Ingrid Waldron: "Our Bodies, Our Land, Our Laws"

Season 2, Episode 5

***Small Planet Heroes* Podcast**

October 31, 2025

***This transcript has been lightly abridged for optimum coherence and flow.**

Kai: Hello, and welcome to the *Small Planet Heroes* podcast. I am one of your hosts, Kai Chan. I'm a professor and Canada Research Chair at the Institute for Resources, Environment and Sustainability at the University of British Columbia, and I'm founder and lead of CoSphere, a Community of Small Planet Heroes, which produces this podcast. And I'm joined here with Dr. Nancy Kang, who is from the University of Manitoba. Nancy, do you want to introduce yourself again for folks?

Nancy: My name is Nancy Kang. I am Canada Research Chair in Transnational Feminisms and Gender-Based Violence at the University of Manitoba.

Kai: Today, we have the pleasure to talk to Dr. Ingrid Waldron at McMaster University. She's the Professor and Hope Chair in Peace and Health in the Global Peace and Justice Program in the Faculty of Humanities. We're talking to her in part about her work with the ENRICH Project, which stands for the Environmental Noxiousness, Racial Inequalities and Community Health Project, which she's been leading since 2012.

Nancy: And we should also note that Dr. Waldron–or Ingrid's–profile as a scholar and activist really epitomizes community involvement. She is also one of the producers of the acclaimed documentary *There's Something in the Water: Environmental Racism in Indigenous and Black Communities*, which was originally a book published in 2018. So the documentary really illuminated for a greater audience the extent to which environmental racism affects communities in Nova Scotia, as well as in other areas of Canada and beyond. So we're really pleased to welcome Dr. Waldron to CoSphere and look forward to speaking with her about her work.

[*Medley of Small Planet Heroes theme song*]

If there's a pit in your stomach from the way that we live,
You want it to change, something's going to give,
We've got stories that'll give us a glimpse
Of better ways to reconnect everything.
We're Small Planet Heroes,
Small Planet Heroes.

Kai: Wonderful. Hello Dr. Waldron, Ingrid.

Ingrid: Hi there.

Kai: How are you?

Ingrid: How are you doing? Very good!

Kai: Great! We want to talk first about how you got into this. I mean, the first thing to say is that you are *clearly* a scholar with a purpose, which really resonates with us. You know, it's something very central to CoSphere that we don't just do our academic research just for its own sake; that we have some broader purpose in the world that we're seeking to achieve with that. And that seems *really* obvious in terms of your work. I mean, I'm just guessing. Correct me if I'm wrong, but can you tell us a little bit about that journey of yours, like, which came first? Was it the scholarship or the purpose, and how did the two evolve together?

Ingrid: I think it was the purpose. I remember when I was around 14 years of age, I would–my mother would be cooking in the kitchen–and I would go to her and I would say to her, "Mom, why are we all here? Why are we here? What's my purpose?" Since that age, I've been looking for my purpose and questioning what we're all doing here. And I remember saying to my mother, "Whenever I get a job, I don't want it to be a job that's part of the rat race, and that's a nine-to-five, and that it had to have *meaning*." And it did take me a long time to decide that I wanted to be a professor, because every job I tried, I was bored. After three months, I would get bored. My mother always wanted to know what to do with me. So it seems like–and then I'm one of those people, I used to be one of those people who would go into a bookstore and go to the section on psychology, and purpose, and spirituality, and I was always attracted to that section. So I think I've been on this journey for a long time to kind of figure out, "Why am I here, why are all of us here? What are we doing here? What's our purpose?" I think even more recently, I feel like if I don't have a purpose, or if I'm not making some kind of special significant impact, then why was I here in the first place? So there's a part of me that thinks that a higher power has put us here, I guess, to use whatever talents we each have to do something for the greater good.

Took me a long time to figure what that is. I mean, some of the things that have happened to me through the projects I'm leading, even when I didn't chase these projects or pursue them (which is the story of environmental racism), I wrote about that in my book that I didn't know anything about it, didn't pursue it. I feel it's kind of–what's the word? *Serendipitous*.

Kai: That's super-interesting. You know, I had the same kinds of struggles about purpose myself as a kid and actually, many of them *also* developed with my mother and also in the kitchen, you know, so *really, really* similar, I think, in those respects. And just like you, you know, [I] really did not know what that purpose was going to manifest in. It was not my first choice to do that through academics. So for you, did–did you get steered into your research *before* you decided on environmental justice or was it like environmental justice and then, "Oh, a research track might be a good way to pursue making change there"?

Ingrid: I never knew I was going to *do* environmental justice from my undergraduate degree, my Master's degree, my Ph.D., my post-doc. My undergrad was psychology. I just–I wanted to be a psychologist or a psychiatrist. My Master's degree was Intercultural Education because I had an interest in race and ethnicity, and my Ph.D. was Sociology and Equity Studies in Education. So at that time I was really about–I was interested in race and then during my Ph.D. I decided to look at the impacts of racism on Black women's mental health. I had a keen (and still do) interest in mental health, mental illness, how discrimination impacts the mental health of Black communities and other racialized communities. There was *no* telling at that time that I would go into environmental racism. Never heard the term, was never interested in anything having to do with the environment. I don't think I– it ever–I really encountered anybody doing it. I think there was a professor, an Indigenous professor, in the sociology department, when I was doing my Ph.D., who was *maybe* teaching some courses on it. But [I] didn't get it, didn't understand it, wasn't interested. So, yeah, I thought I would

go–I thought my *biggest* research area would be mental illness. It is probably my secondary one.

Kai: So it was partly because you came to see that the environment actually had quite a bit to do with mental health? Is that–is that it?

Ingrid: No, I now see that there are health and mental health impacts of environmental *injustices*. But no, that project came to me through an environmental activist when I was in Halifax in 2012, *way* after I finished my Ph.D. And he presented this topic called Environmental Racism. I looked at him, I said, "What's that?" And he was leaving to go to California to do a start-up, and I guess he wanted to leave the topic in the hands of someone, maybe who can sustain all the work that he and other environmental activists had done in Halifax? I don't know why, but when he came to me and he said, "It would be great if you could do a project on environmental racism", I was hesitant. I had no interest in the area. I also felt that that's the work of an environmental scientist. I'm a sociologist of race and ethnicity. I have no background in environmental studies, environmental studies, environmental science; I didn't understand why he was coming to me. Later, when I hesitantly decided I would do it, I realized that there was a *health* impact. And as I continue to study the topic a little bit more, do my own research, I said, "Well, it's an opportunity for me to engage with Black communities and Mi'kmaw communities in Nova Scotia, and I like that because I wanted to do community-engaged work with Black communities and Indigenous communities. So it was like, "Tick!" I love that part of it, and I love the part of it that will allow me to focus on health, because it's clear to me that if people don't want these dumps in their backyard, it is probably because they're worried about cancer. That's what I jumped to. No one had told me that, but I assumed. But I said, "This *environmental* piece of it all, like, I can't do this, it's really for an environmental scientist. I don't know anything, I'm probably going to end up being really *embarrassed* because I don't have any knowledge about this. I was really–I was lacking in confidence but for a reason. You know, when you don't have any background in environmental science, you know, you feel like you have a lot to learn and I didn't feel I had enough *time* to learn it. [Laughter]

Well, that's when I talk about purpose. I'm like, "I don't know why this project was brought to me. I don't know why this topic–something I'd never thought about–was brought to me!" So, you know, as I continued on, I said, "Is this supposed to be my purpose?" And I think maybe it is because of how everything has kind of settled into place, and how there are things I did not pursue and go after that just came to me through environmental racism without trying, you know. So.

Kai: Yeah, that's fascinating. Because it doesn't link necessarily with the way that you understood your academic expertise, but it linked with your purpose in terms of your concerns about social justice.

Ingrid: You know, social justice is a–you know–integral part, of course, of environmental racism, because I started to understand that the communities that were *most* impacted were Black and Indigenous communities across Canada and then similarly in the United States. But, you know, the United States also has Hispanic communities. So I realized there was a kind of racial element to it, which I didn't understand when the project was brought to me by the environmental activist. That's why I wasn't really that interested. And then when I did some readings, I said, "Oh, it's disproportionately impacting Black and Indigenous communities, and *that's* where my expertise lies." And although, I said to myself, "Although I'm not an environmental scientist, as a sociologist (and we study race and ethnicity; that's what we do well)," I said, "maybe I can bring something else to this." I will never be able to tell anybody about pollution and contamination and specific pollutants in the water. That's just not what I can do. But there's a lot of people doing that *already,* so maybe I can put my own spin on it, a *sociological* spin. I don't know what that's going to look like, but that's when I gained

confidence, realizing that I don't have to do what other people are doing.

Kai: No, absolutely. You're complementing the scientists in a really wonderful way, bringing your interdisciplinary social research and mindset.

Nancy: So Ingrid, we were really interested in the ways in which you were able to sort of translate scholarship into action. And part of your book, as well as your forthcoming book, which is a meditation on Black trauma (*From the Enlightenment to Black Lives Matter*), you talk about the ways in which it's never just about the theory. Like, for instance, from your public health expertise, you link environmental violence on the land with environmental violence on the body. So we were wondering, could you perhaps share with us your perspectives on violence as you approach them?

Ingrid: Yeah! I mean, it's probably a bit of a sociological concept, but also ecological/environmental, as well. I started using the term *violence* in a more holistic way as I continued on in my project. Obviously, I'm not talking about *interpersonal* violence, but I'm talking about the violence of harmful policies that impact marginalized and especially racialized communities on the ground. So when I talk about environmental racism, I'm talking about a particular type of ecological violence that results from harmful environmental policies and decision-making. That's one form of violence and that impacts, for example, Indigenous communities in many ways.

So when we think of violence on the body, it impacts them in terms of their health. Indigenous communities that are experiencing environmental racism have severe health outcomes, such as high rates of cancer (reproductive cancers, for example), and reproductive health issues. And then I also know that Indigenous communities and Black communities also have holistic understandings of well-being and Indigenous worldview sees the world in a particular way. There's a connection between the mind, the spirit, the body, the land, animals, insects. Everything is seen in a holistic way. And if any aspect of that, any aspect of a *harmonious relationship* between those things I just mentioned is out of balance, then everything is out of balance. So you know, we see Indigenous communities say, for example, "When you desecrate our land, you desecrate us as a community. As a culture, in terms of our body, in terms of our health: everything now is a bit out of whack because–and there's no equilibrium anymore–because you've desecrated the land." So they see the world in that way. And it's also [that] people don't often talk about it, but it's also an African-centered viewpoint. It's very similar to Indigenous people. African-centered viewpoints are also about holism and seeing the world in a holistic way.

So now, when I talk about violence…Somebody used the term *environmental violence*, and I think they were talking about environmental racism, but they were also talking about all the other things that happened, for example, in Indigenous communities. In Indigenous communities, I mean, Indigenous communities in Canada face so many social ills. They're at the bottom of the ladder in terms of health, in terms of poverty and income insecurity, and labor, and housing, and environmental issues, in terms of education. I see those as forms of environmental violence. Structural inequities is what they are, but those structural equities happen through policies that, once again, are harmful, and I see that as violence, *structural violence*.

Kai: So in the movie [*There's Something in the Water*], you actually didn't use that term, and I want to return to that a little later. But what you *did* do that I thought was *so* valuable, was that you revealed these additional dimensions of injustice that are not commonly thought of–or at least were not commonly thought of until a few years ago. So, from my understanding, you know, being adjacent to environmental justice scholarship, most of the conversation up until around the time of

your book was about *distributional injustice*: basically the fact that communities were more likely to have sites of landfills (oil refineries and polluting factories and the rest of it) situated near them if they were marginalized communities, if they were communities of color, if they were low income communities, et cetera, right? And that distributional injustice was understood as being the primary problem. But what your book and also the movie do so well is revealing the *systemic* nature of how we get there, right? Which shows that this is not just a simple policy problem. This is not something that we can fix just by, like, making sure that, you know, the next couple of landfills get sited somewhere else, right? It's not–it's not that simple. And what it reveals in you pointing to the *procedural* injustice, is that there are baked-in ways that we got to that distribution. Can you say a little bit more about that?

Ingrid: Yeah, I mean, there's a distinction between distributional justice or *spatial injustice*, which is where we see the spatial patterning of industry and primarily Indigenous communities across Canada. And then there's, as you said, procedural injustices. That's the decision-making and the policies that result in the outcomes that we see.

Kai: Let's give a couple of examples of that from your work, for example. So like, one of the ones that I loved and *really hated* with the third story in *There's Something in the Water* with the Water Keepers–I think that's what they call them?

Nancy: Grassroots Grandmothers.

Kai: Grassroots Grandmothers. Alton Gas put them into a box, basically–right? There was like a section, a gated-off section that was there, the place–the only place–that they were supposedly legally allowed to protest, right, as one. But then there's also the examples from the case with Boat Harbour, where the Pictou Landing First Nation was misled about the nature of the pulp and paper treatment facility, right? That they were taken to a place that actually had a facility that was *nothing* like that, and were led to believe that it was going to be like that, right? Can you give us another couple of examples of those *tangible procedural injustices* where people were actually misled, you know, in ways that we would recognize as being illegal in today's context, but that were a really, actually built-in part of how Canada became a nation?

Ingrid: Well, I'm not sure this is misled, but when you think of the case of Shelburne–South Shelburne, Nova Scotia–the African Nova Scotian community and Louise Delisle was in the film talking about her community. This is a community that was, I would say, in general, African Nova Scotians, when they're descendants of Black Loyalists from the United States, from the War of 1812, and they were promised land in particular areas. And the promises never kind of panned out, and so they were steered mostly into rural areas with rocky land that were not good for agriculture. So, you know, Shelburne would be a similar community, but they were placed in an area where, after they came to Nova Scotia, a landfill or a dump–I should say a dump–was placed in their community. And of course, a community doesn't necessarily know the dangers of this. But the fact that the South End of Shelburne, the Black community, was selected and not the North End, which is primarily white, is telling you something. And that's what environmental racism is: the fact that you would select Black communities and Indigenous communities, and that there's a pattern in doing that in Canada. That's environmental racism, regardless of whether or not there are health effects.

Kai: And the health effects were actually exacerbated by the fact that the Black community wasn't on municipal water, right?

Ingrid: Yeah, that's another part of the–I call environmental violence that is maybe not to do necessarily with an environmental *racism*, but it's about public infrastructure, a built environment, or planning policies that still disadvantage Black communities. So the Black community in Shelburne is on well water, which tends to be more contaminated, and they've *always* been on well water, and the white communities on clean municipal water.

Kai: Yeah, and so *if* the Black community *had* been on municipal water, then they actually likely wouldn't have suffered from many of those health effects that they likely encountered as a result of the dump, right? So it's like, it's one process of inequality layered on another one that produces these harms.

Ingrid: That's right.

Nancy: Well, we might think, for instance, Ingrid talks about Africville in her book. Africville was the community in the Bedford Basin area. And when you were speaking Ingrid, as well as Kai, I thought of an African Canadian writer Frederick Ward. He wrote a poem about the expropriation and essentially the razing of Africville in the 1960s. And the final line of one poem that's called "Dialogue [#1]: Mama" is "*They moved me in garbage trucks*." And the reason that I bring that up is because the City of Halifax did not–well, they asked for moving trucks to move these communities, but the moving companies were unwilling to do so–so they mobilized a whole bunch of garbage trucks to relocate these possessions. And if we look at films, for instance, like *Remember Africville* (which is available online for streaming), this wasn't a slum: it was a community of proud individuals who were self-sufficient. They were not on welfare; they were rooted there for over a century. So I think your book really underscores the need for awareness, not only of Black history, but the imperative for respect of peoples.

Ingrid: Yeah. I was shocked when, I think I was on Google, and I saw photos of a child on a dump truck. So when you just said that, most people don't mention that, but it is the case that they still wanted the community out of there, that dump trucks were used. And there is a photo I saw; I don't think it was a drawing, it was an actual photo of a young child. And this was, I would never say a *flourishing* community in terms of economics, but it was a tight-knit community that was doing well and people had their own businesses and–

Nancy: They paid taxes too!

Ingrid: Yeah!

Nancy: And yet didn't receive the sanitation services…

Ingrid: So it's an example. And then in the wake of industrial development in Africville, there were left a lot of–a number of environmental hazards. So that's why I always say that Africville represents a case of environmental racism *and* gentrification. Because in the wake of the industrial kind of development that they were doing in Africville, several environmental hazards were left, like three systems of railway tracks, a cotton factory. There's a list of things that were left that were environmentally hazardous in that community. So it's, you know, we can call it "urban revitalization," all these nice terms ("urban revitalization" or "gentrification"), but it was expulsion, right, of a community that they needed to get out [of] there and that the community went to other places. They went to Montreal, they went to other parts of Halifax, like the North End of Halifax, but in very low-income areas such as Uniacke Square, which is a social housing area, you know, it is not looked upon in a very good light. You know, Uniacke Square is a stigmatized area. People look at

it (it's a stereotype, of course), but they look at it as a place with guns and Black people with guns and drugs, and so they were forced into other areas of Halifax and Canada.

Kai: One of the dimensions of injustice that I'm *specifically* interested in is one of *recognitional injustice* in current dominant structures, politics, and social structures here in Canada and in the US. But what your movie does, *There's Something in the Water*, what it does so well is it reveals–like I said, the procedural injustices at the heart of the problem–but also these recognitional injustices. You mentioned at the beginning how both Indigenous communities and many Black communities also have this more holistic way of understanding well-being, and those ways are not sufficiently treated, are not attended to through law or policy, right? So, for example, there are quotes in the beginning of the movie about…in the Boat Harbour case where the Pictou Landing First Nation is talking about–I think they called it *A'se'k*, their–

Ingrid: That's the actual Indigenous name for Pictou Landing First Nation.

Kai: And they talk about that as a sacred body of water for them, right, that it was called "The Other Room" as if it were a part of their *home*, like physically, right? And the harm that they revealed in talking about that. And I think the woman's name was Michelle [Francis-Denny], one of the extraordinary women they interviewed, it was so palpable that it wasn't just the denial of the *resources* from that place, but a *physical harm* that they experienced as a result of the harm to this place that was their home, right? And in Western cultures, which we've inherited through colonization, we don't interpret those as harms in the way it's like, "Oh, if it's not a physical resource that you own, then that's not a harm." It doesn't count as a harm, right? If it's not cancer, and we can't prove that the dump was the cause, then that doesn't count as a harm, right? But it shouldn't be that way.

Ingrid: Yeah. I mean, both Pictou Landing First Nation was a pristine hunting and fishing ground and very spiritual to the community. And you're right, in your Western knowledge, we separate the mind and the body. It's very fashionable now to do yoga and mindfulness healing and meditation: those are non-Western approaches that recognize holism, but it's fashionable for a lot of people and people, but other people are also starting to understand the importance of it. But in traditional kind of original Euro-Western thought, everything is divided. That's why we have psychology departments that are separate from medical departments, even though your mind is connected to your body. [**Kai:** Yeah] I mean, though, that when our mind hurts in many ways when we're going through things that are emotionally difficult, it's something we feel in our body and vice versa.

The way in which–I've said this in the book, as well–the way in which environmental assessments are done also indicate to us that there's this deep separation of mind, body, and spirit in Western culture, because an environmental assessment is, of course, a tool that decides where a particular project in, you know, environmentally hazardous project goes. And it does not consider the positioning of Indigenous people in terms of all the various social ills that they experience. It does not acknowledge health issues. It just decides to put a dump in a particular place or a pipeline without considering other issues [**Kai:** Yeah] how it impacts the well-being.

Kai: Well, in the context of the Alton Gas project, which was in the–can you pronounce that river for me? I stumble over it.

Ingrid: Shubenacadie.

Kai: Thank you!

Ingrid: Took me a while! [Laughter]

Kai: I won't try to say it! In the context of that project, right where the First Nation was up in arms about this proposal to pump a *large* quantity of salt water into a river in a way that would very likely harm that ecosystem, the impacts on the First Nations' right to fish *their* culturally significant fish species, right, those were not included, right? It was–and I mean, the ecological impacts were *supposedly* considered–although there's a lot of critique about whether they were sufficient or not, but yeah, the impacts on a people through the fish, those were not attended to through that provincial environmental impact assessment. And it's like, well, those are the ones that are most closely linked to their identities, right? Like those are the ones *most likely* to impact their well-being, and yet somehow, our colonial systems have excluded those as legitimate harms to be considered through the environmental impact assessment process.

Ingrid: Yes. I think you know the way to kind of address the lack of knowledge we have in Western society and in Western research and universities (and it's happening more and more), is that we need more knowledge about information about traditional Indigenous knowledge. And you know that's–it's happening in Canada because there are courses at McMaster and other universities across Canada that are teaching students about Traditional Indigenous Knowledge, Indigenous epistemology. So that, to me, is really the way to address it. It's rooted in our school systems and how we learn and what we think is important, and whose ways of knowing we think holds most significance. So that, to me, is a structural issue in terms of how we're educated.

And I think as universities start to, kind of, deliver more courses on Indigenous issues in general, but also Indigenous Knowledge, and also specifically Indigenous knowledge in health and also in environment, then we can start to address these issues. But we're working with two completely different ways of knowing: Western ways of knowing–very different, very interested in concrete things that you can see. And if you can't see it, then you can't prove it. And then you've got Indigenous Knowledge, which is, once again, much more holistic, and they would also say that they have their own science. They have their own Indigenous Science, but it would be science that Western researchers would underestimate, of course, and dismiss.

Kai: Yeah, it'll be key to teach that in a way that it doesn't feel token, right? That it–because at the moment, I worry that just teaching about Indigenous ways of knowing is not sufficient to demonstrate that link to well-being, right? And so I think that these ideas of justice are really crucial right, because a fundamental principle of recognitional injustice is that we ought to be able to *recognize* the world *as the other person sees it* in the way that we make our decisions. And so if the other party–if the affected parties, in this case–see it as a really *fundamental*, like larger-than-person, a *nation-scale* harm to ruin this ecosystem that they have depended upon for time immemorial–then we need to represent that as being, like, equally valuable, right? So that Indigenous Knowledge doesn't just get seen as something "quaint," you know, that's like "interesting" and of historical importance, but not necessarily of *present-day* importance, which it obviously is.

Ingrid: Yeah, you're right about that. And probably the first step is not about Indigenous Knowledge. It's just about Indigeneity and how we incorporate that from grade school onwards. I've had so many students say to me, because I was teaching, I'm teaching, and I teach about Indigenous (obviously) issues in my courses, because I'm teaching about environmental racism and health, and students

have said to me that it's the first time they're learning about it, and they wish they had been taught this in grade school. So a much more organic introduction to Indigeneity and the history of Indigenous people and colonization, having it kind of *woven through* grade school and beyond in organic, natural ways, so it doesn't otherwise…Of course, as you're saying, Indigenous people as just part of the curriculum is probably the first step.

Nancy: Yeah, that's absolutely correct, especially in terms of reconciliation and the corollaries. Maybe if we could segue, Ingrid, into your interests, vis-a-vis feminism, and not only in your public health expertise. You mentioned reproductive justice issues; one of your tenets in your book regarding transformative resurgence is to "Honor women and youth-led, solutions-oriented, grassroots resistance." The book, as well as the film, underscore the centrality of women in these activist efforts. Could you speak a little bit about, number one, the ways in which, for instance, in the film, you chose particular–you and Ian Daniel and Elliot Page–chose particular stories. And I think reading some of your articles and some of your talks, listening to the talks, you stress the importance of community voices and how the centrality of including people in their own discussions is really imperative. So could you speak a little bit about your sort of feminist activist concerns, and then how that relates to community voices?

Ingrid: Feminism, and particularly black feminism, was something I became interested in when I was doing my Master's degree in London, England, at the University of London. I was going there to look at the underachievement of Black students in the educational system. That's what I thought I would do my Ph.D. in. That's what I really thought my career was going to be in, because I was concerned about the high dropout rates of Black children in Toronto schools. And then there was this whole literature in England, British literature about Black British people, who are *also* underachieving in the British school system. But I was introduced to a lot of Black feminist scholars at that time. I didn't know much about Black feminism at that time. I knew about feminism, but I didn't–I didn't necessarily always feel engaged, although I definitely know I have feminist *leanings* because of, you know, the decade that I grew up in and having a mother who pushed certain things in terms of independence and education and, you know, so I had a feminist sister. She was strongly feminist.

But I became more of a Black feminist because feminism didn't speak to me. White feminism and the work I was reading was about that. Why is, you know, feminism, or white feminism, not enough, and how Black women have very specific experiences in their lives, and Black feminism speaks to those. So I was really interested in that work, and when I went to OISE [Ontario Institute for Studies in Education] to do my Ph.D., I was going to still look at education and the dropout rate, but I started reading literature on mental health, and Black women, and it spoke to me. And I went to my supervisor and I said, "Can I change my thesis topic from underachievement in the educational system experienced by Black people to Black women's mental health issues as a result of racism and discrimination and sexism?" And I don't know if he was jumping out for joy, but he said, "It's fine." So I think, yeah, I became a very strong, at that time, Black feminist. Feminism is not enough for me. It's Black women's experience, the world and the family and reproductive issues in very specific ways. And I loved reading the literature on that, mostly British, and then later US.

The film, despite my feminist leanings, the decision to have, to feature–

Kai: I was gonna ask about this. It was so notable to me. And it's not, I mean, it's not unique that there are so many strong women at the forefront of these battles, but it was definitely notable that in every single story it was–it was women leading the charge.

Ingrid: You have Elliot Page to thank for that, not me! Because we had filmed a man by the name of Irvine Carvery: major activist, *fantastic* speaker, *fantastic* storyteller. I would invite him to speak at events in Halifax all the time because he's such a commanding speaker. I wanted him in the film, and I thought Africville *had* to be in the film. Africville is one of the most, you know, popular, well-known cases of environmental racism. And they *had* filmed him, they *had* filmed him. They interviewed him on film. And then Elliot Page sent me an email saying, "Um, Ian and I think that this should just focus on women." And I said, "What about Irvine Carvery?" He said, "Well, no, we're thinking, we're not–we're not going to use him." And I said, "Okay, well, you can tell him because he's a friend of mine and he's also somebody who, you know, he enjoys being on camera. And I–this was going to be disappointing." But Elliot said, "Yeah, we're seeing this as an all-women film." And it might have something to do with the fact that I did a journal article on environmental racism about women: "Women on the Front Lines," it's called. It seems to be very popular, one of my most popular environmental justice journal articles, because a lot of students say they've read it. So I did do that, and I may have sent them that, yeah, as a backgrounder to help with the film. I was disappointed when they said that, and then later, when I saw the film, I said, "*Yeah*, it makes sense that this is all women." And I can see young girls looking at the film and feeling *inspired*, and now it's so right. Now I'm so happy they made that decision. The only reason I didn't [at the time] is because I just think you can't beat Irvine Carvery as a speaker. But beyond that, I'm now so happy!

Kai: The women that you had in the film were amazing. Absolutely amazing. I mean each of them in their own ways, they are *so* powerful in their representation of the vulnerability and the hurt and the injustice, but without a kind of bitterness that, like, you know, might paralyze someone from acting. I felt it so palpably. And every time I watch it, I feel it even more strongly.

Nancy: Ingrid, we were wondering, for instance, you did write *Jezebel Tales*, and that one meditated on US– African American women's representations–and you do, in view of your pedagogical sort of scholarship, you do talk about theorists like bell hooks and Patricia Hill Collins. Could you tell us in terms of your pedagogy (like how you teach), how do theories get translated into particular practical applications, like in the classroom or when you're presenting to others? Is your pedagogical approach "transgressive," to quote bell hooks, or what sorts of methods do you engage when you're teaching?

Ingrid: Intersectionality. And I know everybody's talking about that today, *a lot* today, but you know, way back when I was doing my Ph.D., that's, you know, that's what I was introduced to: an intersectional framework. And of course, that was created by–what's her name?

Nancy: Kimberlé Crenshaw?

Ingrid: Kimberlé Crenshaw. So I, you know, I teach a gender and health course and it's very much feminist, but I prefer an intersectional approach because I want to engage with everything. I want to engage with gender identity, trans issues now that I feel a little bit more comfortable. I wasn't always doing that. And of course, trans issues are, you know, just in popular culture, it's just more talked about now, but it wasn't when I was doing my PhD. So I want to be able to talk about trans issues.

So I talk about gender identity, sexual orientation, social class, disability, age. For whatever, yeah, I'm able, surprisingly, to talk about *all* those things, because I choose my articles very carefully and make sure that some aspects of those social identities are in the articles, and if they're not, then I'm bringing them together in the classroom, so *none* of them are left untouched. It's the gamut and the topics that I choose, whether it's environmental racism–you know, environmental racism

allows me to talk about many of those things together. You can't talk about all of them at once, perhaps, but–and the guest lecturers I bring in talk about all those things. So I'm very–I guess I would say I'm a Black feminist in terms of some of the work I've done on health and mental health, but I'm–I'm an intersectional scholar. I prefer to situate myself within intersectionality and the way it plays out, I guess, beyond the *classroom* is that because of that framework, I'm able to understand the need when I am developing an interview guide or organizing a workshop and developing the questionnaire for the workshop and wanting a particular framework for the workshop, the focus group, or the interview, that intersectionality is captured, even in terms of who I want to recruit.

You know, when I was doing some climate change workshops in Greater Toronto and Hamilton area this year, the recruitment was specifically for people from all those groups. I wanted to hear, for example, how they experience climate change in very different ways, maybe based on sexual orientation and gender identity, as much as possible. I don't want to overcomplicate things or slice things up too much, but if you're asking about how it plays out practically? If I'm doing a focus group, because I need to do a focus group or an interview or workshop in order to conduct research that will then get to policy, then I make sure that the people I recruit represent different social identities, certainly at once, you know, because we all have multiple identities at once. We are gendered in particular ways and classed and raced in particular ways. And then that allows me, then when I write the final report, to talk about how those intersections shape people's experiences, which a lot of policy people and other people who are not academics are not even thinking of, right? I really think that, even though it's very basic to me, to do that–to do work on intersectionality–the policy-makers that I speak with and meet with have not thought of those things.

The documentary that I just–I have a new documentary now on climate change in Black communities in the Greater Toronto Area. I'm looking at social class, I'm looking at geography, I'm looking as much as possible, I engage with those social identities so I can open the eyes of policymakers. That's where it's important. I get it. But not everybody is an academic, and not everybody has studied these issues and understands intersectionality. So where it gets practical then is then I can incorporate that into my policy brief, my five-page policy brief that I'm going to send to the policymaker, and they can see the *totality* of experiences that Black people have based on social identities, that it's not one experience, that experience is not a homogenous experience, but it's shaped by *all* of these different experiences *due to* their social identity. Yeah. So it comes out in the work that I do with communities, the community engagement, who I decide to recruit, how I recruit, where I recruit, the outcomes and documents that I write or develop from the data gathering, who I share it with, what's in the information and documents that I share with–with policymakers and community organizers and community leaders and community organizations. It's extremely important to me!

Nancy: I guess, Ingrid, in terms of talking about heavy issues like violence and abjection, or people being left out or abused, or essentially made Other: we were wondering, you know, with your background in psychology as well, how do negative affects like shame come through in your work as you perceive them, and how do you sort of transmute those negative affects–those "bad" feelings–into something that's perhaps more healing, or at least incite some sort of reflection or metamorphosis, at least in terms of public attitudes?

Ingrid: That's a good question! The shame has come out through community members, if that's what

you're getting at? The shame has come out through community members who feel stigmatized, that there's a taboo. They feel shame by the fact that, for example, they're living near a dump.

Kai: Or, in the words of Louise [Delisle], the fact that, because they had to walk past the dump on the way to school every morning, that they would smell like the dump when they got to school. And then be spurned for it.

Ingrid: That's right, and that came out just even in addition to the documentary, it came out when I decided I would do a project in Shelburne on the mental health impacts of environmental racism. Because Louise was telling me, "Oh, Ingrid, they're real mental health impacts. Our men, our Black men are all on drugs. They're addicted to substances, and I think part of the reason they are is because of that dump. Our young children, our children, our adolescents, are not doing well. They're not doing well in school, and I think they're shamed because of the dump." So it's come out through community members, you know. Louise would say, with respect to the folks in Shelburne, that, you know, "We are already stigmatized because of our race. We're seen as nothing in Shelburne, the lowest of the low. And then we are also seen as people who live near the dump and therefore we are seen *as* the dump." I thought, "Wow." You know, so I think for members of her community who are perhaps not doing so well in terms of academics and in terms of health and mental health and high rates of substance dependence, she's said to me that part of that is the shame and the stigma of living near the dump and also being Black, specifically, in Shelburne. And I, you know, when I speak to her, I see how hard it is to be Black *in* Shelburne, because the white community there is *unrelenting* in their racism and not wanting to understand. I haven't seen anything like that in other parts of Canada. And you know, I say to Louise often, I say, "It feels like the Southern part of the United States when I go to Shelburne."

Nancy: It's a national shame as well to realize (you broach this in your film), this sort of paradisal discourse of Canada as this heaven. Even Martin Luther King, when he gave the Massey Lectures in 1967, he talked about how Canada was like a "heaven," given, you know, the historical realities of the Underground Railroad. So, yeah, absolutely.

Kai: The shame that we–as, you know, folks who have experienced that kind of marginalization–that we have taken into ourselves has turned into a movement that, I think, is also turning shame on others, in a way. And this is my own, my own sense of it. But I think a lot of the way that we talk about these problems, you know, whether we intend it or not, is then internalized by white people in particular, as something that they should feel ashamed of. And I feel like, especially in light of recent events with the US election, I feel like there's a *real backlash* against that: like the notion that the Left is shaming those who don't see eye to eye, who can't see environmental racism, who–you know–are *proud* of their white privilege, in a sense, right? That is actually something that people might feel, or rather, that there is reason to feel bad about that, right? And I don't–I think that there's differences in how the activist communities see this, right? Whether we are intentional about making others feel guilty or feel ashamed of themselves or their people? But I feel like, you know, for myself, I look at the backlash, and I think that that is partly due to the negative effects of *shame as a tool for justice:* of using shame in dialogue in a way that the oppressors will feel ashamed. And I can't help but think, you know, when we're thinking about system change, I can't help but think that we got it *a little bit* wrong. I feel like we went a little too far, in a sense–maybe not too far–just like with a flavor of that was maybe not, either *not intended or not constructive*.

Ingrid: Are you saying that you think a lot of activists are using shame as a tool against white people to address structural issues?

Kai: Yeah, and I don't think it's just against–I don't think it's just about racism, you know, and this is not just activists. I mean, honestly, this is like children, right, when they are coming home and having conversations with their parents. I personally don't think it's an accident that *so many of these* right-wing backlashes are coming about as a result of gender policies and the kind of *policing of speech* that children bring home to their parents, right? About pronouns, for example, right? That they are imparting a shame on older generations who have trouble recognizing that pronouns don't necessarily align with how a person looks. You know, like that–that's actually hard for folks who are like, I don't know, 40 something and older, right? So children are *unknowingly* wielding shame as a tool for what they see as justice in a way that I think is part of what has inspired so much of the backlash across North America against these "woke liberal policies," and *especially* in their entrenchment in education that has their children shaming their parents for these "woke" causes, right? Like, I don't know: feel free to differ.

Ingrid: Do you think shame is the way to go though? I'm trying to get a sense from you if you think shame is the right tool to use?

Kai: My feeling–yeah, no–my feeling is that it isn't. My feeling is that it's not.

Ingrid: White guilt. You know, when white people talk about white guilt, yeah, that's–you know–I'm not interested in that, and I'm not really… they should feel ashamed, of course, but that's not going to get us anywhere, right? It's the structural changes and the policy changes that are important to me. And I'm not sure necessarily if policymakers have to feel shame in order to change policy.

Kai: I agree.

Nancy: Well, Kai, you speak from a different location because you're multi-racial, as somebody with European as well as Asian extraction. So yeah. I mean, I think it's very much complicated by our identity and then the galvanization about particular identity politics, and this is inflected by our national identities.

Kai: Yeah, I mean, just on my side, I felt shame as a child, being biracial, being half-Chinese, right? So I *suppressed* the Chinese part of my identity, but then later, later in life, I'm ashamed of the white side. Yeah. Like, hey, I'm ashamed to have been a part of the oppressors, you know.

Ingrid: And who made you ashamed of the Chinese side?

Kai: Oh, you know, kids in the schoolyard, basically. Racist slurs for mostly my last name and then also school lunches and stuff like that. But, yeah, so Nancy's right. Like, you know, I've been there in terms of internalizing shame and it having a real effect on my identity. But yeah, also being able to see that it really does go both ways. Like the shame that I feel as a person who is partly white is just as–is greater, actually–in a sense, than the shame that I felt [being partly Chinese].

Ingrid: Okay, and you feel that shame of oppression that white people have done to others because you're part-white so you feel that shame…

Kai: Yeah, for having, in a sense–yeah, being a part of that system of oppression.

Nancy: If we could remember, though, for instance, to quote towering African American intellectual W.E.B Du Bois, when he writes in the *Souls of Black Folk* that we are all "coworkers in the kingdom of culture": we know that, you know, white activists have been involved in movements like abolition;

white activists have been involved in Black Lives Matter. So it's really not so easy to reduce us to these racial categories. I think that, you know, apart from kinship and blood ties, there's so many different elective affinities and coalitional politics that need to come to the fore.

So we were wondering, perhaps to close, Ingrid, could you share with us what's in the future in terms of your vision and your ambition? You have multiple projects coming up. Could you, you know, share a little bit of what your aspirations are in terms of the next steps?

Ingrid: Sure, I mean, I could talk about all the projects I'm doing, but I think what's more important is that I'm very excited that we now have an environmental justice law. What accompanies that is a National Environmental Justice Strategy. I'm not leading it. The Federal Department of Environment and Climate Change is leading it, but I would love to be involved in some way in the future because I see this kind of as my baby, right? I co-developed with Lenore Zann the environmental racism bill in Nova Scotia back in 2015, and we were the ones who co-developed Bill C-226, the national federal environmental racism justice bill that is now law. So I see this as kind of the work that I started. So I'd like to, in some way, support the new National Environmental Justice Strategy that's mentioned in the bill. It's going to be, you know, they're going to be consulting with Indigenous and Black and other racialized communities across Canada and in many ways, that means that those communities get to be involved in the co-creation of policy which they've never been involved in. They've never had a seat at the table. So I don't know what lies ahead. You know, the federal environmental department and climate change department may not want me involved at all, so that's fine. I'm sure they can handle it, but I'm really interested in seeing what comes of it.

Kai: Can you tell us a bit more about that, Ingrid, before you go on? So this was a pretty major effort at system change on your part, right? To actually introduce a law, and a law that is fundamentally different from any other law we have on the books, right? Either provincially in Nova Scotia or federally now. Can you tell us a little bit about the difficulty getting *traction* with that, and then how you ultimately succeeded with it? And also then *how much* of *what kind* of change that enables?

Ingrid: It's been a long road, right? I met with Lenore Zann, a politician in Nova Scotia. She was, at that time, an NDP MLA. In January of 2015, didn't know I was meeting with her to develop any kind of bill. I just thought, "She's an MLA, maybe she can help me and support me in addressing environmental racism." And she was the one during our coffee, you know, we were at Starbucks and having coffee. She said, "Well, we can develop a private member's bill, but I just want to caution you, Ingrid, that those bills never turn into law" (which is interesting, that it has!). "It never turns into law, but what it can do is it can give the topic of environmental racism attention. We can get into all the newspapers, and I can do a press conference after I introduce it, and you can be there, and you can talk to the press." And I said, "Okay, that's great!" And all those things did happen.

She introduced it, she organized a press conference. I talked about it to a lot of press. The next day it was in all the papers. I don't think Nova Scotia talked about environmental racism to that extent. And, you know, it was introduced, and then it went to second reading, and it didn't–it didn't pass. And she tried every year since 2015 up until 2018 to introduce it again and again, and nothing ever happened. And then, just before COVID hit, in 2020, she said, "Ingrid, remember that bill that we developed?" I said, "Yeah." She said, "Why don't we turn it into a federal bill?" And she was now MP Liberal Party. She had moved over to Liberal Party MP, and I said, "Yeah." I said, "You know, so many Indigenous communities across Canada with pipelines in their backyard. Why should we

confine it just to Nova Scotia? Let's deal with it. Let's do a federal bill." And we made the bill a bit more robust, I would say a stronger bill. She introduced it on February 26th of 2020 and then there was another introduction of some kind. She spoke to it in December of 2020, and then, as you know, the snap election was called. This was so frustrating! Snap election was called in 2021 September. And when that happens, all Private Member's Bills die. They die. What is called "die on the Order Paper" is what it's called. So the bill was no longer after all of that. So I said to Lenore, and then Lenore lost her seat. She lost her seat in Nova Scotia to a Conservative. So I said, "Lenore, what now? You know how long we've been trying to do this?" I was so frustrated! And she said, "Well, I'm hearing some rumblings that Elizabeth May might want to sponsor the bill." So we got onto a Zoom call with Elizabeth May, and Elizabeth May said, "I've got *another* bill I want to sponsor. So it's either your bill, Ingrid, or it's this other bill. I will go ahead with your bill, Ingrid, if I know that you're going to support me." I said, "Yes!" I said, "I'm part of this Canadian coalition, Coalition of Environmental Justice and Climate Change organization. We have a whole bunch of civil society organizations as our members. David Suzuki, Environmental Defense...." I said, "We're going to support you! We've done this before. We've done online campaigns on social media. Trust me, we'll support you!" She said, "Okay, I'm not going to worry about the other bill; I'll do this bill."

And she introduced it *again* in 2022. And this time–it *used* to be Bill C-230 under Lenore–and now was Bill C-226. And it had to go through the *same* process it went through *all the way* through Parliament, you know, same process as Lenore. And then, unlike with Lenore of course, it was at Senate, which I never–that, to me, was an achievement! Just the fact that it reached Senate. And I thought, "Maybe we have a chance." Don't forget, this all started in 2015 for me, right, as a Nova Scotia bill. And then it went to Third Reading at Senate this year in June. And I thought, "*Wow.*" And then I, you know, there were some critiques about the bill by certain politicians, of course, the Conservatives and the [Bloc] Québécois folks, but we had some witnesses. I was a witness. Witnesses have five minutes to speak. And there were witnesses who really said some really great things about it, but I was still worried. And then we hear it passes, and then a week later, June 20th, it was given Royal Assent, which means the bill becomes law. And I was in shock because it's *been* so long, and there were times I just gave up, and I said, "It's probably not going to happen in my lifetime, but there'll be some young person who will support it and get it passed into law." So I never thought it would be while I was alive. [Laughter] So it's been a *long* journey when you think about the fact that it started in Nova Scotia, and Nova Scotia–it was the first environmental racism bill in Nova Scotia, but also in Canada. No one was talking about it to that extent, and no one was thinking about a bill. So for me and Lenore, it's a long journey, longer than most because of when we started all of this.

Kai: We have a conversation lined up with Dr. David Boyd, who was UN Special Rapporteur on Human Rights and the Environment, and we're going to talk to him about environmental law and its power and also its weaknesses when it is–when it is weak. And so just quickly, the law in question that you're talking about, the Act C-226, it's not a binding, enforceable law, right? Like it doesn't enable communities to sue the government or companies based on what has happened or what has not happened, right? But it has a *different* kind of role in terms of bringing about change. And can you just say just a tiny bit as we wrap up about the nature of the change that this act enables?

Ingrid: Yeah, it doesn't do that, as you said, but it is supposed to look at, or look at *addressing* current or past cases of environmental racism and future. And although no one likes the word *reparations*, there's reparations–is it–I would say reparations is a part of it, because if you look at the bill, it talks about financial compensation to communities who have been impacted. So, you know, the law

accompanies the National Strategy, which is, as I said, to consult with communities, to share their concerns, and to share their solutions. So the solutions that they share will be incorporated into that National Environmental Justice Strategy, which is essentially a policy. So I see the bill as important for redressing past cases of environmental racism. It's also, you know, a study has probably been completed by now. When I was talking to the person who's leading this, it hadn't been completed, but the study is looking at the health effects. It's looking at socio-economic status, race, and health. I love that intersectional focus, in terms of providing evidence that this is real in terms of the health effects, because so many people I've met with over the years, particularly government, don't want to believe that there are health effects, and also just consulting with communities to get their ideas and suggestions for how environmental racism should be addressed.

So for me, that's important, because one of the definitions of environmental racism is that the communities–so one of the four, the five definitions of environmental racism is: the communities that are impacted never have a seat at the table. They never get to be at decision-making tables. They're excluded over generations from being part of decision-making. And for me, even though we can look at this as just consultations with communities, the fact that they can actually provide suggestions on solutions, at least in some way, they're being part of policy-making to me, because the National Environmental Justice Strategy is a policy, and they will be able to say, "Well, this is how I feel," and the government has never done that. This is how I feel it should be addressed from the perspective of my community. And to this extent, the government has never done this. I mean, I've done it to some extent in terms of consulting with communities. I just don't have the grants and the funding to do all of Canada. The government has never done this, and this is really important.

Just being heard, like everything we talked about today really comes down to being heard, and the communities have never felt heard. And you know–what's the Environment Minister's name? You know, he [Steven Guilbeault] went down to Shelburne this year and he made some promises. I hope, you know, he commits to those. But I see a real interest; I see it in terms of addressing some of these issues. He did a roundtable with Shelburne folks, listened to their concerns, and listened to some of the other concerns they had about urban planning issues and the fact that they don't have sidewalks, and the fact that they're on well water, and all these other issues that, even though he can't address, he can point them in the right direction. So I'm *hoping* that this government is serious. But then, you know, we have a–we may have new [**Kai:** That's right] leadership.

Kai: That's right. Yeah, because it will be up to the government. Once it's a strategy, it's policy, it's up to the government to decide how to implement that law. So, we're gonna have to wrap up, but this is just a great way to end it in terms of a *very* tangible change that *you* have helped to bring about, that changes the system in a way that brings these crucial considerations to light through decades of work amplifying the voices of community leaders and activists. We're so grateful for what you've been doing and what you are, you know, are doing *now* and what you will do in the future.

Ingrid: And it's important for me to thank the communities, because I haven't done it alone. I've done it with politicians, environmental scientists, and Indigenous and Black communities, so we never want to forget that. You know, I sometimes get a lot of attention because I'm a professor. I have a certain amount of privilege, I realize that. Even if I'm Black, I have lots of privilege. But we have to remember that communities have also been leading the way on this before I came along. Don't forget, I didn't know what this was all about: "Environmental racism? What's that?" [Laughter] But there were communities leading the way on it long before I got a sense of what it was. So yeah.

Nancy: And Ingrid, you mentioned earlier spirituality, and just as Kai and you were talking, I thought of the patron saint of social justice and race relations [who] is San Martín de Porres, a Peruvian saint, and he was Black, Indigenous and white.

Ingrid: Wow!

Nancy: So maybe we can end on that note. [Laughter]

Ingrid: You're very well read.

Nancy: Thank you so much, and thank you, Dr. Waldron, for your wonderful insights.

Ingrid: It was a pleasure!

Maia: ----------
[*Medley of Small Planet Heroes theme song*]

Thank you for listening to this episode of *Small Planet Heroes*. *Small Planet Heroes* is a production of CoSphere, a project of the University of British Columbia. UBC is situated on the unceded territory of the Musqueam First Nation. Our guest this week was Dr. Ingrid Waldron. Check out our show links in the description below to learn more about their work and ongoing projects. *Small Planet Heroes* was created by our Executive Producer, Dr. Kai Chan. This episode was edited by Emma Jarek-Simard. Production is by me, Maia O'Donnell, Sam Blackwell, Emma Jarek-Simard and Clare Price. Your hosts this week were Dr. Kai Chan and Dr. Nancy Kang. Our show coordinators are Clare Price, Sam Blackwell, Maia O'Donnell, Dr. Nancy Kang and Emma Jarek-Simard. Special thanks to Jai Ranganathan, Bilal Bartai, Elizabeth Ye, Katie Kathiresan, Dr. Nancy Kang, Anahita Seraji, Dr. Sarah Klain, and Zaida Schneider. Our theme song was written and performed by Daniel Forrest. Our interviews are conducted and recorded at UBC Studios. If you would like to join our Community of Small Planet Heroes, check out www.cosphere.net. Thank you for listening.

Selected Links to Things Mentioned or Discussed:

There’s Something In The Water: Environmental Racism in Indigenous & Black Communities (book)

There's Something in the Water (documentary)

The ENRICH Project

Union of Nova Scotia Mi’kmaq

From The Enlightenment to Black Lives Matter: Tracing the impacts of racial trauma in black communities from the colonial era to the present (book)

APTN News on the Grassroots Grandmothers

Pictou Landing First Nation

Alton Underground Natural Gas Storage Facility | Environmental Assessment

Nova Scotia Archives - African Nova Scotians in the Age of Slavery and Abolition (on Black Loyalists)

The story of Africville | CMHR

Remember Africville (documentary)

On Nova Scotia's historic Shubenacadie River, a slow-motion showdown | Globalnews.ca

Irvine Carvery profile from the *Halifax Daily News*

Women on the Frontlines (Dr. Waldron's article)

Trailblazing feminist author, critic and activist bell hooks has died at 69 (on the Black public intellectual)

Martin Luther King's 1967 Massey Lectures

Kimberlé Crenshaw: The urgency of intersectionality | TED Talk

The Souls of Black Folk by W.E.B. Du Bois

National Environmental Justice Law & Strategy

Lenore Zann - Member of Parliament

How a bill becomes law in Canada

Elizabeth May

Minister Guilbeault meets with historically impacted Black community in advance of environmental justice and racism bill

St. Martin de Porres, Dominican - Information on the Saint of the Day - Vatican News

***Small Planet Heroes* information:**

CoSphere.net

Follow Small Planet Heroes on Instagram

Follow CoSphere on Instagram, Facebook and LinkedIn

Follow Dr. Kai Chan on LinkedIn

Follow UBC IRES on LinkedIn and BlueSky

Institute for Resources, Environment and Sustainability

CHANS Lab

UBC Studios

Executive Producer Dr. Kai Chan

Production and show coordination by Sam Blackwell, Maia O'Donnell, Emma Jarek-Simard, Clare Price, and Dr. Nancy Kang

Editing for this episode by Emma Jarek-Simard

Theme song by Daniel Forrest

Transcripts by Sam Blackwell, with the help of Otter.ai, and with Dr. Nancy Kang