

Episode 1: Feminist perspectives on prison abolition and border abolition  
The Criminalisation of Freedom of Movement podcast  
Transcript

Welcome to the Criminalization of Freedom of Movement podcast. We are Aila, Anna, Camille and Deanna, and we're all part of the Feminist Autonomous Centre for research. This podcast is based on the recordings of an online course that we held in spring 2023.

In this course, we brought together no-border activists and scholars engaged in the struggle against the criminalization of the people who facilitate freedom of movement, as well as people who have been directly criminalized by the EU border regime.

Those facilitating freedom of movement and who resist border regimes are often accused of being violent traffickers or smugglers and risk years of imprisonment. The conversations in this course, which you'll hear in this podcast, arose from the need to link struggles against borders with struggles against prisons and any form of confinement. No border struggles in our view must be anti-carceral struggles.

The course is informed by a transfeminist analysis and practice, trying to dismantle the binaries between protection and control, between victim and perpetrator, as well as between vulnerable and dangerous, that tend to legitimize the need for stronger or better borders. From this perspective, resisting the criminalization of facilitation is part of a decolonial transfeminist practice to abolish borders. The series comprises seven episodes.

each addressing the politics of criminalization and facilitation from different perspectives.

We thank all the people who participated in the course, either by contributing to the roundtables or by participating in the conversations and discussions. We also thank all the No Border groups that are part of the struggles against criminalization, and with whom we co-created new languages, narratives and knowledges over the past years.

All course materials, syllabus and readings can be downloaded from the FAC research website at [feministresearch.org](http://feministresearch.org).

thing is, it's not a matter of trying to keep us outside. We are already here. Right here in Amsterdam, in every street in the Netherlands, in Belgium, in Germany, in the whole of Europe. What does that tell you? It tells you that where there is a will, there is a way.

Nobody is going to stop that!

This episode is based on the core session titled Feminist Perspectives on Prison Abolition and Border Abolition, recorded on

15 April 2023. Over the past years, within our no -border networks, including the Captain Support Network, Borderline Europe, Watch and Med Alarm Fund, the Bifal Crew, Sportello Sans Papierro of Arci Porco Rosso and more recently the Maldusa Project, we've been discussing the relationship between struggles against borders, the illegalization of people on the move and the criminalization of any form of facilitation to freedom of movement. Today, we want to pick up on these previous conversations to discuss the relationship between border abolition and wider struggles for prison abolition. In a previous introduction session,

We'd ask participants to read the article 'Why No Borders' by Anderson, Sharma and Wright to listen to the podcast episode by the Weer Branders titled No One Is Illegal with the participation of Mariam Omar from the We Are Here movement in the Netherlands so that we could collectively reflect on the relevance to our current struggles against borders and against prisons.

"Here are people who are in a country where you are basically stuck in a limbo. You don't have housing. You don't have health insurance. You cannot walk. You cannot study. You cannot function as a way a human being is supposed to function in any society. And because of that, people just get stuck in some kind of a dimension within this reality.

Because you've also had encounters where other neighbourhoods did not react well. You understand that? Where people don't want you to come into their neighbourhood because somehow they see you like some kind of criminal. know? Also, we don't want you in our nice white -fenced neighbourhood. Because you are a criminal. Well, if I was a criminal, then why am I not in jail? I mean, of course I am in jail. You created this invisible jail around me that I cannot break through."

As Maryama powerfully said in the podcast that we, I think most of us listened to last week, she said that borders are like prisons. Like prisons, borders confine and immobilize people. Like prisons, borders punish people and they keep them stuck in geographical and temporal limbo. Like prisons, borders are violent and they kill people.

Like prisons, borders and border violence legitimize themselves by claiming that they deter people, that they deter movements, that they deter people from committing actions against state-imposed laws or actions against state-imposed borders. But like prisons, borders do not actually have this deterrence effect. Their violence do not stop people

from moving. And it does not stop people from defying borders and state -imposed laws. People do not stop breaking borders and breaking laws and defying them because of the fear of the violence that they might face. So they do not have a deterrence effect. What they do is not deterring people, is not stopping people. They also do not only exclude and isolate people. Borders like prisons do not

have only repressive functions. Instead, if we have to bring an analysis of borders and prison together, we can see how they are both productive or specific social relationships of forms of racialized apartheid of subjectivities and categories in our society.

that create hierarchies between people. They create regimes of racialized segregation. They create precarious for people. They create differentiation. They also create hierarchies of humanity. And they try to dehumanize people by confining them and by subjecting them to their regime, be it the prison regime or the border regime. In doing so, they create the conditions for people's exploitation.

They create the conditions for creating subjects and subjectivities that, according to their logic, should not just be stopped, but should be afraid, they should be silenced, they should be invisible, they should be docile and disciplined. Their function, rather than stopping people movements, is trying to repress any form of political action against state-imposed laws or state-imposed borders. Moreover, like prisons, like the so-called prison industrial complex, the border regime does not stop at the border. They multiply in every aspect of our lives. The police, they put controls, they put surveillance, but do not stop at the border and do not stop at the prison, but are present in every aspect of our life.

In this way, borders are not just like prisons. They're not just similar institutions, but borders need prisons. They need criminalization. They need punishments. They need imprisonment in the form of deportation, of pushback, of camps. But they also create new prisons. So they are not just similar to prisons. They also need prisons and they create prisons. They are co-constitutive as much as prisons also need and create borders.

As Maryama powerfully explained last week, she clearly explained how the border regime created thousands of prisons around their body, how it criminalized and made illegal every aspect of their lives. Her very existence is criminalized and illegalized by the border regime. But again, as Maryama explained, like prisons, borders do not work. They do not stop people's movements.

They do not stop resistance. They do not silence. They did not manage to silence her. They do not make us afraid. And then we come back to the simple slogans we started with last week and that motivate our movement since decades. The slogan, no border. The slogan, no one is illegal, which for me, they're not simple slogans and they're not utopias.

Last week we were discussing artists' utopias, abstract ideas that do not have materiality in the real struggles of our lives. No, for me they are not slogans. For me they are everyday practices. They are things we try to create in our everyday relationships. And to close, I made a few notes of what does it mean for me to take these

slogans.

This abolitionist slogan of no one is illegal and no borders from a feminist perspective. And maybe I will make some reflections on methods and I know that Anna has a few very important additional points on this, so I'll pass the word to her. So for me, understanding borders from a feminist, abolitionist feminist perspective means understanding how borders are not only repressive, but how they create subjectivities, narratives and practices. So how they generate relationships, hierarchies in our society. Not analyzing only what they exclude, but really trying to analyze what they produce in order to resist what they produce. And in particular, following black feminist thinking, it is important to understand how they generate specialized gender's form of violence, that are structural and that are institutional and are not just interpersonal or individualized. So when we resist them, for me it is important to understand how the violence they generate is structural and institutional. At the same time, in relation to this feminist perspective to abolition, for me means understanding how borders are multiplied and internalized. And if you read and listen to Harsha Valia, she speaks very well about this internalization of borders and externalization of borders.

But by internalization of borders, we mean how they shape our lives, as Mariamma was also saying, how they shape our bodies, our feelings, our relationships, well before and after they're crossed, not just at the moment of crossing, but also not only for the people who cross borders, how they shape our bodies, our lives, even if we don't need to cross borders. So in this thinking, for me, it's really important to think how resistance can be multiplied and extended to all these aspects of life. And how it needs to be, how when we place resistance against borders, we cannot stop by rescuing people like seen. We need to think about how borders are really present in all our social relationships. And last, and when I pass the word to Anna, this also means having an abolitionist perspective from a feminist approach also means to exit all the language and logic of punishments and of prison, and to get rid of all those forms of carceral feminism. And instead, seeing abolition not as an attempt to repress or to destroy something only, but as an attempt to create something different, to create alternatives, to create transformative communities that are based on love, on mutual care, and on freedom, first of all, rather than carcerality on the one hand or charity on the other. And Camille, in a conversation we had last week on border abolition, she referred and we were talking about border abolition and the slogan, is there justice or is there just us? And Camille beautifully said, well, this just us is actually really big. And actually there is no border, no police, no prison that will ever stop us.

I hope we can have a conversation starting from these topics and Anna maybe I'll pass the word to you. Thank you so much Diana for that, in my opinion, very inspiring also opening to our conversation. think in starting to pose the question and starting to answer the question, what does an abolitionist feminist perspective

bring to the analysis and the praxis against borders and prisons? I mean, it's a bit circular. I don't think we would have a concept of no borders, no prisons if we didn't have a long tradition of abolitionist feminist praxis that dates back actually to the 19th century. In one thing that we were discussing, Aila, Camille, Deanna and I, when we were preparing for our meeting today, was that Harsha in her book and even more so in her podcast makes very little explicit mention of the kinds of intersections between gender, race, class. She makes reference to them in passing in the chapter that we read, chapter four. For example, she talks about how incarceration constitutes a form of gendered state violence. And she gives the example of solitary confinement, the lack of access to reproductive health care, strip searches, and sexual violence, particularly targeting trans women, but also people of all genders. So I think it's quite important to make a distinction a little bit between, like very often I think we conflate a feminist perspective with the presence of an analysis that centers women or speaks about women exclusively, or that speaks about gender exclusively. So I think this is, I think, a limited way to look at it. And you mentioned this, Deanna, I believe, when you started speaking, a little bit talking about method, right? The method, the lens, the perspective, the kind of gaze and the kind of relationality to these phenomena, borders, prisons, and violence, which sutures them together. And one of the things that comes through a little bit, very little bit in Harsha's text that we read, but I think it's a great occasion to kind of have the conversation amongst us here today. And I know it's in the background of her concerns and it appears elsewhere in her work and writing, and by no means saying otherwise. One of the things that I think we can discern in terms of this violence that sutures all of these institutions together is that, and this is also an insight from black feminism, that it has this kind of atmospheric character. And you mentioned the internalization of borders. They're not just internalized into the nationalized space, but they're actually internalized through the very micro space of our own body, of our own affective, like our feelings, of our own self-conception of how we perceive other people and ourselves. And I think this atmospheric aspect of this border violence and of this carceral violence, two being, as you, I think, explained, very compellingly mutually constitutive. They produce one another. They require one another. We also encounter it in a system of binary gender, do we not? We also encounter it in the heteronormative patriarchal family, do we not? We encounter it in becoming beings who are ascribed these identities, whether these identities are racial identities, gender identities. We are in every aspect of our lives in a way, living out that violence, even on a very sort of, how do I put it? Imperceptible because completely normalized level.

So that's one thing that I would add to everything you've already said. The other thing that I think is really important to kind of notice in connection also to Harsha's invocation of various abolitionist thinkers, such as in that chapter that we read, the comments by Lisa Monchalin and Dylan Rodriguez, who both of them talk about how what needs to be abolished is the inheritance of a long, a process of long duration of the ongoing colonization, which

has morphed into settler colonialism, which has morphed into contemporary imperialism. So, you know, looking at the context of settler colonies, such as the United States or Canada or Israel or a number of any settler colonies around the world. Rodriguez argues that what needs to be abolished, institutions like the police, jail, prison, criminal court, detention centers, reservations, plantations and borders are the underside of the new world and its descendant forms, as he puts it. And similarly, Lisa Monchalin talks about how it's a mistake to think, and we hear this word a lot, over-representation. It's a mistake to think of Indigenous women as being over-represented in the carceral institutions of settler states. Rather, we need to view the incarceration of Indigenous women and the feminicides of Indigenous women, I would add. It's not in the quote that see that Walia has taken, but it is a concern of Monchalin as well.

Feminicides of Indigenous women, when they attempt to cross borders or they're working in borderlands, like for example, in Juarez, it's a pillar of gendered settler carceral governance that traces its roots to and is reproduced through ongoing colonialism. And then I think the other aspect, I think there's a very nice concept from Maria Lugones, I will put, I'm not sure we have this reading in the folder, but I'll try to remember to put it.

The other concept that I think is really important to kind of draw on here that supplements these two things is the concept of the modern colonial gender system, the process through which a binary system of gender, a heteropatriarchal concept of gender, was globalized around the whole world, supplanting, violently replacing other forms of gender kinship, embodiment, sexuality, spirituality in its globalization. So I think we need to think about how these institutions that appear to have a kind of natural presence in our lives have a historical origin and they grow up together in time, do they not? Basically,

The issue is not just focusing on how these gender identities have congealed and we take them for granted in the present. And in that way, we're done with the feminist analysis by using, for example, tropes like women and children, right? Or focusing our attention on people whom we conflate with gender, right? Or people whom we conflate with race itself as a structure of experience, right?

Rather, I think it's about looking at how these categories come to be embodied all at the same time in our everyday lives, such as they become completely self-evident. And that too, I think, is a form of violence. And it certainly required violence historically to take place. Abolition feminism. What is it? Where do you see the need also for abolition feminism in our own structures? And in our struggles, in the borders we fight or how the things that we introduce now in relation to gender, to feminism, to abolitionist perspective resonate to you? I don't know how much it can relate with borders?

Now I'm speaking from a, let's say, more feminist perspective, I

have to say, but like abolitionism feminism in its core, it's this specific kind of feminism that in our perspective it's much more needed in a sense that we are living in a world that feminisms, is for sure it's not only one feminism, there are several feminisms, but at the same time there is this massive attempt of feminism to actually build more prisons, hire the sentences, have a huge carceral approach from the well-being of the women honestly.

Et cetera. I think abolition feminism, from my perspective, let's say, try to be or reflect people on the margins, basically, because like, if you feel so secure as a feminist that you will never end up in jail, if jail and prison or deportation.

They're so far away from you. Yes, maybe you speak about another kind of feminism. For me, it's the part that brings people in the margins, people in the borders, any borders, internalized, externalized, somehow more close together. I think that this sort of punitive approach is really what links these two as well in sort of in our struggles or in everyday encounters and activism. I mean, obviously on a sort of on a level of national discourses like we have in Italy and Germany, I'm sure also in France. Now I'm not familiar with many other contexts in this sense, but the conflation of sort of male violence with migration. mean, that's very...

like one of the strongest tropes to defend borders, right? And even though we criticize it, I think we still experience this same dynamic very much even in activist spaces. And that's often where the two things merge, when a sort of carceral feminism reaction, because we don't have, we're not prepared enough, we're not trained enough, we don't have the horizon to think of different ways of approaching violence, for example, gendered violence, rape. And then this carceral feminism is the only answer that we have. And then it really becomes one with sort of the approach of borders. mean, kicking people out of places, for example, even if it's not putting, closing them up somewhere, but then it's kicking them out of somewhere.

So I think, yeah, I really relate to what Christina said and I think it's both a very big question but also a very everyday practical issue. Thank you, Lucilla. It's so important to also think about how we internalize all these structures, also in our own struggles, movements, that claim to be anti-racist, no border, anti-carcer, but then maybe we reproduce similar dynamics. Nada?

I was thinking just about the logic about award and punishment. In every step that we take in our life, like also in school, when we are child. So I was thinking about that for try to dismantle borders and also prisons. How was written in the book, we have also to dismantle the fact that there are people that deserve something and people that doesn't deserve something.

And the thing that we are talking about now is freedom. I think that is not something that you deserve, but it's something that you need to live. So there is a strong relationship between borders and

prison, also because they just decide that some people doesn't deserve freedom. I agree with all of the people speaking before me.

I'm very happy that we share these thoughts about abolition of feminism because I believe that in Greece that I'm living, abolition of feminism is something that starting, voices from this part of feminism starting to be heard just now, just the years that we are in now. And I wanted just to add that maybe to also connect with the previous conversation we had, the last conversation we had on the previous session about doing the unthinkable, about really fighting structures, the existence of structures that the whole society, let's say in quotes, cannot imagine destroying them, like police, like prisons, like borders, structures that are really made to be like in very close relationships with what we understand as our civilization, our national states, our societies. So yes, I will agree very much with what Lucilla said, it's something theoretical but also something very much in our daily lives. And it's very, very necessary for me to connect in this specific case borders with abolitionism and feminism. I think we have to explore a great area.

I would like to add some other perspective to this discussion because for me abolition and feminism is not only connected with people on the move themselves or imprisoned women or just not cis male people but also it's about feminism inside solidarity structures and for me it's so visible that there are much more female comrades involved in anti -prison struggle. Very often they started because their cis male partner ended up in prison or detention center at some point. And also we can see that the society and our movements are pushing women to do the solidarity action and expect from them that they will be just active inside this movement because there is this, you know, expectation that we as a women, need to take care of. And I come from Poland and I see it also in the No Border movement that we have male comrades who are really active on the field, mostly non -seas male comrades are active, for example, in detention centres for migrants. So they are taking care of this invisible worm.

Yeah, I just wanted to maybe express a bit because listening to all of you made me think of so many conversations we had in different networks and how I think like talking from my perspective, I started really like being involved in activism with a really anti-racist, border abolitionist perspective and the feminist approach came a bit later in a way.

Or I started thinking about it afterwards, which was really interesting also to see, where it was coming from. But I think it's opened to me so many ways of thinking about the struggles we were having, all the fights we were building. And it really helped me to understand that the movement I wanted to be part of needed to be like, to really be open to all those

All those discussion about every system of powers or domination that can happen, that intersect in so many different ways and that touch so many different things and not only about borders or prisons, but



also access to social rights and all those different struggles that has to come together at one point that we need to find places and to build places where we can think about every different aspect of it and to really like start to create a new world in a way. But I think the abolitionist feminist approach really helped me to maybe find a way to connect all those different points that I had in my mind. I think all those writings and all those authors and podcasts were really precious for me in that aspect, to connect and to reconnect again. Yes, thanks everybody.

Just to add on a previous comment, was on the fact that many times we treat people on the move as deserving or undeserving. And this was also explained in the text. It was a point that was quite interesting to me and it explained how the Geneva Convention kind of made it institutionalized, these logics, and sort of create a category frankly out of nowhere, in which we decided to protect certain kinds of people on the one side and on the other, not granting the same protection by other kinds of people or to other kinds of people. And I find it interesting because this is also something that actually we, let's say, solidararians, we are often there to support, to protect. Yes, the Geneva Convention, you cannot go against it. It's one of the last or the strongest legal things that we use to pursue our cases. So in a way, at the same time, it's like we have to use these tools that we have at our disposal in order to pursue our fights. But at the same time, by doing so, in way, we're also losing some kind of ideological ground because we're already accepting a kind of language and narrative, which is already a defeat in a way. And just a point which is connected, it's about mixed migration. So it's also interesting to notice this word, let's say mixed migration, it really wants to, at the beginning, at least wanted to show that people on the move moved because of many different reasons and that they were interconnected. So you would move for a reason that might fall into the category of those prescribed by the Geneva Convention, but also for another one that wouldn't. And so you're a mixed migrant, let's say. But then it became something that international organizations and UN organizations just say, okay, there's migrants of one kind and migrants of another kind, they go through the same route, which was not the initial use.

Yeah, I'm just resonating with so much, guess, also to take a personal perspective for me, abolition of feminisms as a person who's worked in and around and against international law for a long time has meant understanding, as so many of you have said already, those intersections, those omnipresent intersections where carceral logics exists in those ontological and the categories that are created through law, which is of course part of the systems of the statist, capitalist, racists and oppressive systems that we are part of. And it's been extremely generative for me to think about orders as forms of, as carceral logics, as exclusion mechanisms, also as a function of imagining. For me, Abolition Feminisms is really about the building, the collective care centered, community centered building and envisioning of worlds in which community can be global,

can be really not structured around states at all, which is an incredibly radical and emancipatory idea and embodied feeling for me to work with and think with. Thank you so much, Valentina.

I think it's also so important to think about it as a practice that we already put in place, that's not something we dream of. And, you know, the way we configure a world without borders, also in our thinking. And all these conversations and reflections, I think, lead quite nicely to the next part, where we want to think about the relationship between reform and abolition. And maybe for many of us, it's very given for granted, but I think we still need to go back to this and to think about what is the difference actually between reform and abolition? What are we accused of when we try to argue for abolition? What does it mean to take, as someone was saying, these rights, rights to freedom, rights to life? Should these things be governed by rights that can be given and taken at any point? Or shall we just speak about life and freedom not formulated within the legal system of rights? Do we need legal tools in order to bring forward our struggle? Do we need legal reform or do we need to think outside of the logic of the law? How can these legal tools, and I know there are some lawyers and legal scholars here, support a struggle for abolition and for freedom rather than just reforming it within the same logic?

And making some small amendments rather than subverting the entire logic. So how can we think about this not as mutually exclusive but as co - know, maybe going together, doing the step -by -step struggles can be around legal tools, even humanitarian practices, but also within a framework of abolition and revolution.

From what I've learned about abolition and from what I know from reading on feminist perspectives on that, it's kind of this form of resistance against the pushback, against kind of thinking about abolishing borders and abolishing prison systems. So it's kind of this cyclic idea of there's this idea that's seen as very radical compared to mainstream ideas on borders or on feminism in general. And then there's a pushback against that because it's seen as too radical, as utopian, as we said last week. that border abolition from a feminist perspective would be kind of a resistance to this pushback, if that makes sense. Yeah, thank you so much. It makes a lot of sense. I think that people from also Alarm Phone were here. I don't know if some of us introduced ourselves as members of Watch The Med-Alarm Phone. We are having a lot of these conversations lately. And I have to say that even within the Alarm Phone itself, the network, there are sometimes arguments of people saying, you are abolitionists. You're not connected to the struggles on the ground. And yeah, we had a few conflicts, interesting heated conversations around the relationship between to reform, to bring justice through the legal system and the more like broader abolitionist perspectives and some of us were accused of being utopian abstracts dreamers rather than connected to the possibilities of struggle on the ground and for me it's always important to remember how these struggles are not utopian or abstract.

Hello, hello everyone. But just to say, just to jump in on what you say, Deanna, because I thought it was really important and interesting, because I remember a conversation which I can also share with you. I have to find the link. It was one of the first, like, conversation which was organized by Abolish Detention Association, which is this collective I'm also part of.

that was created to oppose the opening of a new detention centre for women in the north east of England. So it's called County Durham and it's an abolitionist collective. And they organised this conversation. There was Lea Cohen and there were other people. Sarah, my friend, was also facilitating.

And it's interesting because actually one of the persons there, comrade from All African Women Group, she made a very powerful intervention about what you said, because actually what she was saying that when there was all the discussion around, let's introduce the, I think it's 21 days limit to detention.

And there was this fracture in the movement between those who were saying, that's an improvement and those who were actually against it because they thought that we should be more radical. And what she said is that actually introducing that 20, I think it was 21. Now I'm not 100 % sure, but I mean, this like sort of time limit to detention was actually something which was pushed forward by some groups, but actually the people inside detention centers, they were not like in favor of this because if you ask them, I mean, it's okay for you, it's okay for you to be detained for just 21 days. Everyone would just tell you that even one day of detention is horrible. It's like an horrific violence, it destroy your life.

So actually, the radical abolitionist kind of vision was very much on the ground, was very much linked to the voice, desires and visions of the people who were directly affected and where the others one who were like, you know, the practical or they were actually disconnected from the ground. So it was just to share this with you because it made me think of this. Lucilla, go first and then Cristina.

I actually wanted to ask you Diana, but don't know if you want to do that, but if you want to go a bit more into it and also in relation to what you were telling me about a few days ago on sort of the extension of this, not just sort of in the Mediterranean, but also how, for example, Black people are racialized on the one hand, as criminal in certain circumstances, but are also racialized as in sort of victims, or there's this idea that there is sort of yeah, de-subjectification happening that people are not really having agency over their lives, whereas there's a different racialization happening, for example, in North Africa, where people then are, for example, Libyans are associated directly with sort of, you know, kind of all the tropes we have about the violent coast guards and the slave markets and all of these images that have circulated. And I don't want to speak about it because I don't know, but you were talking about it and I thought that was so important as well. So I

don't know if you want to say something.

I get the whole statement, etc. But maybe I'd like to go a bit step backwards just for clarification purposes. I wouldn't like to end up in a context that there are not smugglers in this world. Because also from my experience, of course, there are people that they are getting crazy amount of money and they exploit like every single person, to just put them in a boat and cross the borders. Like they are, they exploit people and honestly, I don't really care from any perspective what it will happen to them. For sure, this kind of occupation, let's say, it will not be needed if we didn't have borders.

And for sure, these kind of people, they are working in cooperation with the coast guards, with everything. Like it's a whole business. But at the same time, in my head, somehow, yes, they actually are smugglers. They do benefit a lot by thousands and thousands and thousands of euros and dollars and et cetera. And most of them, they never enter to any boat.

As we will discuss throughout this podcast series, we cannot imagine a world without borders if we do not imagine a world without prisons. The two regimes are entangled and mutually constitutive of patriarchal and white supremacist forms of power, violence and control. Borders and border regimes are punitive and carceral institutions. They require criminalization and exploitation of people on the move to create regimes of immobility.

Abolition feminism insists that abolition is not just about tearing the current system down, but rendering it obsolete. Abolition is about presence, not absence, as geographer Ruth Wilson Gilmore has said. It's about building life-affirming institutions in place of current ones, which reproduce, normalise and proliferate violence.

Thank you all for listening to the Criminalization of Freedom of Movement podcast, composed of seven episodes based on the online course that took place in spring 2023 and that was facilitated by Camille, Deanna, Aila and Anna at the Feminist Autonomous Centre for research. For additional learning materials, please check the description of the podcast or visit our website at [feministresearch.org](http://feministresearch.org).

We thank again all those who made these exchanges possible, either by participating in the course or by sharing knowledge and struggles over the past years. We also thank evi nakou for the sound design and music composition.