

Catalyst Origin Stories: Deboleena Roy in Conversation with Kiran Pienaar and Robyn Lee

Deboleena Roy
Emory University
droy2@emory.edu

Kiran Pienaar
Deakin University
kiran.pienaar@deakin.edu.au

Robyn Lee
University of Alberta
robyn5@ualberta.ca

Abstract

To mark the ten-year anniversary of the journal, former and current *Catalyst* editors reflect on the journal's origins, its contributions to feminist technoscience, and their aspirations for *Catalyst* in the next ten years and beyond. Presented in conversation format, the piece offers insights into the rich histories and intellectual legacies that have shaped *Catalyst*, and the feminist ethos that underpins the journal's scholarship and editorial practices.

Keywords

Feminist technoscience, *Catalyst*, feminist ethos, editorial practices

Opening Reflections

Kiran Pienaar (KP): Maybe we could start with what you think the key contributions of *Catalyst* are to feminist technoscience.

Roy, Deboleena, Kiran Pienaar, and Robyn Lee. 2025. "Catalyst Origin Stories: Deboleena Roy in Conversation with Kiran Pienaar and Robyn Lee." *Catalyst: Feminism, Theory, Technoscience* 11 (2): 1–14.

<http://www.catalystjournal.org> | ISSN: 2380-3312

© Deboleena Roy, Kiran Pienaar, and Robyn Lee. 2025 | Licensed to the Catalyst Project under a Creative Commons Attribution Non-Commercial No Derivatives license

Deboleena Roy (DR): Community building, not just networking, creating a space for people to develop; the support and friendships. It's a space for mentoring. Of course, there's an academic side to it. But I think when it comes to feminist organizing, whether it's inside academia or outside of it, the great thing is that it's not just about the end result. It's about asking, "what's happening around us and what are we doing to get us to our goal." I think that this has been the biggest gift in the journey of this journal. This journal is an example of how a collective can work and how other opportunities can come along the way.

KP: Oh, that's such a beautiful response, and that really resonates with me. Feel free to chime in as well, Robyn, if you want to add anything.

Robyn Lee (RL): Oh, yeah, that was terrific. Thank you. It's so wonderful to hear you reflect on what makes *Catalyst* so important because it's consistent with how we're experiencing it too.

DR: Good. You know, we really thought hard about how to develop this journal and we knew it was going to be a challenge right from the beginning. The people who did put those early years of blood, sweat, and tears knew that we weren't going to compromise our values for the sake of becoming an academic journal, which it is. We didn't want to fall into a certain kind of "cookie-cutter" way of doing things. There were a lot of early discussions about working with a university press, and every model that we explored basically took away exactly what I just described: It felt like we would have to compromise the relationship building and that opportunity to invite more people into the process, and our goal of making it a distributed project. Every model that we looked at didn't seem to fit our vision, and so it made things more difficult because we had to scrounge to find funding, and that continues to be part of the work. But I'm so glad that we stuck to those ideals.

KP: I think that's one of the things that really makes *Catalyst* unique and distinctive. And we're still building on that legacy. But as you say, it's a challenge, because we also looked at other models or possibilities for getting the journal indexed. But I think one of the challenges is balancing those imperatives with the desire to be completely independent and not be answering to publishers or to other imperatives that detract from the feminist solidarity, and community building and inclusivity that is so unique and special to *Catalyst*.

DR: I could be wrong, but I thought that issue had been resolved when Murphy and Banu served as the lead editors. I think it was when Murphy took it on at University of Toronto, they were able to get an ISBN standing for the journal and also be indexed through University of Toronto Libraries.

KP: Oh, that's interesting. We must look into that. I don't know that it is [resolved] because we had a librarian come and talk to us about indexing.

RL: Yes, we have been thinking about it because one major motivation for indexing is because we have so many junior scholars publishing in *Catalyst* that it could be advantageous for their careers, and also just to expand the readership potentially as well. So we've been looking at some options which wouldn't require us to change anything substantial about how *Catalyst* is run. But hopefully, just be able to broaden the audience, making sure people who are publishing [in *Catalyst*] are getting read.

DR: Good, because I think we became institutionally legitimate through the University of Toronto Libraries, but that was so long ago. I don't remember details, but there are notes! If you go back to the Google drive; do you all still use the Google drive?

KP: Yes, we do. I'm actually looking at it right now.

Origin Stories: Starting *Catalyst*

DR: That's hilarious. So this is a funny story...I'll just give a little bit of my background and what made me want to do something like this. My PhD is in neuroscience and molecular biology. And then I made a radical shift into women's studies for my first tenure-track job because they wanted to hire a feminist scientist. I had never taken a women's studies class. I had no idea about the scholarly field of women's studies, but I did consider myself a feminist. I was told by this women's studies department that I needed to publish in women's studies journals to get tenure, not just in the science journals. And so, you know, I thought, "Okay, well, where am I going to publish this work as a scientist who's doing feminist work?" And the only journal that I could find really that made sense was *Hypatia*. I had to learn feminist philosophy and feminist philosophy of science to then place my work. I would not have taken that as my career path and professional path if it wasn't for that journal, and for the fact that I had to get publications in order to get tenure. I thought even back then, "Why isn't there a feminist science studies journal?" and I promised myself that as soon as I did get tenure, I would start working on something like that. Right around that time I got the position at Emory I went up for tenure—and Elizabeth Wilson, whom you also must know, Liz had also just been hired. And so the two of us thought, "Let's use some of our Emory resources to start hatching a plan to collaborate. And around that time, Liz was asked to consider editing *Configurations*, which is the SLSA [Society for Literature, Science, and the Arts] journal, I think along with Lisa Cartwright and David Serlin at UC San Diego. They were thinking that *Configurations* might be the place where we could do this work. But just to have that kind of feminist framing they couldn't take over *Configurations* and make it *Feminist Configurations*. This is when *Catalyst* started hatching. The four of us, me, Liz, Lisa, and David, I forget if we met in person first, the four of us may have met up in San Diego first, or Google Meet, or on a Skype call—yes, I said "Skype." But that's when I started the folder in

Google drive. [We brainstormed], “What ideas do we have here? What are we gonna do?” We hosted a dinner with feminist STS colleagues at an SLSA conference and then we decided to host a meeting at Emory with a few people; Murphy came, Banu [Subramaniam] came. I think Anne Pollock was invited too. Mara Mills, Rachel Lee—I know I’m forgetting some folks. And so we just started brainstorming. And that’s where [the Google drive started]. So if you’re still all using the *Catalyst* Google drive, that’s amazing!

KP: We absolutely are. But we now have folders for each editorial team so it’s actually an archive of your work. It also means it’s more manageable because we’ve got the relevant documents for each editorial term, but we can access the legacy documents too. So it’s still going, Deboleena. It’s a great collaborative tool.

DR: You know, I used to get notices about people trying to access that folder. I hope I passed over ownership of that drive, so other people are getting access!

KP: Yes, we did, thanks, that’s good.

DR: It just occurred to me!

KP: Thank you for sharing that story with us. One of the things that you would know about *Catalyst* is that it really tries to support graduate scholars, junior scholars by including work from undergraduates, artists, activists, and it prides itself on developmental editing [...] What advice would you have for those interested in submitting to the journal for the first time?

DR: Oh, what a great question! Just do it! Just do it to try and get that feedback. It is so rare to get feedback from experts in the field outside of your professors or committee if you are a student and you’re trying to test out some ideas. This is what the journal is for. It’s for a place to get some different views and some support and feedback that you might not be getting at your own institutional homes for whatever reason. I’m so glad that this is one of your leading questions, because that was also very core to what we wanted to develop, not just for the junior assistant professors trying to get tenure, but I think there was a strong belief and even evidence at that point that those of us who were now in feminist science studies, that we were training undergraduate and graduate students who identified as feminists and were in the classroom ready to learn about feminist science. It was not as if people were coming to feminist science studies as a field late in their careers. For the generation before us, in many cases, institutions limited the ability to even talk about women in science, let alone incorporate a feminist analysis in their work and have it count as scholarship. When we started the journal, we realized that we were, in fact, training generations of new students at the undergraduate level and upwards who already identified as feminist scientists and feminist science studies scholars. Students who might have their own perspectives

that we want to hear about, right? That was what was behind the “Lab Meeting” submission type. Do you still do the Lab Meeting as a submission type in *Catalyst*?

KP: We do.

DR: Okay, all right, that’s wonderful. It was really around that idea that if there are junior scholars, or if you run a lab meeting, or you are a professor who has a whole group of students that you want to think about something together, that could be a lab meeting. And everybody would get authorship in that process. I’m so glad that that’s still around.

KP: It is, we’ve still got the same submission type, a lab report. In fact, we’re still using the same categories of submission that the founding editorial teams came up with.

DR: Oh, that’s so good! But your question was, ‘What advice to give?’ Is that it? Yes, well my advice is, do it! Make a connection for yourself, and that networking happens in many different ways, if not in person or through mentoring, but through one’s thoughts, and then you have an entire network of people who are interested in thinking with you, around you, and developing those ideas.

KP: I think that’s one of the beauties of having these intellectual interlocutors whom you may not know, but they’re engaging with your work.

DR: It’s a huge benefit. And even though *Catalyst* is peer reviewed, we tried to take the pressure off what some disciplinary journals expect. So having more of a chance to reflect or to think, and speak and write in the first person. Even in that respect, I think we’re a little different than a lot of academic journals out there, so it’s a broader space that’s more inclusive.

KP: Yeah, absolutely. Thank you. And what do you see as some of the pressing concerns for the journal to address in the future—given that we live living in such a historic moment and in such challenging times?

DR: I mean even the title of the journal itself, the subtitle [*Feminism, Theory, Technoscience*], think of how much of that is under attack. I think that even to call something “feminist” risks placing yourself in a precarious position, but that’s always been the strength of the journal. That’s the strength of a collective, that it’s not just all on one person, who might be intimidated and made to disappear. It’s more of a movement. And that’s what you want to develop, right? We want the work to continue. I think this is the pressing thing. And it’s not just about finding those next editorial team members who are going to take on all the work. It’s about growing that kind of base of people who can see their own careers being supported through the work of the journal. They’re expanding their community, and then they

will want to give back to that community that supported them, right? So however we can do it, we need to continue that work.

KP: Yeah, well, we hope we're doing that through this editorial term. And certainly for me, I don't know about you, Robyn, but the connections that you're speaking about, Deboleena, have been incredible. And the sense of being part of a feminist, collective, part of a sisterhood, a network of like-minded scholars supporting each other and working through things; and when one person's having difficulties, others pick up the labor. Having that sense that we're part of something bigger, and we're building a legacy. I'm so grateful for that [sense of collective endeavor], because I think increasingly in our neoliberal institutions, we're so atomized and everything is so metrics driven. And it's a breath of fresh air to come to a *Catalyst* meeting, and we're not talking metrics. We're talking about ideas and how we can support each other. And the ethos that we have is just...

DR: Refreshing, right? It's difficult work. But it's refreshing and different. Oh, that's really good to hear; you're making me very happy.

RL: Well, we're very happy so and we're grateful for all of the groundwork that you did in terms of making this collective and this community possible.

DR: Yeah, there's a bunch of us, right? And in a way, I think we're in a good place with the challenges happening in higher education. With all the cutbacks in federal funding here in the US right now, others are trying to figure out what to do and how to collaborate, to pool resources. In the meantime, as a collective we have been building a set of best practices and figuring out the skill sets needed to do this important work together, despite facing financial challenges for some time now. Where you are institutionally right now, are you getting some resources from your institution to help support the journal?

KP: It varies institutionally but we do still have some funds. In my context, in Australia, we don't get that kind of support or it varies widely across institutions.

DR: How about you, Robyn? The Canadian institutions have been better about offering some support that way.

RL: I was able to get a course release, which was great. But no funding, unfortunately.

DR: When we started the journal, I was just trying to get student funding...

RL: Yeah, budget cutbacks, even without the US administration, they are still happening everywhere.

DR: Yeah. Irina is at Michigan, right?

KP: Yes.

DR: Is she able to have some funding resources as managing editor?

KP: I think she has some, that's my understanding. But I think she's concerned that it might run out. There is so much uncertainty now with the new administration. So we're trying to make sure we use what's been allocated before the funding cuts kick in.

DR: Yeah, that that is the challenge. Sorry, Robyn, go ahead.

RL: Oh, yeah, Irina has had some funding. She's trying to spend it, though, because she's not sure if she'll continue to have it.

DR: Wow, okay, there we go. That's going to continue to be a challenge. But you know the funding challenge has been there from the beginning. If anybody's developed the muscle memory to figure things out, it's this group. And in fact, you know, this gives me a reason to reconnect with the journal again. If there are resources that I can help with through Emory, I'd be happy to try to do that.

KP: Thank you, Deboleena, we appreciate that. So, if there was a particular topic or theme that you'd like to see featured in a *Catalyst* special section, what would it be?

DR: I would love to see a theme about the cover art, an entire issue about the art that's happened over the years. It's been amazing from the get-go, and I really give Lisa Cartwright the props for what she did and for her vision of what she wanted this journal to be. Have we had a special issue on the artwork?

KP: No, not at all. But for this anniversary issue we've put a call out for cover artwork and we've received submissions. And what you're saying echoes what I was thinking for this anniversary issue—namely, that in addition to the cover art, we'd love to feature the artwork of feminist artists, maybe bookending the issue, or throughout the issue, so that we can show the amazing work that is being done, and profile it. My role is production and design.

DR: You've done such a good job.

KP: It's wonderful to get these amazing pieces of art to work with and to work with the artist to develop a cover. We want to give more prominence to the artist statement. We'd also like to have the covers displayed in a larger format on the website. At the moment because of the limitations of OJS [Open Journal Systems], the covers are almost like a thumbnail, and it seems such a shame that you can't see the cover in all its glory.

DR: Yes, so Nassim [Parvin], when she was on the team with me, she really put in a lot of effort and made big leaps in terms of what to do with the artwork. And the idea of the artist statement, I think, came from Nassim, too. So OJS, how is that working for you all? Because in the beginning, we spent a lot of time wondering, “What platform do we go for?” And if I recall correctly, back then, it didn’t seem like the most user-friendly platform, but it was the best out of what we had. But it has survived! I’m really surprised by that!

KP: It has survived. I think from my perspective, one of the challenges we face is we’re working across multiple platforms. So we’re working on the Google drive, Dropbox, and OJS, and it’s tricky to coordinate those different...

DR: Systems!

KP: And it would be more seamless to just do everything on OJS. We’re also figuring it out, or certainly I am as we go, and figuring out some of its limitations. My sense, from talking to the journal *Feminist Africa*. While they’re not a sister journal, they are a journal that was interested in our work. And in our discussions with them I realized that there are functionalities that OJS has that we’re not using. So maybe it’s also about discovering the limits of our knowledge, and exploiting all the functionality. But I don’t use it as much as Robyn, who handles all the peer review. Maybe you have more insights, Robyn, into the day-to-day challenges with OJS or the day-to-day benefits.

RL: Well, there is definitely a learning curve for me. But I feel like it’s fairly intuitive now. There’s just like a few things you had to look in the right spot for to find the right button. But I find it pretty easy to use now. I don’t know anything else. I haven’t worked on a journal before this, so I don’t have a different system to compare it to.

DR: Okay! Well, it’s stuck. That’s good. It served its purpose. That’s wonderful.

KP: I’m curious to know, Deboleena, you said that you looked at other options, what were the other options?

DR: What were we thinking of? Oh, gosh, I don’t think I’ll remember the different platforms now. [...] I can’t remember who actually brought the idea of OJS to us. It may have been that another journal, that we thought of as a possible sister journal, was using it. I forget what that journal was, and if it’s still around even. I think Lisa or Murphy might remember, but that’s why we decided on OJS.

KP: That’s fine. OJS is working.

DR: Because, mind you, a lot of these conversations about starting a journal actually started in 2011, right? I mean, the first issue didn't come out until 2015, but there were four years of regular meetings to figure out, what are we doing? How are we going to do this? So maybe it wasn't monthly, but you know it took regular meetings for four years to make this happen.

KP: And did you work on the first issue, the very first issue?

DR: No, see by that time, Lisa and David kindly decided that they would take on the main editorial roles. Meanwhile, I had just got tenure and was asked to serve as director of graduate studies for my department. For my service to the journal, I said that I can do some things, but that I could not take on full editorial responsibilities, right? So Lisa and David took it on at UCSD and the planning of that first issue. Gosh, remind me—what is the first issue about? I remember us putting out an interesting call [...] What was it about? The inaugural issue, oh, is this the one where we decided to have people in the field comment about why we needed this kind of a journal? I think I may have coordinated the first Lab Meeting section.

KP: It looks like it might be the introduction.

DR: Yeah, I think we all were reaching out to our networks and saying, "Hey, would you like to make a contribution? It will be peer reviewed, but we'd like to have your voice in there." I do remember Lisa working on making that amazing cover. She put a lot of work into that. I think it was an image that came out of an exhibition that was happening at UCSD at her technoscience lab; it's a very striking cover.

KP: It's interesting to go back and read the introduction to the inaugural issue, and see to what extent, like, some of the similar concerns are still enduring...

DR: Yes, that's a great idea for a reflection piece. So that introduction, I'm looking it up right now in our issue. Let's see. I'm sorry I'm doing this in real time. We welcomed people to join us. The three words in the journal subtitle "*Feminism, Theory, Technoscience*" matter to the vision and to the political framing that this journal is designed to stimulate. We all worked on this, I remember. And then how we came up with the name *Catalyst*! I remember we dedicated an entire afternoon session. We did some intense brainstorming, and Liz and I have the original [flipchart with...] where we were brainstorming names for the journal. I believe I still have that somewhere in my office.

KP: Could you share that with us, Deboleena? If it if you don't mind, and if you're open to us including that? It would be such a beautiful historic piece.

DR: Okay, let me see what Liz has. She might have some of that too, in her office. That's so funny. You know, we had all kinds of names, but I think *Catalyst*. I wanna

say that I think Lisa might have also brought up the name *Catalyst*. And then we had two rounds of voting. And we said, "Okay, this one's gonna stick." But it was really just that it captured what we wanted to do. We wanted this to be a space that ignited, that brought different worlds together and made a new thing, a space that facilitated reactions—good or bad!

KP: It is a perfect name for those reasons.

DR: Okay, also to get something going, to stir trouble...

KP: Yeah, to stir trouble and to stay with the trouble. Given that, what is your vision or aspiration for *Catalyst* in the next ten years and beyond? You've kind of touched on this, but we'd love it if you could elaborate.

DR: So I think that expanding who sees themselves as a scholar-activist-thinker that can contribute to this space. I want that to grow. I want that to expand in the next ten years. I think it was part of the mandate of making sure to include undergrads or grads. I don't know how we've been able to fulfill that as much, but making that a stronger part of the journal going forward would be great. There's a lot of universities that have undergrad journals so maybe there is space for *Catalyst* to actually serve as the co-host for an undergraduate journal—or reserve a space for undergraduate students to contribute. You're asking about ten years from now? Well, when we started work on the journal fifteen years ago, I had a nine-year-old daughter. Fifteen years later, I have a twenty-four-year-old daughter who is an artist and a feminist. She is doing stop-motion animation, but also using feminist theory. A journal such as *Catalyst* has relevance for her. In ten more years, hopefully the journal will serve as a place for people who might not be women's studies-trained, or might not see themselves as part of academia. In fact, who definitely do not see themselves as part of academia—I hope that this journal can also somehow be a place for them to express their ideas and build community.

KP: Expanding who sees themselves as a feminist scholar, and interpellated by the journal.

DR: Yeah, and who counts as a contributor to knowledge making. I wonder also if the journal...I mean a lot of the early things that we tried to do—for example, there was a film by Jackie [Orr] that we had included—and so, including films and other kinds of enhanced forms of media. I mean OJS kind of limits to some extent, but to have other forms of expression and to be able to house that and support it. That would be cool. Did we ever have podcasts through *Catalyst*? I don't think so. But maybe there's a place for an archive of the spoken word and oral histories that the journal can also house.

KP: I love these ideas. I love all the non-traditional research outputs and the other ways of generating knowledge and valuing it. I think that's really good. And there's such a push for podcasts. I know that increasingly for grants, we're encouraged to produce publicly accessible outputs and podcasts are a great output.

DR: So after the first editorial team, this is what happened. I thought I might become editor after Lisa and David were editors; we thought the journal would come to Emory, but then I think I became chair of the department at Emory. Again, I had to let folks know that I needed another three-year cycle before taking on the responsibility. But speaking of publicly accessible outputs, what happened when I did move into my most recent administrative position is that I became PI of a Mellon grant that supports digital publishing in the humanities through open access. And it's because of all my experience building *Catalyst* that that happened. And so in this Mellon grant, we support monographs in the humanities through open access, to get on an open access platform. So anybody in the world can download [the work] for free and look at it. Then there's a more interactive open access. Manifold is a platform for that, for example. So, for example, the book that I published is open access, [which means] somebody in Australia teaching a class can use it, and students can highlight different parts of it and send a question to the author, and I can respond in real time. So that's kind of cool and fun. And then there's the enhanced monograph where the book can link, or also open up to a piece of art, or to a film or to audio recording or podcast, and so those enhance the experience. We have one monograph that we are trying to support that will take people into a VR-like space while they're reading the book. And so, I mean, it's happening in open access now. So I wonder if the journal might go in that direction.

KP: Wow! I haven't heard of this enhanced multimedia monograph. [...] What is the publisher? What is the of the platform on which it's hosted, like what you're describing?

DR: The enhanced ones. Yeah, so right now, because this is the Mellon grant that's at Emory, our Emory Center for Digital Scholarship is helping build these enhanced monographs. So it's because we have that resource at Emory, we can do this...

KP: And then is it only confined to Emory, or would it be a platform that is then created as an open access platform for other scholars to be able to use the same way? Do you know what I mean, or is it proprietary? As in Emory owns the intellectual property?

DR: Emory doesn't own the intellectual property, but let's say someone writes a book, okay? It's not behind a firewall—the publisher, let's say Duke or University of Washington Press—they make it open access. So the permissions are granted by the press, but then the support for the enhanced parts is coming through the author's institution. So, you know, somebody has to work at that. And if there's a problem, someone has to maintain the site. Most presses are not doing that. The

person's institution is doing it and so it is restricted to academics right now who have that institutional support, that's true.

KP: Okay. Have you heard of this, Robyn? It's so cool.

RL: No, this is fascinating.

KP: This is new terrain. It's very exciting. Well, that's something we could look at for future.

DR: [In the next] ten years. You said ten years, right?

KP: Ten years, yeah. Is there anything else that you'd like to add that we haven't covered? Or perhaps, Robyn, a question that you'd like to pose?

DR: I would just like to say a few more things about [...] how this journal developed. [...] I think it's many of us who in those early days had been exposed to this way of being a feminist and, at the same time, being in academia. [It was] like, "How do we hold these elements of ourselves together?" And so, if I am to close—although she didn't have anything directly to do with *Catalyst*—I will say that I want to talk about Sandra Harding and talk about the work that she did. I could get emotional about this, so apologies. I'll never forget. As a junior scholar, she welcomed me and so many others into a feminist space. I am getting really emotional, sorry.

KP: That's all right. Take your time.

DR: So in her own way, she always welcomed junior scholars. She wanted to learn from them, to hear about their work. What are they about to take on and change? I met Sandra, I would say it was pretty early on in my career as a feminist science studies scholar. I met her at the first FEMMSS (Feminist Epistemologies, Methodologies, Metaphysics and Science Studies) conference in Seattle in 2004. I had just finished my PhD and was in my first tenure track job. She was so generous with her support from the get-go. Years later, she brought me together with Laura Foster; you know, Laura was Sandra's student. And then Kim TallBear, and Banu [Subramaniam]. Sandra brought us all to her home. We were in LA for some meeting, and she said, "You all need to come to my house." And so Sandra made an entire pot, a Dutch oven full of chicken soup, and she put it in the middle of her kitchen table, and she had us sit around the table. She dished out soup for all of us and then sat off to the side and said, "I want to you to talk. I want you all to imagine what a feminist, post-colonial science studies looks like." I'll never forget that. She just provided a space for us to come together, to feed our creativity, and to literally feed us [*tears up*]. I'm so sorry.

KP: Emotions are welcome here, Deboleena, and you've made me tear up, too. That's a beautiful story—the feminist spirit and ethos that *Catalyst* carries.

DR: That gesture she made has meant so much to me. She modeled that for us, you know, she did. She modeled that for us, and I think that is embedded within the feminist work, and particularly in this journal.

KP: What a beautiful story. It's also such a contrast to the kinds of neoliberal academic selves that nowadays we're [encouraged to be]. It's such a welcome contrast and [an example of] service.

DR: So with her passing, it's been about a month now, I've really been reflecting on it.

KP: I think it's a beautiful tribute to her and to her legacy, and I'm so glad we can include it. Thank you for sharing that story.

RL: Yeah, thank you so much for sharing it. [The story] and the soup go over very well together.

DR: Yeah, yeah. Well, as you're transcribing this, so you could say, "As she was bawling, Deboleena said..."

KP: To me it makes me think, you know they say chicken soup for the soul. For me *Catalyst* is like soup for the soul. That is, that has been my experience. When I've had a hard day, [it's comforting] to know that there are like-minded people who are going to hold you up and support you. It sometimes feels so fiercely competitive, academia. It's a balm for the soul, [being part of the *Catalyst* collective]. It's been transformative for me, especially when you're feeling like it's all too much, to have a space where it isn't about competition. It's about collaboration and supporting each other, feeling seen.

DR: Yeah, and we're not used to it. We're not being trained in that way. So actually, this creates that space to train and to let us let go of how we think this competitive, individualistic academic world [is] or has to be. You know, we have been trained to do things in a certain way, so it's a new way of thinking. She literally made us chicken soup to feed our souls.

KP: It's a beautiful gesture.

DR: Listen, I have questions. So I am coming out to Seattle because I heard that at 4S, there's going to be a celebration around *Catalyst*. Is that happening?

KP: Yes, yes, that is happening. Unfortunately, I am not gonna be able to make it.

DR: Oh no!

KP: I have another conference around the same time, but plans are afoot for a celebration and for a *Catalyst* panel.

DR: Nice. I'm gonna show up to party, that's for sure! I mean, maybe you should ask Lisa, ask David, ask Liz to join?

KP: We're meeting some of them next week. We're meeting the [other former editors].

DR: Oh, wonderful! That's so great. Have you asked them if they thought the journal would last a decade? I'd be really curious about what they would have to say. I think we're all a little surprised it's made it this far!

KP: That's a great question, I'm gonna add it, thank you Deboleena.

Author Bios

Deboleena Roy is Vice Dean of Faculty and Divisional Dean of the Sciences for Emory College of Arts and Sciences. She is Professor of Neuroscience and Behavioral Biology and Women's, Gender, and Sexuality Studies. Roy received her PhD in reproductive neuroendocrinology and molecular biology and is the author of [*Molecular Feminisms: Biology, Becomings, and Life in the Lab*](#). She has taken on a number of academic leadership roles and is dedicated to building trust and transparency in higher education.

Robyn Lee is Associate Professor of Social Theory in the Sociology department at University of Alberta. She is also Co-Editor (Peer review) of *Catalyst: Feminism Theory, Technoscience*. Robyn's current research investigates emerging practices of human milk exchange, focusing on how care and compassion are harnessed in the commercialization of human milk, and what kinds of relationships are created between donors and recipients.

Kiran Pienaar is a Senior Lecturer in Sociology at Deakin University, Melbourne, Australia. She is also Co-Editor (Production and Design) of *Catalyst: Feminism Theory, Technoscience*. Kiran is the author of [*Politics in the Making of HIV/AIDS in South Africa*](#) and co-editor of [*Narcofeminisms: Revisioning Drug Use*](#). Her research has contributed new understandings of the performativity of drugs in shaping queer subjectivities; ontologies of addiction; and the impact of public policy on minoritised communities.