level of our discourses, our praxis, and our political agendas, to challenge a femonationalist discourse that proclaims itself feminist while serving decidedly anti-feminist ends. It is, at its core, a racist and nationalist project dressed in the language of women's rights. In this regard, transfeminist movements would benefit from deepening their relationships with migrant justice and no-border movements, and from actively challenging the hegemony of a white feminist discourse by centering the voices and struggles of migrant, queer, Black and brown folks. For instance, the programmatic platform developed by the Italian *Non Una Di Meno* movement in 2017, the "Feminist Plan to Combat Male Violence Against Women and Gender-Based Violence", already addressed the question of racism and borders, making explicit the connections between gendered violence, criminalization, and border enforcement, and advancing an intersectional feminist political agenda against racism, institutional violence, and for the freedom to move and to stay. In it, they declared their commitment to fighting together against the violence of patriarchy, racism, class, and borders. This struggle remains as urgent today as ever, and these questions must be given far greater centrality within feminist and transfeminist movements more broadly.

The challenges ahead are considerable. We are living through a deeply difficult historical juncture in which decades of feminist struggle are being simultaneously undermined and appropriated—our language co-opted, our frameworks distorted, to advance a political project that is antithetical to our own. The task, then, is to develop the analytical clarity and political tools necessary to fight back. Because what is being offered in feminism's name is not feminism.

Cemile Gizem Dinçer and Eda Sevinin: Speaking of political projects and tools, you prepared a video based on the stories of women from the detention center that ends by asking: "What kind of society do you want to live in?" Especially these days, we find it important to reflect on this question. So, what kind of society do we want to be? And with a specific focus on the intersection of struggle and knowledge production, how can community-engaged scholars and activists contribute to transformative efforts against the carceral border system, working toward a future of freedom, dignity, and justice for all?

Francesca Esposito: I will be honest: my relationship with academia has never been a straightforward one. There have been many moments, and there continue to be, when I think I should simply leave and return to fully dedicate to the community-engaged work and organizing I did for many years before. I came to academia late, and not through any linear trajectory. I did not follow the standard path of Bachelor's, Master's, PhD, and straight into a university post. There were many detours: years of community-based work and activism, training and qualifying as a community psychologist and psychotherapist, and then, eventually, a return to academic life.

I say this because I think we are now at a very difficult juncture on many fronts, including within our educational and academic systems, which are being relentlessly neoliberalized. There is an ever-increasing pressure to transform universities into places where people run like rats on a wheel, producing articles that serve their careers, that are read by no one, and that are useless to everyone outside the academy. The logic is one of quantity over quality: impact factor metrics, endless output, the university as a neoliberal factory. And yet, when I am not too demoralized and disheartened by all this, I realize this is precisely why we should stay and organize. This is one front among many in a broader assault, and we need to struggle wherever we are. We should be organizing within our universities and fighting back against the forces that are steadily eroding the conditions for genuine critical research and thinking. This includes resisting the increasing militarization of university spaces, and challenging the ways in which universities are becoming sites of border enforcement where students are asked about

their visa status, where information is shared with immigration authorities, and where the university itself becomes an instrument of migration control.

I know in the first person that sometimes it is hard. There are moments when I question what I am doing, whether I should be putting my energies elsewhere. But I keep returning to something I heard Judith Butler say at a panel held at Birkbeck University in 2025 titled "BDS and the Remains of the University: A Conversation on Resistance with Judith Butler". At some point, someone asked her whether we should leave universities and go into the street, since that is where the struggle really is. And she said, clearly and without hesitation, that she thought abandoning universities would be a profound mistake. Change happens in the streets, yes. But it also happens in universities. These institutions have a role, and we should not cede them.

All of this points to the same conclusion: we need to remain organized and fight back. And when it comes to knowledge production, the stakes are particularly high. At a moment when the other side is working hard to produce and consolidate hegemonic discourses, we need to be able to counteract this—through rigorous research, through the development of frameworks and conceptualizations that sharpen our understanding of social reality, that can travel beyond the academy, and contribute to advancing struggles for liberation and emancipation. I have heard many times the argument that we should simply leave universities, that the knowledge produced there no longer serves anyone, that the real struggle is in the street and that is where knowledge is truly produced. But if we do that, we are handing the entire educational system over to them. We are surrendering a terrain that has been won through enormous effort and struggle. I think that would be a serious mistake.

So, I think we should stay where we are, even when the positions we occupy are difficult to navigate. We should organize with our comrades in those spaces, resist the forces trying to transform educational spaces into something we do not want, and do as much collective work as possible—transnationally where we can. This is part of the broader struggle which is happening in the streets and in every corner. As Ruth Wilson

Gilmore often says, we must keep organizing, organizing, organizing, wherever we are and however we can.

Cemile Gizem Dinçer and Eda Sevinin: Thank you, Francesca!