

Women's Studies 422: Research Interview

Time: 4:00 p.m.

Date: Nov. 16, 1999

Place: Gillian Creese's Office

Who: Gillian Creese By Sheena Brown

SB: Let's start with question one: How would you sum up your experiences before coming to UBC?

GC: Do you mean my experiences teaching?

SB: Yes, but also both your teaching, academic and life experiences before you came to UBC.

GC: Well before I came to UBC I was just finishing my PhD. D. at Carlton and teaching, but got a job here before I finished. I just happened to be lucky enough to see an ad that was for exactly for all the things I do, in all the combinations I do them in. Amazingly I got an interview and a job.

In terms of feminist teaching and research, my graduate work certainly fits as research, but I didn't have a lot of teaching experience. I had taught courses for two years as a sessional on gender, social movements and power...What else was I teaching? I can't even remember! Certainly this included stuff on the Women's movement, but I wouldn't call them feminist courses. There was feminism in them, but as a sessional I didn't feel that I had the same level of autonomy in terms of what I taught, and maybe lacked confidence about how to organise materials either because I was just learning how to do it. Learning how to put a lecture together at all (laughter) was a major feat! So I really don't have huge experience before coming here actually, which is interesting.

Except I guess I mean you always have experience in the universities your in. I came from Simon Fraser where I did my undergraduate degree and found the university was a much more open place then UBC.

Carlton too was a much more open place then UBC. I went from Simon Fraser to Queen's which was a terrible, terrible shock because I found Queen's a very elitist and closed environment. It was hard to be to be a woman at Queen's. It was hard to be from a working class background at Queen's too which had been really easy at Simon Fraser. That's also why I chose Carlton. It was a much more political place. The Sociology program was a program that was really focused around issues of class and issues of inequality. They also had a couple of good feminists there although that wasn't what I was looking for at the time. I suppose UBC was a bit of a surprise in that way being so elitist. I remember coming here and thinking on all kinds of levels that I just didn't belong. Both as a woman I did not belong and as a young woman I didn't belong anywhere near the place expect as a student. (Laughter) I remember going into the Faculty Club when we had one and thinking who are all these people, feeling like a fraud, like I couldn't possibly be a faculty member because I didn't look at all like any of them! (Laughter)

SB: (Laughter) Just in response, in my own experiences I noticed when I first arrived at UBC what a shock it was to be on campus. Although I come from a very lower class background, receiving the money to be at UBC through a scholarship and a bursary, I found it very different from my high school experiences even though I had gone to an elitist high school. The school was notorious for receiving all the doctor's children and the lawyer's children, but because it was public I got to go too- a conscious choice my mother made. But I mean coming from that to here was defiantly a big shock even a student so I can imagine...

GC: Well universities have different cultures. UBC is like Queen's in that sense, it is a very elitist culture and it draws more upper class students. Simon Fraser is much less that way, it's a consciously less elitist place and it draws upon a group of students that do not have as uniform a class background either.

SB: Luckily I had a high school teacher who prepared me how to write (laughter) exams for UBC which was really helpful in. He came from a working class background but ended up going to Cambridge in England where he got a scholarship. He told stories about purposely garbling his ascent so people wouldn't know where he came from and other things he had done just to fit in...

GC: This has to do with culture; it has nothing to do with academic background. The credentials of SFU students are the same as ours; it's not about that. It's about class culture. But it's also about gendered culture as well, all though I don't think that fairs in as much in what ever university your at. It's a pretty masculine environment.

SB: Which is strange too. I think I've been lucky to be able to do the cross between Women's Studies and Sociology. I was lucky to have for a year and a half nothing but women teachers, even for my empirical sciences, which was quite interesting. I wasn't aware of how unusual that was until I hit third, fourth year.

GC: I think in my whole undergraduate career, I remember having two women teachers. That was it.

SB: Oh, I guess there has been considerable change in some ways.

GC: In some departments. Certainly in Sociology, huge changes, the fact that Women's Studies exists is another big change. But in some departments it still would not be unusual to have not many women instructors at all.

SB: Yes (laughter), I can see that happening. For example pharmacy: I have a friend in there and she's always complaining about the notorious bias against women in Medicine. They look at menopause as in need of hormonal therapy but don't explore the idea of menopause as socially created. In other cultures menopause doesn't exist at all, which is an interesting variation. But why did you pursue Sociology?

GC: Why did I pursue Sociology? I don't know. I started in English and didn't find it

very interesting, then I moved into Psychology and just found that too individualistic. I was always very political and Sociology really provided me with the ability to ask the kinds of questions and find answer's to the kinds of political things I was interested in. I think that's why.

I've always had a real interest in inequality and social justice issues so Sociology seemed a natural. People do that in other disciplines (laughter) but it just felt right. Certainly like most people, I didn't know anything about it before I went to university. I'd never know anyone who had gone to university before I went. I'm still the only person in my entire extended family that went or ever set foot in a university, you know I didn't know anything, but it just kind of felt that it answered or that it allowed me to answer questions that I was interested in pursuing.

SB: Did feminist scholarship fit in with that too?

GC: Not early on. In fact in my entire undergraduate career I don't believe I ever came across a feminist teaching, a feminist research, a feminist material, a feminist of any kind. This was in the 70's and there just wasn't anything there. I think there probably was one Woman's Studies course offered that I didn't take. I think it was just starting, at least I know now that it was just starting, but I didn't know that then. But no not until I got into graduate school, and more so when I went to the PhD level. When I got into the MA I began to encounter feminist work more, in the late 70's, and by the time I got to the PhD of course I was looking for feminist material. In terms of my own history I would say that of course I was always a feminist I just hadn't encountered anything that would allow me to say "I'm a feminist".

I come from a background where my mother always worked full time, she's a very strong person, and she identifies herself as a feminist today but it wasn't the language she had then either. It was kind of a natural process. Once I found that material, and I think like some many people, once you find it you can never see the world the same way again. You know it's not possible (laughter) to move away from it again and say "that was interesting," and ask another question now, because what ever question you ask feminism has to be there.

SB: Well I suppose I'm lucky enough to have had that progression of history already with the Women's movement in schools, in post secondary institutions were I came in, encountering it not only in first year but again second year when deciding what to major in was central. Luckily there were people there to direct me into different types of scholarship.

GC: And it's not hard to find today though. I think when I was an undergraduate there was literally nothing there (laughter).

SB: Yes I guess you'd assume there would a proliferation of literature and resources...

GC: Yes absolutely. You've got to intentionally not encounter it today. You've got to decide that you don't want to, at least I think that's true in Sociology. It's not true in lots of other disciplines. And it's not true in lots of other disciplines in the social sciences.

SB: Interesting. Again it goes back to the whole production of knowledge and issues of legitimacy. I know Psychology certainly seems to be a more “legitimate” science yet they never deal with gender issues. I have a friend right now who is looking at abusive relationships but they never encounter a gendered aspect towards it which I find incredible and completely blind! How can you do that and look at and talk about this without looking at gender!

GC: (Laughter) How is that possible! Yes Psychology is defiantly not a friendly environment for feminists. There are feminists teaching in the psychology department, but very few. But the thing about Sociology is that in fact it is an easy home for feminists, which is one of the reasons why the discipline has been very much transformed by feminism.

SB: I’m still recalling my first experiences with Psychology, and remember learning more about dogs than about human beings. The celebration of individualism and of the human being I found really contrasting when I took my first year Sociology course. I wondered why don’t we talk about this in Psychology.

GC: I think that the disciplines we do choose have a lot to do with the questions we find personally interesting. I mean I have the same response to Psychology but clearly a lot of people don’t. And they find in it the questions they want to ask because they think about the world in a more individualistic way. It’s a lot about perspective, but as you encounter other traditions it also changes your perspective.

SB: That’s true. How do you feel about defining research as both Sociological and feminist?

GC: I don’t think it’s a conflict at all for me to think about a feminist sociology, it’s something which fits very easily together. But I think that there is less conflict in the discipline, many other disciplines not only psychology. In History for example, there is incredible conflict between feminist historians and non-feminist historians. To define yourself as a feminist historian, it is also to define yourself in the middle of a debate and in the middle of a controversy. To define yourself as a feminist sociologist today, I don’t think it really is. I think it was 20 years ago, maybe even 15 years ago when I started teaching here, but I don’t think it is now. I think it’s just changed so much that the discipline itself has been feminized, and its been feminized in terms of personnel: who’s teaching, who’s doing the degrees.

You look at the graduate programs today and Sociology is one of those were women are now a majority of people who are pursuing graduate degrees. So it’s an easy home I think, and I think it’s been a very fruitful kind of interdisciplinary paring between Sociology and Women’s Studies. I think there is a reason why a lot of students are doing both degrees. There’s a reason why Dawn’s the chair of the program I was chair of the program before her, and that Becki was one of the first two appointments. It’s because it fits quite well, we’re asking questions about social inequality and that’s what feminism is all about, as well about asking similar types of questions from a more interdisciplinary

type of perspective.

SB: You've sort of hit on this before, but what do you feel are the advantages/disadvantages to this type of work?

GC: (Pause) I'm probably the wrong person to ask about disadvantages. I'm not sure I see any (laughter), no doubt there might be, I'm probably blind to all kinds of things, but you're taking about merging the two aren't you? I see real advantages in merging them because I wouldn't be anywhere near as interdisciplinary as I am in terms of the things I have contact with and the things that I read. I'm not as interdisciplinary as I'd like to be, but I'm much more, I think, than a lot of my colleges who are not reading so much feminist material because they don't have to. It's very easy to be in a particular niche where you do research because it's very self-referential. You read the same people and they read you, you become caught in this self-enclosed circle.

If you're using feminist work and see yourself as part of a larger feminist community, that's not possible because you're constantly encountering people from different disciplines as well who ask things in different ways. So I think the interdisciplinary stress in sociology is really quite important. I think that a disciplinary home is important for me to know what I'm thinking and how I think about the world, but I'm sure that if I didn't have that interdisciplinary connection at the same time, I wouldn't be as good a sociologist.

SB: Do you feel that feminist research has received its recognition both within Sociology and within a broader academic community?

GC: Yes, very much so, yes I think it has. As I say, it's not got the same kinds of battles that are still going on in a lot of other places. It was those kinds of battles, but I think they've been won. (Laughter) I see it here for example here, say when I look at the core theory courses now which in just a few years ago didn't include feminist theory. Students used to talk to me about how it didn't include feminist theory, they would be in those classes wondering how can you not teach such and such? Well all those sections now include feminist theory. Some the instructors who teach them weren't there then and have probably always taught feminism, but others who taught those courses before would probably say that they've shifted in terms of whom they include and how they include it. But they really responded to demands from students and to the kinds of perspectives they were getting in other courses.

So that's a really change, you're not getting feminism in some places, of course. Not everyone is teaching from a feminist perspective, but at least in a lot of the core courses like theory I don't think it is a problem so much anymore. But maybe you get feminism over here, then nothing about feminism over there, as if you're trying to negotiate two separate worlds, something my generation had to do. We had to negotiate two entirely separate sets of readings and disciplinary ways of thinking and somehow come up a way to fit them together.

SB: I think my experience with theory is kind of mixed as well. We spent an entire semester on functionalism and then one class on feminism in the entire year, making it

seemed rather token. I think he had good intentions for teaching feminist theory and suddenly found himself out of time. I'm not sure how intentional or deliberate that move was, but I think he was sincere in trying to teach it. I certainly talked with someone else who was teaching and had him in the mid 80's as a teacher and who said that this was a change for in the 80's he wasn't even teaching feminist theory.

GC: Well maybe the change hasn't gone far enough. You don't place it at the very end (laughter) if you actually think it's central.

SB: How would you describe doing research at UBC?

GC: Well I guess I don't really have much to compare it with since I haven't taught at any length of time at other universities. One of the things which is really wonderful about doing research at UBC is the Centre for Research in Women's Studies and Gender Relations, that it's there and that it is a community of women scholars and feminist scholars is really critical. But apart from that, is there lots of support for the kind of research that I do? I can't say that I haven't been supported. I have a good record of research grants, the kinds of indicators that you would look to say is feminist research valued. I'd have to say that in my experiences that I've done well by it. But is it across the institution? I don't think so (laughter). Yes I defiantly don't think so. The creation of the Centre which is only 6 or 7 years old now was a huge, huge change on this campus. Before the Centre existed there wasn't really anywhere to connect women, and particularly feminist women on campus. It made a big difference to me, but is it enough? No it's not enough.

SB: I certainly got that feeling last year when I was taking a stroll around the graduate school' seminar- workshop- interview kind of thing where they had all their booths set up to introduce you to graduate studies in different universities in Canada. There was UBC and Anthropology/Sociology, but way down in the corner in a little tiny booth was Interdisciplinary Feminist Research. It certainly had that feeling that it was rather token in the sense of existing...

GC: Yes speaking of token that it took until 1991 to get a Women's Studies majors program. And the first faculty wasn't hired until 1994? That's astonishing for a major research institution! Next year we will have a master's degree, some (laughter) 20 years behind everyone else? So that does give you an indication of the type of resistance of this institution. I think that any institution that is really elitist is harder to move, it's harder to make change. Certainly when I was chair of Women's Studies there was a marginalization of feminisms and if you're into administration in any role, it's really clear. It's also clear to me when I had to take part in all those kinds of things, how this home in sociology was so much friendlier (laughter) than anywhere else in Arts. I'm not talking about anywhere outside of Arts, just Arts.

SB: It seems visually apparent on campus.

GC: It is!

SB: The Centre is a tiny portable! The office space is different with the sliding doors making more cubical like making it feel not as official or as ordained as it is here in AnSo.

GC: Well, it's a temporary building, and it was a temporary building for Disability Resources before they moved into a permanent home in Brock Hall when it came up for Women's Studies. But yes it is a temporary building. But yes when you ask about doing research on campus, you see for me, my research really isn't done on campus. Research is about getting research grants, which I don't have any problem getting, and doing research collectively with other people in which I do with I do in a whole series of departments. We do wonderful research with a couple of men, I think there are 4 women and 2 men that I'm involved in with a very big research grant. The project is 3 years old now and will go for another 3 years. It's a wonderful group to work with, just wonderful, but that's got nothing to do with the institutional structures of UBC. When I think about UBC I don't think about how is it to do research here, but more of it is how is it to do teaching and administration as a feminist. Doing administration as a feminist is very difficult (laughter). Doing teaching as a feminist is fine in this department but it's not in many departments.

SB: What are the advantages to doing teaching as a feminist sociologist?

GC: (Pause) Well I guess just for me, I think that everyone should be exposed to feminist research and feminist thinking (laughter). If you don't include that in your teaching, then how do you communicate with other people? If it's just by what you write, who's reading it? Other academics and maybe some students, but there are disadvantages too. You lose a certain proportion of students who just don't want to really pay much attention to what you have to say. So you have to work harder to appear really balanced and open, I mean those are the kinds of things that I think are important in teaching anyway, but you have to try a lot harder. I don't think that there is any question at all that you have to spend more time responding to male students in classrooms. Again I've read the research I know that that's always true (laughter) to some degree but I think it's even more true when you come out and identify yourself as a feminist in a course that is not a Women's Studies course.

In Women's Studies it's different. The expectation, is of course you're a feminist, the question is just what kind of feminist are you, the politics around what does feminism mean anyway. But to identify yourself as a feminist in a non-Women's Studies course is always has advantages and disadvantages. It has advantages in that all those students in there who, appreciate feminist material know their going to get it, know that they can include more of it, add things, and raise questions when their not getting the kinds of answers they want in a way you may not feel as comfortable doing in another course where you might feel that you would be marginalized if you did that. But in a classroom environment where the instructor already has said that this is not only valid but this is where I'm coming from, then I think that that sets a different climate. But it sets up a different climate for the whole class, not just for who already identify as feminist and are already interested, but also for those who don't and are quite hostile.

And there are always some people who are quite hostile, and it's not just men in the class, there are always a few women who are hostile to feminism in the class as well. It often comes out in various ways. There are challenges in that, but I think their challenges worth taking on. It affects course evaluations sometimes. In courses at the 3rd and 4th year level I think it's much easier to teach as a feminist in a non-Women's Studies course. Courses at the 1st year, it's really difficult. The level of often quite clear hostility is much stronger and I found it much more difficult. Students are coming from anywhere. If you're teaching a 3rd or 4th year course chances are that most students will be sociology majors or maybe Anthropology majors, or that they've taken other social science courses or at least another sociology courses, and if they didn't have some kind of interest in issues of inequality they probably wouldn't be there, letting me move those issues of inequality a little bit further to take in gender issues. But in a 1st year class, 80% of them because it fit their timetable. They don't know what their doing to do and may have no interest whatsoever. So it's extremely challenging.

For a woman to walk into a classroom at a university it is still the case that you have less credibility to begin with. You already start with less credibility then a male college, so if you now come out and explicitly identify as a feminist for some people in the class you will now become bias. Now for a man to walk out and explicitly identify as a feminist is a whole different dynamic. He will still get some kind of hostility but he won't be accused of bias. It's like me teaching stuff on "race" and ethnicity because I'm white. I might get some resistance but I'm not accused of bias. I don't think that I get the level of antagonism that colleges of colour will get when talking about issues of "race" and ethnicity. But I get it around gender. So there are definitely challenges.

I used to think of it as teaching as an "out" feminist, because there is a sense in which that's true. You've identified for a class something about the way you think about the world, their going to get it anyway (laughter).

SB: Do you still feel that there is a growing sense of hostility within the student population?

GC: I think within Sociology less and less because within Sociology students are encountering feminism all over the place. I now find that most students have already encountered feminism, both men and women. A lot of the men who are Sociology students are actively reading feminist material which they weren't doing in those numbers 12 years ago. So I find less and less so long as I'm teaching Sociology majors (laughter). Move outside of that into the intro. classes and it's a different world.

SB: Do you think that there is hostility towards including gender or is it more of hostility towards Sociology? I remember my experiences during first year there was a huge hostility towards C. Wright Mill's idea of history and biography, and fact that most of their reactions were socially constructed.

GC: I always found that I could teach about class, but as soon as I got to gender, boy, the hostility went up. I think it's because you use to thinking about things at an individual level, and nothing is more important to you then your gender identity. And that includes how you think about yourself and your, your partners and your assumptions, you know



I'm assuming people are heterosexual here, assumptions about what you think you're life is going to look like. Now, for students who are gay or lesbian that can be a real liberation just to talk about gender identity, never mind sexuality. But for students who are straight there is just incredible hostility, and more often hostility from the women. Didn't want to talk about it, didn't want to think about it, didn't want to know at all, that was old that was, that's not my life. But why is that? So yes, I think people feel it very, very closely. It is their identity; it is who they are. We think about class that way even though most of the student population is pretty privileged, but you don't think of that as a part of your identity in the same way that you do about gender or the way you do too think about ethnicity, particularity for people who are from minority backgrounds.

SB: I think class background is a little easier to disguise then something like gender and ethnicity.

GC: Yes it is easier to disguise.

SB: You might stick out 1st year (laughter) but pretty soon you learn the ropes. You learn what to wear, what to say and pretty soon it isn't a divide anymore.

GC: Yes, and it's not about how you identify yourself in the same way, I mean it is when you've got a working-class background. But, in fact most of the student population, here their class background is like being white in an environment, or like being male. It's about privilege; it's about that normalcy of privilege. But poor people are around, (laughter) you know you can show statistics around class inequalities but that's not the same as saying most men are not doing domestic work, what are the implications for women?

SB: How do you think that these research and teaching experiences have affected you personally?

GC: (Pause) I guess it would be hard for me to even think about my life any differently then teaching and researching today. So I guess what affected my life was going to graduate school, and the ability to do this for a living. It's a huge impact you know, it's had a massive impact. I really like what I do you know, I think it's an incredible privilege to be able to research and read, and think, and teach. So for me it's a great thing to be able to do. How has it affected my life? It's made it good (laughter) in all kinds of ways. It's given me a job I think is a really great job to have. I'm sure it's affected by life in all kinds of other ways too, in terms of what I do in the community, but I guess like whenever you talk about identity it's hard to distinguish what we do from who. For academics, I don't know if it's more so for feminists or not, it is who you are. At the same time my community isn't just an academic community, I've certainly been involved in outside stuff, and I wouldn't want to spend my whole life with other academics. (Laughter) I think that can be very myopic kind of existence as well.

SB: Do you feel a strong link between feminism and activism?

GC: Yes, yes I do. I think there is a strong link between who becomes a feminist academically and often its people who already have a strong activism background as well. So yes I do think there is a link.

SB: Do you think that the way that you teach has made sort of the impact you desired?

GC: I'm not sure if I can answer that, I'm probably the wrong person to ask. I don't know... I don't know, how do you judge that? I guess I would need to keep track of students to see what their doing 20 years from now, and I don't know...

SB: Do you see a difference in your students when they come in September to the time they leave at the end of the year?

GC: Yes, some students. And I mean I would probably like more students to come and have conversations with me about these kinds of things, so yes with some students for sure. For others, they already got a lot of this stuff from somewhere else; it all just depends what a student's background is. But sure for some, but it's nice to know that you can actually help see things in a different way. I mean people did that for me, helped me see things in a different way. I mean people did it for me. I don't think you should be able to get through a university program and certainly not a Sociology degree without seriously encountering the cleavages in our own society along all these kinds of lines we are talking about, not just gender, but the other kind of main cleavages as well.

If I think about the kind of impact I'd like to have, it would be to help to inform citizens more. That for me would be an important thing and then what people do with that I guess is an individual thing. Go off and do whatever you do with it. Some people are already activists and they are long before they come into my classes or anyone else's, and others are never going to be. But not everyone has to be an activist. But if you raise your kids if you have kids in a non-racist, non-sexist way that would be good (laughter) thing from my point of view. So partly I think it's about citizenship kinds of issues anyway, just understanding the society better. Maybe make better decisions when you go to the ballot box or something like that. But it's pretty intangible, how do you know?

SB: (Laughter) It's hard to tack the demographics after awhile to see what happens. How do you think your experiences teaching or doing research right now affected prior notions of teachings you had before? Do you think they've changed or...

GC: Do you mean my assumptions about what I thought teaching was going to be like?

SB: Yes.

GC: (Pause) Well certainly for me being involved in the Women's Studies program really made me much more aware of pedagogy and feminist pedagogy, that was a huge change for me. I guess what one question would be weather I'd think it would be different to be teaching as a feminist sociologist somewhere else now, say like at Simon Fraser. I'm not sure, I'm not sure weather it would be. I think that the atmosphere on campus would be a bit different so in terms of dealing with colleges outside of the department, but in terms

of students I don't know if it would make teaching different. Probably not.

When I compare notes with other feminist faculty it doesn't seem to matter where you are in terms of that level of hostility and resistance that's out there generally. I think of Women's Studies as a little oasis from all that and we often think that it is (laughter) the real world, unfortunately it's only a tiny little corner. I think of this department as kind of the best next place to be in terms of my ability to do the kind of work that I do. I find it perfectly friendly and comfortable, but the rest of the campus is not.

You know it just isn't, and for me when the PoliSci stuff happened I was the chair of Women's Studies so I was really involved in all that kind of stuff and had to sit on a faculty of Arts committee that was trying to put in place a policy around this kind of stuff, and it was horrific! I never want to go through anything like that again, I never want to sit in rooms week- after- week- after- week and hear what my colleges in other departments, could have been my own except my own department voted almost unanimously on the proper side, my department and Geography were the only two that did, but you know those kinds of things are really painful. And I guess it was a while ago so I can pretend that it's not out there, but I know it is. And a few of those people who were leading the anti-feminist, anti-political correctness charge are still doing it. Their sitting on senate, and their now immersed in the Faculty Association, and their out they're spewing that kind of stuff and I just don't currently have the energy to be the person to take them on at the moment. But I have no doubt that we'll have to do it again.

SB: Do you think that confrontation is the only way to change the university as an institution?

GC: I think that we would have to do that at times in order to make this a more hospitable place for feminists in general. Having the Women's Studies program and the Centre have made a huge difference, but it's not enough you know, it's not enough. That there are 5 faculty now in Women's Studies, all joint appointments...give us 10, give us 20 ...then we could teach real graduate programs not just borrowing everyone from other departments. So no it's not enough; we've got a long way to go.

SB: Do you feel that there will be a progression, in maybe the next 20 years?

GC: Well there has been in this 20. I wouldn't want to be pessimistic and when I look at the students coming through our graduate program, in Sociology, they're almost all feminists. They're mostly women, a lot of the men are feminist too. So things are changing. It was a lot easier for me than it was for the women a generation before me who are only 10 or 15 years older than me, but they really forged an incredibly hostile environment, which I really never had to do, and it's going to be easier for the next generation who are 15 years younger than me... Critical mass means it's going to be better.

SB: I suppose in 20 years time, given the educational system if there could be a movement towards introducing ideas of feminism at the high school level there before they even get here. It has happened. I have had a classroom were we sat down and had a discussion at the high school level about feminism and what feminism was. It was a little

skewed but it existed, and it was there, and it was helpful.

GC: It would be great if that was happening in the school system, say in Abbotsford, it would be great!