



Feminist Communities of Practice: Building Stronger Research Coalitions to Counter Antagonism in the Academy

SHANA MACDONALD
University of Waterloo, Canada

KATE BRADLEY
University of Ottawa, Canada

ABSTRACT *In the face of academic antagonism, this article argues that feminists must build caring and careful communities of practice to sustain ourselves. In it we explore the importance of creating intentional, feminist-oriented spaces of actionable solidarity to protect activists and academics from institutional antagonisms. Through our encounters as researchers working within feminist archives, and as academics who are part of feminist research collectives, we have developed a process for creating provisional solidarities that protect both our persons and our activisms. This process is based on our lived experiences, archival explorations, and social media research that informs our sometimes messy and often nuanced praxes of community-building as a counterpoint to increasing neo-liberal co-option of discourses of solidarity. In this paper we provide some guideposts for how we do our work as a way of inviting further conversation around how to manage the antagonisms we face as feminist scholars.*

KEYWORDS feminism; activism; solidarity; antagonism; care; archives

Introduction

We have been thinking a lot about what it means to produce forms of feminist solidarity in the academy as a way to survive the constraints of misogyny and patriarchal structures. We are speaking on these questions as intergenerational co-authors, one a tenured professor, the other an emerging scholar working on her Masters. We are both white, straight-passing, cis, bi-women with over 20 years separating us. We have worked closely together on research projects funded by co-author MacDonald's grants, giving co-author Bradley up-close knowledge and experience in the theoretical and practical aspects of feminist research and activism and how these are both constrained and supported within

Correspondence Address: Shana MacDonald, Department of Communication Arts, University of Waterloo, Waterloo, ON, N2L 3G1; email: shana.macdonald@uwaterloo.ca

ISSN: 1911-4788



the university. Over the last few years, we have worked together as part of Feminist Think Tank (FTT), a research collective at the University of Waterloo that brings together a community of interdisciplinary feminist scholars to build support for feminist, queer, and anti-racist research and activism.

During our time at FTT, we have faced scholarly and professional experiences of antagonism ranging from everyday microaggressions in the classroom to threats of violence against our persons for daring to speak about feminism in public spaces. By antagonism, we mean the many forms of hostility and opposition one may face in their everyday work and social lives based on how they are positioned and perceived by those directing antagonism toward them. We are specifically interested in how this occurs in gendered contexts and the kinds of antagonisms experienced by those whose expressions of gender or affiliations with gender equity activism elicit hostility by others. For us, this includes overt forms of antagonisms including public discrediting of their personhood, threats or actions that are violent in nature, and hateful speech. It also includes more tacit forms of antagonisms such as the minimization of one's gendered lived experience, to a lack of recognition for one's skills and expertise, to the dismissal or erasure of one's contributions to discussions or the sharing of knowledge.

These of course are not unique experiences to those targeted for their gender expression or feminist positionality; racialized and queer communities are equally if not more targeted by both online and offline forms of vitriol which include intimidation, hate speech, rape threats, death threats, and public doxing campaigns. As the Canadian Research Institute for the Advancement of Women argues, "attacks on women's rights, and reproductive rights, LGBTQIA2S rights, and white supremacist violence" are "not new," however we currently face "a resurgence and mainstreaming of right-wing extremism, and it is better connected and more effectively reorganizing itself" (Alig et al., 2022, para. 3). Within this climate of hostility, we have found the time spent together as a group of intentionally committed feminist scholars and activists offers forms of provisional solidarities that sustain us.

FTT meets on a weekly basis in an Arts building on the University of Waterloo campus. Regular attendees and newcomers are encouraged to bring their academic experiences and interests into the space as a way of community-building through sharing, largely akin to consciousness raising tactics from the 1960s (Combahee River Collective, 1977; Michals, 2001; Sowards & Renegar, 2004). We focus our meetings through an invitation to "think, talk, make" together. We invite thinking about feminist theory and how to integrate feminist principles into our academic work. We invite sharing and talking about our positionalities, and experiences of antagonism that make us feel vulnerable and sometimes keep us silent. We provide the creative tools to make material outputs of our embodied feminist discourses (such as zines, collages, and friendship bracelets). FTT uses research-creation practices to further foster this community space for feminist research (MacDonald & Wiens, 2019; Wiens, 2022; Wiens et al., 2020). This is seen most clearly in our Instagram

account @aesthetic.resistance, which makes original feminist content as well as amplifying the work of other intersectional feminist media from both the past and the current moment. We also adhere to forms of consensus building and coalitional politics that are necessary to face the manifold ways social and scholarly conversations currently tend to include and reproduce divisiveness and prejudice.

We believe that such spaces and encounters as the ones we've explored at FTT are integral to the work we do as feminists. In the context of this special issue, we wanted to consider how groups that experience antagonisms externally can develop meaningful forms of support from internal groups through communities of practice that ideally benefit all involved. We wish to explore in response the concept of solidarity and related concepts of coalition and care to extend our own efforts to build feminist community into a more broadly applicable set of practices for others to experiment with. To do so, we offer a conversation around methods and practices we have drawn from our archival research into the longer history of feminist communities in academic and activist settings, as well as the ways we put this into practice within FTT, namely through our workshops, media making, and our Instagram account.

There are many models and ways into this conversation, including most significantly the work done by Black feminist thinkers and activists facing multiple intersecting experiences of exclusion and oppression within social movements in the 1960s, 1970s, and 1980s. The most important formation for our work is based on Kimberlee Crenshaw's (1991) definition of intersectionality, which orients our feminism and ensures that we consistently "account for multiple grounds of identity when considering how the social world is constructed" (p. 1245). This is closely followed by our reliance on bell hooks' (2000) definition of feminism as "the movement to end sexism, sexist oppression, and exploitation" which she situates as both "systemic" and "institutionalized" (p. 1). Together, these frameworks help to establish the necessity of broad and inclusive understandings of what it is we do as feminists to make sure we are participating in the careful building of coalitional communities of solidarity. While these are sometimes necessarily provisional and contingent, they need to attend to the ways that those in community experience the sexism and antagonism we are focused on differently, while remembering how embedded we all are in the systemic structures that uphold such antagonisms.

We are particularly informed by the Combahee River Collective Statement, which outlines a model of a "collective process and a nonhierarchical distribution of power" that includes a commitment to "continuous self-reflexivity" in how they "practice politics" (Combahee River Collective, 1977, cited in Taylor 2017, p. 26). For us this aligns well with the call by Audre Lorde (1981) in "The Uses of Anger: Women Responding to Racism" to practice a form of intersectional coalition politics that "lies in recognizing differences between us as creative, and in standing to those distortions which we inherited without blame, but which are now ours to alter" (p. 9). For Lorde (1981), this

can be achieved by respecting the anger of women, and women of colour more specifically. When this anger is recognized and engaged with it “can transform difference through” by offering all of us all greater “insight into power” and its operations as well as its possibilities for greater liberation (p. 9). Echoes of the Combahee River Collective, hooks, Crenshaw, and Lorde’s work are also found in the more recent work of adrienne maree brown (2017) writing on the political practice of emergent strategy, which she articulates in her book of the same name. As brown (2017) argues, emergence as a political strategy relies on the collective actions of individual people joined in community. Together, these actions can produce transformations we cannot anticipate even as we encourage their emergence through this building of networks of solidarity. Such networks are necessarily open to diversity and creative experimentation to achieve our shared goals. Our work and conversations together at FTT are centered around the work of the Combahee River Collective, Lorde, and brown, as well as other feminist scholars including Sarah Ahmed (2014) who teaches us the value of willful resistance, and Judith Butler (2015) whose work on the value of assembling to advocate for more “liveable lives” guides us. Before delving deeper into the specific ways in which we work to build communities of practice based on these principles of solidarity, it is important to consider the term solidarity in more detail.

Solidarity, Coalitions, Emergent Communities of Practice

Previous public histories of feminist solidarity from the second wave onwards largely rely on a white, cisgender, heterosexual-centric concept of feminist sisterhood, excluding those that second wave feminists did not see as sisters (Combahee River Collective, 1977; Lorde, 1984; Lyshaug, 2006, p. 78). In the 1990s, new modes of solidarity emerged that incorporated reflexive dialogues beyond ideas of commonality or sisterhood but often focused extensively on class and failed to fully integrate an intersectional approach to feminist activism that meant white, cis women were centered in the histories of the movement once again (Hanna, 2024; Zeisler, 2016). Writing in 1998, Jodi Dean described what she called a move towards “reflective solidarity” as being rooted in the “opposition to those who would exclude or oppress another” as well as “our mutual recognition of each other’s specificity” including “women’s class, economic, and material conditions” (p. 4). In the 2000s, feminist discussions of solidarity were increasingly global and intersectional in focus (Mohanty, 2003), incorporating decolonial perspectives and opening doors for feminists in the 2010s to popularize ideas of affective solidarity that would move feminist solidarity “towards modes of engagement that start from the affective dissonance experience can produce” (Hemmings, 2012, p. 147). In essence, solidarity has meant many things for many generations of different feminists. It is an enduring and yet nebulous term. In its most effective form, solidarity is tied to a sense of coalitional politics, or the “fluid alliances

between diverse subjects” which in “bringing diverse constituencies together in the temporary pursuit of specific shared goals...enables subjects to act in concert without ignoring or suppressing the...differences that divide them” (Lyshaug, 2006, pp. 77-78).

Departing from this definitional overview we want to suggest what solidarity is *not* (for us). Solidarity is not sleek or comfortable. It is not consumable, brandable, or engaged in comparative thinking. Solidarity is messy and sometimes needs to be direct in confronting oppression wherever it arises. Solidarity in its best form resists neoliberal branding, and is necessarily counter to the post-feminist, girl boss ethos of feminism as a form of individual success within existing institutional structures that reinforce hierarchies and place people into competition with one another. Such framing of solidarity replicates a scarcity model that precludes the possibility of resource sharing and communal support. We outline this sense of what solidarity is not in relationship to the kinds of corporate co-optation we see regularly in 21st century media landscapes. We worry, like many before us (Banet-Weiser, 2018; Fraser, 2020; Gill, 2007; McRobbie, 2008; Rottenberg, 2014), that this brand of feminism moves quickly away from feminist critiques of structural inequality, focusing instead on a bland and ineffective form of palatable symbolism as the operating force of the movement.

Take for instance International Women’s Day (IWD), first celebrated in 1911 by Austria, Denmark, Germany and Switzerland to demand greater labour rights for women and recognized by the United Nations (UN) in 1975 as a day dedicated to the ongoing call for women’s rights around the world (International Women’s Day, n.d.). Through our own archival research within the Canadian Women’s Movement Archive housed at the University of Ottawa we have encountered a wide range of speeches, photos, posters, pamphlets, and buttons from earlier IWD events across Canada. In the 1980s these artifacts revealed the programming of marches, resource sharing, and public events where the needs of participants were considered, including childcare which would have been vital at a time when few children under the age of six would have been in school. Beginning in 1996, the UN designated an official theme for IWD, the first of which was “Celebrating the Past, Planning for the Future,” and in future years the UN and IWD website would each develop their own theme for each year. In 2024, the UN (n.d.) structured their IWD discussions under the theme “Invest in Women: Accelerate Progress” and the IWD (2024) website declared the theme to be “#InspireInclusion.” Notable here is how the theme of “Invest in Women” and the secondary interest in accelerating progress index economic principles most closely aligned with neo-liberalism and the notion that investment in individual opportunities for capitalist success will continue the pace of “progress.” This in some ways feels quite antithetical to a feminist interest in solidarity and inclusion which seeks support for those most impacted by not only violent forms of cultural antagonisms but the antagonisms experienced by cuts to governmental social supports globally. There is a clash of interests perhaps in the alignment here with activism and

corporate or economic interest that has been well-articulated in queer, feminist, and anti-racist scholarship (Chilcott et al., 2021; Vredenburg et al., 2020).

Presently, most of the programming and commemoration for IWD takes place online. To map whether these earlier aspects of IWD organizing were echoed in the present, we gathered data on how IWD was being celebrated in March of 2024. This included collecting media posts with the hashtags #IWD or #solidarity from our personal and research-specific social media feeds on Instagram, X, and TikTok, where much of our research occurs as scholars of digital feminist media. We looked at approximately 100 collected posts from a variety of sources including feminist activist accounts and those from corporate brands that were prevalent in general searches of those hashtags in the search function of each platform. From this analysis, we discovered how much has shifted from earlier iterations of IWD celebrations. Our data reveals a largely corporate imagining of feminism, which despite the year's theme "#InspireInclusion" failed to include much beyond branding and performances of allyship from consumer brands and other institutions. Overwhelmingly, corporations used the hashtag #IWD to mention and commend the work that female employees did for their companies. This hyperfocus on capitalist output diluted ideas of solidarity down to a neoliberal conception of worth; defining women's marketability and value as laboring bodies as the main site of celebration. This focus fails to pause and articulate the kinds of systemic barriers faced by women and other marginalized communities including the "glass ceiling" and the "glass cliff" (Cotter et al., 2001; Ryan & Halsam, 2005); the pandemic induced "she-session" that saw a startling loss of women in the workforce (Elting, 2022; Stephenson, 2021; Thoreau, 2022); supportive parental leave options; or protections from workplace harassment. Further, as feminist scholars concerned with the antagonisms and threats of violence that women and other marginalized communities face when sharing research and ideas in public settings, the lack of attention to technology-facilitated gender-based violence on a day dedicated to inspiring inclusion was a missed opportunity for developing stronger forms of solidarity with feminists working on the ground in real time.

This corporatized version of IWD that flooded social media timelines starkly contrasted the work of many feminist media accounts urging greater global support for a ceasefire in Gaza at the same time. These posts were anti-colonial, intersectional and community-oriented, and contrasted greatly with the empty gestures of neoliberal IWD solidarity that fell flat. The images and slogans we collected under the IWD hashtag were generic, bland, and detached. They evoked a sense of solidarity that was abstracted from any sense of what kinds of harms and constraints women, femmes, and gender diverse people experience, as well as the actionable practices that could support greater forms of equity, especially in the companies and institutions posting most enthusiastically.

This leads us to argue that solidarity is not and cannot be a disembodied concept or set of well-designed statements; rather, it must be grounded in social

justice practices. For us this means reciprocal relationships of mutual care and a recognition that working across differences to share in actions of naming and confronting structural oppression can be a means of confronting antagonisms including racism, sexism, queer and transphobia, and ableism. Recent scholarship reinforces that feminist solidarity must be explicitly tied to social justice goals. For example, Daneshpour (2025) stresses that feminist resistance and coalition-building across differences are central to an “inclusive, justice-driven feminist agenda” aimed at systemic change (p. 350). Likewise, Varma and Shaban (2024) distinguish substantive feminist solidarity from superficial gestures, defining the former as an “anti-colonial praxis” that actively advances demands for social justice rather than remaining performative. In the remainder of this article, we wish to outline some of our insights from different forms of coalitional solidarity we have found both in the work of past feminists we have encountered in the archives and in our own research collective.

What We Take from the Archives

Our on-going explorations in the Canadian Women’s Movement Archive Collection and The Feminist Periodicals and Publications Collection at the University of Ottawa are informed by feminist approaches to archival research. Drawing on Diana Taylor (2003), Kate Eichhorn (2013), Alison Harvey (2019), and Cait McKinney (2020), our approach to the archives welcomes the messiness of emotion and involvement that can be hard to separate for feminist scholars who believe that the “personal is political” (Hanisch, 1970). Within the archives we follow intuitions, chasing rabbits down rabbit holes as we go. We often work in teams when encountering our artifacts of research. This allows for affective solidarity in action; there are the solidarities created in our collaborative research together but also in the affinities we develop to the work of feminists that we encounter in our research. This produces a sense of being linked to a longer trajectory of committed activists and thinkers who have faced sexism and went before us. Further, our intergenerational positionality as we move through the archives sparks many conversations about our individual encounters and experiences with the material, showing us how much our responses to it vary based on how we were situated temporally and theoretically in conversation with the artifacts.

We are fascinated with two periodicals we sat with, *Digressions* and *The Emily*. Both were produced within university settings and responded to recognizable forms of anti-feminist antagonism that we have also experienced in our own scholarly lives. *Digression*, published by feminists from the Women’s Studies University of Ottawa, and *The Emily*, published by the Women’s Collective at the University of Victoria exemplified responses to such antagonisms through feminist coalition-building and community solidarities grounded in action. The first issue of *Digression* (at the time unnamed), was printed on a golden-yellow paper in a mishmash of type and

handwritten text, and declares the contents of the newsletter to be “energy, joy, wisdom, anger, strength, information, controversy, support, criticism, feminism, radicalism, humour, creativity...” and that the newsletter “may explode if exposed to patriarchy” (*Digression*, 1985, n.p). Discovering this passage in the archive entangled us in what Kate Eichhorn (2013) refers to as the often-overlapping categories of “the researcher, fan, and affinity group member” (p. 94). Our research interest in the tactics utilized by community-based feminist coalitions was bolstered by our personal enjoyment of the humour and passion embedded in the artifact. The playful levity of the newsletter’s dismissal of the patriarchy as combustible not only contributed to our research on feminist strategies within specific temporal and spatial bounds, but also to our personal feminisms outside of these specificities. Within the “queer time and place” of the archive (Halberstam, 2005), we became fans of the writers of *Digression*, noticing important commonalities in the ways their coalitional feminist activism described itself and the principles we ourselves hold in FTT, especially in the face of institutional antagonism.

The introduction to the first *Digression* issue is written in French, with a particularly striking passage describing the publication as an “extension of our efforts... and the sorts of parthenogenesis (let us not mince words) of our collective struggles” for feminists joined in “para-patriarchal thought, loving life, solidarity between women, humour, pleasure (yes!), and creativity” (*Digression*, 1985, n.p.; author translation). The use of the term “parthenogenesis,” meaning “a reproductive strategy that involves development of a female (rarely a male) gamete (sex cell) without fertilization” (The Editors of Encyclopædia Britannica, 2024, para. 1), represents the newsletter’s unmediated emergence of feminist ideas within a community that came together to refute their current experiences of sexism and develop strategies to fight for academic spaces untethered by oppressive patriarchal structures. *Digression* stood out to us as an archival moment that exemplified the importance of reciprocal relationships, actionable practices, and praxis grounded in a positionality against structural antagonism that we were considering in our own contemporary feminist practice.

Similarly, in *The Emily*’s “Chilly Climate Issue” (1993) we found descriptions and reactions to institutional antagonism that were uncomfortably familiar, as well as feminist responses grounded in similar coalitional principles. An article in the issue titled “Patriarchal Paradigm,” described the institutional backlash and silencing of a report made by feminist students detailing a “chilly climate’ for women” in the Political Science Department (Newhouse, 1993, p. 3). The article was accompanied by a sketch cartoon of a dinosaur-like creature and the caption “Do Not Disturb the Dinosaurs” (p. 3). Much like our explorations into #IWD, *The Emily* reports that “attention is being misdirected” away from the issues feminists were facing, and that feminist calls for direct action were ignored, while institutional attention instead hyper focused on the implications of the report for male tenured professors (Newhouse, 1993, p. 3). Our reading of these archival artifacts is

implicitly connected to our own experiences of intentional coalitions to mitigate chilly climates in our own spaces of research and relies on the creation of careful and care filled relationships with each other and with feminist material from the past.

A particularly striking encounter in the archive came with the discovery of “The Women’s Kit,” “a cardboard box full of materials (pamphlets, records, posters, postcards, newspaper reprints, biographies, short stories, poems, drawings, plays, filmstrips, photographs, slides, historical documents, collages, etc.) which are all directly or indirectly about women and their socialization” (Harris & Kane, 1973), that was developed in 1973 by a team of feminists led by Pamela Harris and Becky Kane from the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education. The kit is an explosion of carefully curated colourful papers, film canisters, and material ephemera. We joyfully rifled through it, making note of our emotive responses to the grounded, community-based, and knowledge-generating materials. The kit was focused, actionable, and relational; it was an example of the type of grounded solidarity we found lacking in #IWD posts. The introductory booklet with the kit declared that the “aim of the Women’s Kit is to foster a new awareness of women’s role in society, both past and present, and to help people look at and question: what limits are set for human beings through sex-role stereotyping and the socialization process” as well as “how women can gain a sense of their own history, what it is that history has actually recorded, what it has omitted, and why” (Harris & Kane, 1973, p. 1). Many materials in the kit deal with the type of antagonism and misogyny that continues to concern us presently (Rose, 1973). The kit is digitized in its entirety online (thewomenskit.org). It is a contemporarily relevant feminist response to widespread antagonism that incorporates solidarity across multiple axes. We found ourselves continually noticing the relevance of the kit for our current feminist practice, once again consciously combining our research and our affinities. One of the issues that always lingers with us when visiting archives is how much hard work has been done to combat anti-feminist antagonisms by feminists before the present moment and how durational the legacy of antagonism and resistance is within feminist practice (Kroeker & MacAlpine, 2024; Wiens, in press). We believe there is great value in connecting with actions and tactics developed in the past to help guide and support the work we do currently in the interest of more equitable futures for feminist and marginalized scholars. The Women’s Kit is an excellent example of the kinds of prior work that can inform our current actions and is one we hope to engage further with in our own work to combat antagonism in present feminist spaces of research. To that end we wish to turn now to the kinds of work we have been developing at FTT as a compliment to these archival artifacts.

What We Take from Our Time Together

FTT has been hosting weekly in-person meetings during fall and winter terms since 2019 (with a pause during the pandemic). In the fall 2023 semester, following a violent attack on a professor and students in a course on the philosophy of gender, we moved our in-person meetings to the building where the attack took place. The intention was to help feminist, femme, and queer members of our community find ways to make the space signify more than it did for a lot of us after the attack – unwelcoming. We bought a former overhead projector cart laden with craft supplies to the weekly meetings and invited participants, who ranged from undergraduate and graduate students to faculty and staff, to “think, talk, and make” together. We sectioned off parts of the room for thinking, where those with writing deadlines or other projects could work side by side. Another section was for talking, where people gathered to share what was on their mind or crowdsource ideas and research suggestions for their projects. The third section was for those needing to make something creative or simply do something with their hands. At times this was bracelet making, other times it was collaging, and sometimes creating pages for a collective zine or personal mini zines. Toward the end of these weekly meetings in the winter of 2024 the conversation turned towards shared and personal frustrations with the kinds of limiting academic experiences we were facing. In these conversations a lot of tacit knowledge was shared around how to survive such limitations. These ideas were shared in a space where we had, over a six-to-eight-month period, built a provisional sense of solidarity amongst participants. The conversation informed an Instagram post developed by a student member of FTT and posted on the collective’s dedicated social media account (@aesthetic.resistance; FTT, 2024).

The posted manifesto reflects well our collective responses to the different forms of antagonism that surfaced for many of us that year. This may be one of the more useful outcomes of our collective solidarity and we wanted to share some of the takeaways with readers here who may also be facing the limiting constraints of racism, misogyny, ableism, queerphobia, and transphobia in their spaces of learning, thinking, and being. The manifesto is available to access through our Instagram page, but we will summarize some of the takeaways here, which include a few calls to action. These start with the invitation to “make spaces unwelcome for the patriarchy” and the related follow up, “create knowledge in different ways.” For some, the first phrase may read as abstract but one way of thinking about it is to consider how much of our disciplinary knowledge is traditionally centered on hierarchies that privilege a disinterested, or objective, and rational approach to research. This overreliance on one form of thinking and knowing leaves out as much as it encourages. Many feminist scholars know this to be one of the first ways in which their attempt at thinking and knowing clashes against standardized academic principles and creates a sense of exclusion or dismissal (Adams-Hutcheson & Johnston, 2019; Hytten, 2017; Llewellyn & Llewellyn, 2015).

What feminist-oriented spaces of solidarity can foster in academia is the necessary support for generating knowledge differently – knowledge that centers lived experience, relationality, and the pursuit of social justice within and beyond institutional frameworks.. This means being open to the conversations, validating and amplifying approaches that rely on subjective, embodied, affective relationships to our studies. This leads to a third call from the manifesto to “refuse to intellectualize and compartmentalize” our bodies as researchers and thinkers. The risk of intellectual compartmentalization in our work as scholars is that we move too far away from the real, lived, experiences of antagonism by those people most targeted in our spaces of learning. From such a distance it is easy to dismiss the impacts of antagonism and rationalize and justify it within theoretical schemas that speak nothing of care and relationality as a vital part of knowledge production and sharing. This leads to a final grouping of advice from the manifesto to share knowledge and speak out loud the secrets held around how antagonism operates in different people’s lives. It also asks that we be “openly aware of [our] positionality” as any community based on solidarity must be reflexive as to how different structures of power operate among those it includes and recognize if and when it produces forms of exclusion. Communities of feminist solidarity are necessarily provisional because they can always be seeking ways to ensure greater inclusivity. A final point in the manifesto is that feminist solidarity as a coalitional practice seeks to create and curate generative spaces of support, recognition, and creative possibility. In this way the very quotidian acts of conversation, relating, making, and resource sharing become sites of transformation both for those involved as a collective with a shared purpose but also in each person’s own personal feminist path.

What We Wish for Others

As we have discovered in our work with feminist archives as well as in our work at FTT, solidarity is a process; it is affective, interpersonal, material, and sometimes tactile, but more so, it is actionable. Solidarity in this latter sense manifests as coalitions, groups, lectures, and meetings that operate in tertiary spaces, somewhat outside institutional frames (even while often emerging within and sometimes because of the kinds of antagonisms faced in these spaces). This kind of group-directed action provides the time and space, and breathing room, to collectively determine a set of shared commitments and priorities, and the means with which to support those who are gathered.

Throughout our time in the archives and together in FTT we have built a feminist toolkit of emergent strategies (brown, 2017) that encourage solidarity amidst experiences of antagonism. We hope to have outlined an intersectional feminist approach to research collaboration based on developing communities of support for those targeted by forms of misogynist, queerphobic, transphobic, and racist antagonism in the academy. It outlines actionable ways that we can

mitigate the antagonisms we may encounter via community formation that we believe are applicable to a variety of academic spaces and contexts. Our suggestion, based both in our archival research and embodied experiences, is to work towards building careful networks of knowledge-sharing, solidarity-building, and community support. These spaces, purposefully resistant to the expected hierarchical structures of universities, provide necessary support and comfort to feminist academics facing personal and professional antagonisms within the institution. The relations formed in FTT reflect the similar relations we see captured in the archive; ones that are written into periodicals, pictured in photographs in The Women's Kit, and stamped as slogans on IWD buttons. These types of bonds are imperative to counter the detached forms of solidarity exhibited under #IWD, which ignores embodied experiences of inequality and leaves us disheartened, unprotected, and unsupported. Countering empty gestures of solidarity requires a network of support that can build generative gestures. Antagonism cannot be confronted alone.

We are following our own advice as well. Inspired by The Women's Kit we encountered in the archive, FTT plans to construct our own feminist-oriented kit of educational materials. In response to institutional antagonisms, we hope our kit will be a messy, confrontational source of feminist tactics and practices that confronts this moment of right-wing backlash and detached forms of co-opted solidarity. The kit will contain archival materials, feminist texts, photographs, zines, crafts, anecdotes, articles, curriculum, and artistic works; it will be a material collection of community care. Construction and dissemination of this kit will rely on the feminist connections we have built within and outside the university. Additionally, FTT members are directors and partners in a growing network of international feminist and queer scholars called SIGNAL, or Strategies of Intersectional Gender Justice, Networked Action, and Liberation (signalnetwork.org). This network seeks global inclusion and involvement of feminist academics to confront growing antagonism in their respective institutions and the public sphere, especially in areas where institutional protection is lacking or inadequate. We are looking to keep growing this network in ways that reaches beyond our existing communities to build further solidarities. We invite you to join us!

Acknowledgements

Thank you to the ongoing collaborative support of our Feminist Think Tank colleagues. This research was made possible by support from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada.

References

- Adams-Hutcheson, G., & Johnston, L. (2019). Flourishing in fragile academic work spaces and learning environments: Feminist geographies of care and mentoring. *Gender, Place & Culture*, 26(4), 451-467. <http://doi.org/10.1080/0966369X.2019.1596885>
- Ahmed, S. (2014). *Willful subjects*. Duke University Press.
- Alig, M., Atsin, O., Neapole, J., & Thompson, K. (2022). *Feminist responses to the global rise in right-wing extremism: A summary*. Canadian Research Institute for the Advancement of Women. <https://www.criaw-icref.ca/publications/feminist-responses-to-the-global-rise-in-right-wing-extremism-a-summary/>
- Banet-Weiser, S. (2018). Postfeminism and popular feminism. *Feminist Media Histories*, 4(2), 152-156. <https://doi.org/10.1525/fmh.2018.4.2.152>
- Brown, A. M. (2017). *Emergent strategy: Shaping change, changing worlds*. AK Press.
- Butler, J. (2015). *Notes toward a performative theory of assembly*. Harvard University Press.
- Chilcott, A., Fife, K., Lowry, J., Moran, J., Oke, A., Sexton, A., & Thethi, J. (2021). Against whitewashing: The recent history of anti-racist action in the British archives sector. *The International Journal of Information, Diversity, & Inclusion*, 5(1), 33-59. <https://doi.org/10.33137/ijidi.v5i1.34731>
- Combahee River Collective. (n.d.). *The Combahee River Collective statement*. Blackpast. (Original work published 1977) <https://www.blackpast.org/african-american-history/combahee-river-collective-statement-1977/>
- Cotter, D. A., Hermesen, J. M., Ovadia, S., & Vanneman, R. (2001). The glass ceiling effect. *Social Forces*, 80(2), 655-681. <https://doi.org/10.1353/sof.2001.0091>
- Crenshaw, K. (1991). Mapping the margins: Intersectionality, identity politics, and violence against women of color. *Stanford Law Review*, 43(6), 1241-1300.
- Daneshpour, M. (2025). Introduction to the special issue: Feminist solidarity, resistance, and social justice. *Social Sciences*, 14(6), 350-354. <https://doi.org/10.3390/socsci14060350>
- Dean, J. (1998). Feminist solidarity, reflective solidarity: Theorizing connections after identity politics. *Women & Politics*, 18(4), 1-26. https://doi.org/10.1300/J014v18n04_01
- Digression*. (1985). 1(1). Canadian Women's Archive Collection of Feminist Periodicals. Canadian Women's Movements Archive.
- Editors of Encyclopædia Britannica. (2024, May 24). *Parthenogenesis*. Encyclopædia Britannica. <https://www.britannica.com/science/parthenogenesis>
- Eichhorn, K. (2013). *The archival turn in feminism: Outrage in order*. Temple University Press.
- Eltling, L. (2022, February 14). The she-cession by the numbers. *Forbes*. <https://www.forbes.com/sites/lizeltling/2022/02/12/the-she-cession-by-the-numbers/>
- Feminist Think Tank [@aesthetic.resistance]. (2024, May 2). *Navigating the patriarchy in academia: A mini feminist manifesto on scholarly survival* [Photograph slides]. Instagram.
- Fraser, N. (2020). *Fortunes of feminism: From state-managed capitalism to neoliberal crisis*. Verso Books.
- Gill, R. (2007). Postfeminist media culture: Elements of a sensibility. *European Journal of Cultural Studies*, 10(2), 147-166. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1367549407075898>
- Halberstam, J. (2005). *In a queer time and place: Transgender bodies, subcultural lives*. New York University Press.
- Hanisch, C. (1970). The personal is political. In S. Firestone & A. Koedt (Eds.), *Notes from the second year: Women's liberation major writings of the radical feminists* (pp. 76-78). Duke University Libraries Digital Collections.
- Hanna, K. (2024). *Rebel girl: My life as a feminist punk*. Ecco.
- Harris, P., & Kane, B. (1973). *The Women's Kit*. The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education; Canadian Women's Movements Archive.
- Harvey, A. (2019). *Feminist media studies*. Polity Press.
- Hemmings, C. (2012). Affective solidarity: Feminist reflexivity and political transformation. *Feminist Theory*, 13(2), 147-161. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1464700112442643>
- hooks, b. (2000). *Feminism is for everybody: Passionate politics*. South End Press
- Hyttén, K. (2017). Ethical scholarship and information overload: On the virtue of slowing down. *Philosophy of Education*, 73, 149-161. <https://doi.org/10.47925/73.149>

- International Women's Day. (n.d.). *History of International Women's Day*.
<https://www.internationalwomensday.com/Activity/15586/The-history-of-IWD>
- International Women's Day. (2024). *International Women's Day 2024 campaign theme is "inspire inclusion."* <https://www.internationalwomensday.com/Theme>
- Kroeker, G., & MacAlpine, R. (2024, April 15). Conversation on the durational legacy of misogyny from Medieval era to the present [Personal correspondence].
- Llewellyn, K., & Llewellyn, J. (2015). A restorative approach to learning: Relational theory as feminist pedagogy in universities. In J. Nicholas, T. P. Light, & R. Bondy (Eds.), *Feminist pedagogy in higher education* (pp. 11-31). Wilfrid Laurier University Press.
- Lorde, A. (1981). The uses of anger: Women responding to racism. *Women's Studies Quarterly*, 9(3), 7-10.
- Lorde, A. (1984). *Sister outsider: Essays and speeches*. Crossing Press.
- Lyshaug, B. (2006). Solidarity without "sisterhood"? Feminism and the ethics of coalition building. *Politics & Gender*, 2(1), 77-100. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1743923X06060041>
- MacDonald, S., & Wiens, B. I. (2019). Mobilizing the "multimangle": Why new materialist research methods in public participatory art matter. *Leisure Sciences*, 41(5), 366-384. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01490400.2019.1627960>
- McKinney, C. (2020). *Information activism: A queer history of lesbian media technologies*. Duke University Press.
- McRobbie, A. (2008). *The aftermath of feminism: Gender, culture and social change*. SAGE.
- Michals, D. (2001). From "consciousness expansion" to "consciousness raising": Feminism and the countercultural politics of the self. In P. Braunstein & M. W. Doyle (Eds.), *Imagine nation: The American counterculture of the 1960s and '70s* (pp. 41-69). Routledge.
- Mohanty, C. T. (2003). *Feminism without borders: Decolonizing theory, practicing solidarity*. Duke University Press.
- Newhouse, T. (1993). Patriarchal paradigm. *The Emily*, 11(3). Canadian Women's Movements Archive.
- Rose, A. (1973). *We are women (The women's kit)*. Canadian Women's Movements Archive.
- Rottenberg, C. (2014). The rise of neoliberal feminism. *Cultural Studies*, 28(3), 418-437. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09502386.2013.857361>
- Ryan, M. K., & Haslam, S. A. (2005). The glass cliff: Evidence that women are over-represented in precarious leadership positions. *British Journal of Management*, 16(2), 81-90. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8551.2005.00433.x>
- Sowards, S. K., & Renegar, V. R. (2004). The rhetorical functions of consciousness-raising in third wave feminism. *Communication Studies*, 55(4), 535-552. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10510970409388637>
- Stephenson, A. (2021, December 28). *What is the "she-cession" and why experts are warning it isn't over just yet*. Global News. <https://globalnews.ca/news/8476781/she-cession-women-jobs-covid-canada/>
- Taylor, D. (2003). *The archive and the repertoire: Performing cultural memory in the Americas*. Duke University Press.
- Taylor, K.-Y. (Ed.). (2017). *How We Get Free: Black Feminism and the Combahee River Collective*. Haymarket Books.
- Thoreau, M. (2022, January 20). *The she-cession: How the pandemic forced women from the workplace and how employers can respond*. Ohio State University Extension. <https://ohioline.osu.edu/factsheet/cdfs-4110>
- United Nations. (n.d.). *International Women's Day*. <https://www.un.org/en/observances/womens-day>
- Varma, A., & Shaban, S. (2024). Conceptualizing feminist solidarity through resistance in the "woman, life, freedom" movement. *Communication, Culture & Critique*, 17(2), 120-126. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ccc/tcae003>
- Vredenburg, J., Kapitan, S., Spry, A., & Kemper, J. A. (2020). Brands taking a stand: Authentic brand activism or woke washing? *Journal of Public Policy & Marketing*, 39(4), 444-460. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0743915620947359>

- Wiens, B. I. (2022). How to use creative and embodied digital methods. In K. Gregory (Ed.), *The SAGE research methods: Doing research online*. Sage Publications. Online.
<https://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781529608359>
- Wiens, B. I. (in press). Media matrix mapping: A feminist small data methodology for digital media ecologies. In G. Englert, C. Meyer, M. Radzikowska, & S. Ruecker (Eds.), *Clever design in critical times: Conceptualizing the Collidocene*. Lexington Books.
- Wiens, B. I., Ruecker, S., Roberts-Smith, J., Radzikowska, M., & MacDonald, S. (2020). Materializing data: New research methods for feminist digital humanities. *Digital Studies*, 10(1). <http://doi.org/10.16995/dscn.373>
- Zeisler, A. (2016). *We were feminists once: From Riot Grrrl to CoverGirl®: The buying and selling of a political movement*. PublicAffairs.