Moving Forward, Looking Back: Taking Canadian Feminist Histories Online

Alana Cattapan is a CIHR Postdoctoral Fellow at Novel Tech Ethics in the Faculty of Medicine at Dalhousie University. She is a long-time feminist researcher and activist whose current research examines the social, legal, and ethical implications of Canadian public policy governing assisted reproductive technologies.

Quinn DuPont is a Ph.D. candidate in the Faculty of Information at the University of Toronto and a Digital Studies Fellow at Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey. His work investigates code and cryptography in society with particular attention to the emerging role of cryptocurrencies.[1]

Abstract

Canadian feminist histories have long been bound to the printed page, potentially eluding audiences online. This article investigates how feminist histories can be expanded beyond traditional paper-bound venues by adopting a form of scholarly production that we call the "networked model." Drawing on digital humanities methods, we argue that this model enables greater alignment with feminist epistemologies and an improved capacity to reach new audiences.

Résumé

Les récits féministes canadiens ont longtemps été confinés à la page imprimée, éludant potentiellement les publics en ligne. Cet article étudie comment les récits féministes peuvent être étendus au-delà des supports papier traditionnels en adoptant une forme de production que nous appelons le « modèle en réseau ». En s'appuyant sur les méthodes numériques des sciences humaines, nous défendons l'idée que ce modèle améliore l'harmonisation avec les épistémologies féministes et la capacité à atteindre de nouveaux publics.

Introduction

> I realize that much of the experience of the second wave of feminism, that of my generation, is getting lost…It is not only that the wheel is being reinvented, which is natural for each generation, it is also that the rich experience of the women's movement, particularly regarding many of the same issues and struggles that preoccupy young activists today is not easily available. (Rebick 2005, xii-xiii)

Although there is a desire to chronicle the second wave of the Canadian women's movement, initiatives that do so have largely been bound to the page —in numerous monographs, edited volumes, and journal articles. As such, these histories, which seem divorced from the digital, may fail to reach new generations of feminist thinkers and activists who primarily communicate with one another and their communities online.

In an era of peer-to-peer scholarly production (Fitzpatrick 2010), academics are challenging longstanding models of academic publishing tied to the output of "products," organizing instead around models of community trust. The worry is that the process of scholarly production may be superseded by its outcomes, the scholar and the scholar's work obscured by the seeming knowledge produced. For feminists, the contestation of conventional models of scholarly production—produced by one or a few authors, undergoing peer review, for publication in a monograph, edited collection, or journal—has been important and invested in bringing together activism and academia through creative methodological interventions. Many forms of publication derived from the digital humanities are well-suited to filling this new role, but are not adequately recognized as sites for feminist scholarship and publication. Digital humanities is an approach to the humanities aimed at producing or utilizing online and digital outputs, often conceived and produced through online forms of collaboration. Digital humanities projects run the gamut

of diversity and ambition, from the first wave of digital humanities projects (then called "humanities computing") that used emerging digital computers for computational linguistics, to the digital conversion of important Western works (often Shakespeare), and, most recently, pioneering new interfaces for reading, writing, and doing humanities scholarship.

In this article, we explore the evolving production of Canadian feminist history online. We discuss existing models chronicling the history of feminism, especially the second wave, noting how the result is often traditional in terms of scholarly production, but novel and exploratory in terms of epistemology. In these works, we identify four key values for feminist epistemology, namely, an emphasis on experiential knowing, broadening what counts as a scholarly resource, forms of collaboration between scholarly and activist communities, and, more recently, a focus on other markers of differences beyond gender, including class, race, and (dis)ability. We introduce a new model of scholarly production that emerges from the digital humanities—the "networked model"—that we identify with three socio-technical qualities: expanding authorship, contesting peer review, and enabling access for readers. We compare three selective digital projects that disseminate feminist scholarship online; these include the Orlando Project, the *Women Suffrage and Beyond* website, and attempts to address deficiencies in Wikipedia's entries on Canadian feminism. While these initiatives are very different in terms of purpose and format and each have particular strengths and limitations, we are particularly interested in assessing the degree to which they are consistent with feminist epistemologies (Karraker and Larney 1984; Code 1991; Alcoff and Potter 1993; Doucet and Mauthner 2006) and the qualities associated with the networked model of scholarly production. We conclude by suggesting that feminists, and historians of Canadian second wave feminism more specifically, could benefit from deeper engagement with the digital humanities and that, in turn, the digital humanities could benefit from the integration of feminist critical approaches and epistemologies.

Chronicling the Second Wave

Although academic research on women's historical significance in particular periods has a long history (for example, Cleverdon 1950), it was not until the 1970s that women's experiences in Canada and their contributions to Canadian history began to be accepted as a legitimate focus of scholarly interrogation (Brandt 1991). Some of this historical work was published in well-established Canadian academic journals (Strong-Boag 1978; Pedersen 1996); however, the establishment of periodicals, such as the *Canadian Newsletter of Research on Women* (1974), *Atlantis* (1974), and *Canadian Woman Studies* (1978), provided dedicated space for the publication of feminist scholarly research on women and their histories, which took the form of articles, bibliographies, and guides to archival resources (Pedersen 1996).

In the 1980s and early 1990s, a number of key volumes which focused on the history of women in Canada were published, including *Histoire des femmes au Quebec depuis quatre siècles* (Dumont-Johnson and Collectif Clio 1982), *Changing Patterns: Women in Canada* (Burt, Code, and Dorney 1988), *Rethinking Canada: The Promise of Women's History* (Strong-Boag and Fellman 1986a), *The Widening Sphere* (L'Espérance 1982), and *Canadian Women: A History* (Prentice et al. 1988). These ambitious works sought to chronicle the expansive histories of women in Canada and Quebec as well as to document the second wave of the women's movement. Other volumes published in this period reaffirmed the importance of committing feminist histories to the page (Pierson et al. 1993; Backhouse and Flaherty 1992; Andrew and Rodgers 1997; Wine and Ristock 1991; Parr and Rosenfeld 1996), as did the historical research published in new academic journals, such as the *Canadian Journal of Women and the Law* (1985). In addition to these collections and journals, the proliferation of academic associations and research groups dedicated to fostering feminist historical and contemporary research ensured that the histories of women and the women's movement in Canada would continue to be documented and analyzed.

The publication of monographs, edited collections, and journal articles that explore women's history and the history of second wave feminisms has since continued. Of particular note is a collection edited by Catherine Carstairs and Nancy Janovicek (2013) that discusses the production of feminist histories in Canada over a forty-year period and examines the work of the Feminist History Society, an organization dedicated to creating a lasting record of the women's movement

in Canada and Quebec. The Feminist History Society has focused its attention on the years between 1960 and 2010 in part in an effort to chronicle the surge of activism and "energy" during this period. The Society intends to publish several books a year for a decade (2010-2020) to make sure that the history of the second wave is well documented and told by those who participated in the movement.

In too many ways to mention, this brief historiographical overview does not do justice to the nuanced historical work that has been produced on women's movement in Canada. The rich and unique history of the women's movement in Quebec, the ways in which Indigenous feminisms have been articulated and chronicled, and the many feminist initiatives that defy the language of "waves" are absent from our analysis. Works like *Looking into My Sister's Eyes* (Burnet 1986), which focuses on the lives of immigrant women in Canadian history, or *Painting the Maple* (Strong-Boag et al. 1998), which examines the intersections of gender, race, and nation-building in the Canadian context, contest the largely white, Anglocentric historiography outlined above. Further, given that this historiographical overview has concentrated mainly on the feminist and activist histories of the so-called second wave, the complicated intersections of liberal and socialist feminists within and across academia are missing here, as are the debates over women's versus gender histories (Dua and Robertson 1999; Luxton 2001; Nadeau 2009; Sangster 1995, 2000).

At the same time, our engagement with the historiography of the women's movement in Canada illuminates two important principles. First, feminist scholars and activists have long been committed to chronicling the history of the second wave to preserve the historical record, while those involved are still able to share their stories, and to enable new generations of feminists to build on the work of those who came before them. Reflecting on her reasons for writing *Ten Thousand Roses*, Judy Rebick (2005) notes that the death of Kay Macpherson in 1999 spurred her to write as she was concerned that the experiences of her peers might not get communicated to younger feminists (xi). The Feminist History Society proposed its monograph series in the same spirit, expressing concern about missing the opportunity to "chronicle our history" and articulating a desire to communicate it to "encourage and challenge all those who follow" (Dumont-Johnson 2012, x). This sentiment—that it is important to chronicle the history of the second wave and make it available to young feminists—is perhaps most clearly expressed by Constance Backhouse (1992) in the introduction to *Challenging Times*. She asserts that feminists of the second wave

> have an obligation to set down how we think we have arrived at this place, documenting our sense of victories, challenges, defeats. The greater the access to these recollections, the more quickly incoming feminists will be able to take their place as more full participants, questioners, and challengers to our understandings and ideas. (5)

Feminist histories in Canada, then, are both a means of preserving the past and enabling future feminists to learn from the experiences, successes, and mistakes of their predecessors.

The second principle we draw from our brief historiographical overview is that feminist historical writing has been used as a vehicle to challenge conventional modes of knowledge production. Much has been written about the ways in which feminist histories have not only been a medium for telling women's stories, but also a venue for putting feminist epistemologies into action by presenting women's experiences in their own voices (Pierson 1991). Because of this emphasis on the experiential and the need to "tap some previously unused, even uncollected sources" to illuminate women's stories, feminist historians have been instrumental in broadening understandings of "what counts" as an archival source and as scholarly production (Strong-Boag and Fellman 1986b, 5). Furthermore, despite an early emphasis on the ways in which women's experiences challenged dominant histories, the use of feminist epistemologies to conceptualize women's histories, including histories of the second wave, has meant that race, (dis)ability, class, and other markers of difference have, to some extent, been important categories of analysis.

The writing of feminist histories is also notable because it is itself a site of activism and collaboration between scholarly and activist communities—though feminist scholars and activists often were (and are) one and the same. Histories of the women's movement are part of the broader project of feminist knowledge production and, as such, are part of the movement. Two of the early major volumes on women's history in Canada

(Dumont-Johnson and Collectif Clio 1982; Prentice et al. 1988) were the "result of research and writing undertaken by historians who purposefully constituted themselves as feminist collectives," at once advancing the scholarly project of knowledge production in various forms with the goals of articulating women's experiences and making women's history known (Brandt 1991, 443). Between the 1970s and 1990s, these feminist commitments were further realized through the publication of edited volumes that incorporated primary documents from the women's movement (as found in Pierson et al.'s [1993] *Canadian Women's Issues*) or books that integrated the voices of activists (as in the case of Judy Rebick's [2005] *Ten Thousand Roses*) as well as through the establishment of a Women's Movement Archives in the late 1980s (Fulford and Canadian Women's Movement Archives 1992; Loyer 2006) and the creation of feminist documentary filmmaking (in the work, for example, of the National Film Board's Studio D founded in 1974) (Vanstone 2007). In short, women's histories, including feminist histories and the histories of the second wave, are themselves part of a feminist epistemological project invested in contesting power relations through collaboration and challenging conventional modes of knowledge production in academia.

Digitizing Histories: The Potential of the Networked Model for Scholarly Production

Documenting the history of the Canadian women's movement through journal articles, monographs, edited collections, documentary films, and the ongoing development of archives has been, and continues to be, critical to the movement. Significant opportunities are missed, however, when these media are seen as the only sites of historical documentation and scholarly production. Online initiatives offer new possibilities for sharing feminist histories among existing and new generations of feminists and across sites of interaction. Such possibilities might also, for example, enable those with motor, visual, or auditory (dis)abilities to better access and participate in these histories. It is also important to think about the ways in which digital initiatives might facilitate the dissemination of women's histories and feminisms outside of academia.

The use of online initiatives to capture feminist histories is part of a broader shift toward what we call the "networked model" of scholarly production. This model can be considered a re-articulation and expansion of many of the methods used in the digital humanities, based on participatory, non-hierarchical, and inclusionary understandings of how to "do" scholarship and undergirded by the technical infrastructure of Internet connectivity. Unlike conventional models of scholarship (which include some projects in the digital humanities) where one or several authors produce the entirety of a text, the work of scholarly production in the network model is no longer linear and univocal, but rather divided into small, discrete parts that can be managed, ordered, and algorithmically combined.

The promise of the networked model lies in the values that it brings to new forms of scholarly production. The mere act of taking scholarship online does not mean that it engages in a substantially new form of scholarly production; indeed, some digital projects—such as simply putting a book online—can be interpreted as re-inscribing pre-existing notions of expertise, authority, and access that are germane to conventional publishing practices. Additionally, these works are particularly challenging to maintain given that they most often reside with one or a few scholars and the sustainability of these projects may be lost as academics move on and the sites go dark (Earhart 2012). The networked model moves beyond the mere technical advantages on which such projects focus and instead rethinks how the avatars of "the digital" and "the network" might be used to enable new models of sociality and production. Although the diverse scholarship on the contributions of digital initiatives in the humanities raises a range of issues about how techno-social transformations contribute to new modes of scholarly production, we have nonetheless identified three key contributions: expanding authorship, contesting conventional peer review processes, and enabling reader access.

Expanding Authorship

Whereas conventional forms of scholarly production have valued the transmission of knowledge from one author to a mass readership (one-to-many), the network model challenges the notion of sole authorship. The scenario in which one or several authors contribute large swaths of knowledge is displaced as the networked model of scholarly production presumes that many people can make smaller contributions to create scholarly outputs. A famous dictum in open

source software engineering—"given enough eyeballs, all bugs are shallow"—points to one of the benefits of such a model; it suggests that, with a sufficient number of "authors" (or simply "contributors"), errors will be detected and fixed (Raymond 2001, 19). The networked model of scholarly production, then, builds on the idea that the production and transmission of knowledge occur best when the thoughts of many are transmitted to many (many-to-many). From this view, enabling a participatory and inclusive form of knowledge production ensures that the quality of the outputs will be improved simply by drawing on a wide range of experience and expertise.

The networked model of scholarly production also challenges conventional notions of expertise. Here, anyone can potentially become an author or be involved in scholarly production. The many-to-many movement of information in the networked model of scholarly production enables "participatory expertise" by integrating a broader range of potential participants in scholarly work (Pfister 2011; Fitzpatrick 2010). Moreover, potential participants have the option of being anonymous (or use pseudonyms), displacing many concerns about whether or not one has the right training or credentials to participate in scholarly work.

This model of a many-to-many network is perhaps best captured by Wikipedia, the free, online, collaboratively-built encyclopaedia to which many contributors provide small, discrete parts of a larger entry. Alone, these contributions might entail the addition or deletion of a single word, but, in the aggregate, the contributions form entries and, more broadly, a comprehensive encyclopaedia. Wikipedia also challenges conventional notions of expertise. Writing about the "rhetoric of expertise," Damien Pfister (2011) points out that Wikipedia is often seen as a less legitimate contribution to scholarship because it is not written by "experts" (217-231). In the networked model and the changing understanding of epistemology that accompanies it, however, Wikipedia may be viewed as a site of scholarly production *because* it does not require the engagement of experts. While scholars might still publicly deny using Wikipedia, it has become acceptable in some domains to start an investigation using Wikipedia resources or even, in rare cases, cite Wikipedia directly. Matthew G. Kirschenbaum (2008), for example, argues that "information technology is among the most reliable content domains on Wikipedia" and cites it appropriately and approvingly (xvii). That said, while information technology on Wikipedia may be a reliable content domain, feminist histories remain underrepresented (Eckert and Steiner 2013; Cattapan 2012).

Contesting the Peer Review Process

Today, the peer review process is considered the gold standard in academic publishing. This model developed as academic publishing shifted from in-house decisions made by a sole editor to a structure that protected the editor-in-chief's decision, albeit in an acceptable (distributed) way (Guédon and Siemens 2002). In the traditional peer review process, the editor makes the initial decision to reject an incoming submission outright or to send it to approved reviewers. Typically, this review process is performed in secret and anonymously with no outside dissemination of information until a decision to publish or not has been made.

In recent years, the utility, fairness, and quality of traditional forms of peer review have been challenged for potentially perpetuating systemic bias or developing an "old boys club" (Fitzpatrick 2010). Double-anonymized (double-blind) peer review helps to address the worst problems associated with bias and gatekeeping; however, for many, especially those who seek to contest existing social and academic norms, this has been insufficient (Bingham 2000; Cook and Fonow 1984). The peer review process also requires editors and reviewers to give up time that might otherwise be dedicated to teaching and research. Since women academics generally undertake more service, including in the labour of the peer review process, than their male counterparts, there are significant concerns about the collective toll the peer review system has on academic women's career advancement (Misra et al. 2011).

Alternatives to existing forms of peer review have long existed and have usually been predicated on different epistemological assumptions about what "counts" as scholarship. For example, feminist journals, such as *Feminist Teacher, Journal of the Motherhood Initiative, and Ada: A Journal of Gender, New Media, and Technology*, have used collaboration and editorial board review, eschewing editor-led and review-bound publication processes (Mohr 2012). Similarly, while

still at the fringe, open and alternative models of peer review are becoming more common in the digital world. For example, *Nature* attempted and failed at an open review process in 2006, testing a model in which authors could post their manuscripts publicly for comment. Others, such as *Electronic Transactions on Artificial Intelligence* (ETAI), have a well-developed, two-stage open process whereby an extended open review is followed by a "speedy up or down refereeing stage" (Fitzpatrick 2010, 167). *Ada: A Journal of Gender, New Media, and Technology* is at once a feminist and digital initiative and uses a multi-stage public process that requires editors to pre-review articles after which submissions are open to review by any members of the Fembot Collective ("Submission Guidelines"). Perhaps most radically (and with some *jouissance*), Mark C. Marino (2014) has suggested that Facebook "likes" and Twitter "retweets" should count as peer review, a form of Buzzfeed scholarship fit for our times.

Ultimately, all of these alternate models of peer review still rely on peer review. While they challenge conventional models, they also re-inscribe them by granting authority to reviewers and editors over what counts as scholarship. Wikipedia provides an example of a fully networked mode of production that has no formal peer review process with all voices collaboratively editing contributions. Rather than a peer review model, Fitzpatrick (2010) refers to this type of production as "peer-to-peer" review, invoking the idea of peer-to-peer file sharing in which multiple contributors each provide a small part to be aggregated. This peer-to-peer model of review relies on users trusting the network, rather than an individual or credential, to ensure that the information provided is complete and accurate. This process of production encourages inclusion with contributors editing and revising one another's work until there is a near-consensus on the quality of the contribution.

Enabling Reader Access

The networked model of scholarly production may also work to broaden reader access. The expansion of readership may occur both because of the easy reproduction and dissemination of digital works and due to the nature of the network itself. Given that digital outputs are not bound to material constraints (page length, fixed text publication cycles, and economic concerns) in the same way as paper-based works, they can be accessed anytime by anyone with an Internet connection, including people who experience physical, physiological, or financial constraints. For example, the idea of open access scholarship resulted from the introduction of digital technologies that eliminated print costs, shortened or abolished publication cycles, and reduced the need to be bound to brick and mortar buildings. These "merely" digital modes of production, however, still fall short of the potential offered by the networked mode of production.

The networked mode of production may also work to eliminate some economic constraints by diffusing the human resources needed to author scholarly works. The network model enables many authors to contribute in small ways to a larger scholarly work. Authors may be from outside academia, including hobbyists and those with first-hand experience of an issue. Additionally, the network model enables broad sharing and dissemination through social networks like Twitter, Facebook, and Academia.edu, among others.

Taking Canadian Feminist Histories Online

Feminist historians and, more specifically, those involved in producing histories of the second wave women's movement in Canada, have long been engaged in collaborative projects. As a field dedicated to contesting conventional models of scholarly production and broadening authorship, feminist histories are also, in many ways, well-aligned to the networked model of scholarly production. Nevertheless, new initiatives designed to capture feminist histories (including the Feminist History Society) are still anchored by the material page. Disseminating the history of the second wave in monographs, edited volumes, and journal articles misses important opportunities offered by the networked model.

Feminist histories are an important epistemological inflection point for models of scholarly production. Indeed, feminist historiography sits between two worlds—"as an act in the present on behalf of the future" (Friedman 1998, 201). The way in which new generations of feminists come to know about feminisms is often through these histories, which are shaped by both a positivist mission of recovering the historical roles and contributions of women and an interpretive approach of sharing their stories and experiences. Through these

positivist and interpretive lenses, feminist histories have focused on making several key epistemological contributions, which include—at least minimally—telling women's stories in their own voices (with an emphasis on experiential knowing), broadening what counts as a scholarly resource, enabling collaboration between scholarly and activist communities, and, more recently, drawing attention to markers of difference beyond gender such as class, race, and (dis)ability.

In what follows, we examine three digital initiatives—the Orlando Project, the *Women Suffrage and Beyond* website, and Wikipedia—that, in our view, constitute exceptions to the traditional model of re-inscribing print production in digital media. Our selected examples are not exhaustive as there are other important projects that could have been examined; for example, the PAR-L listserv, Women and Social Movements in the United States, Library and Archives Canada's now-defunct Celebrating Women's Achievements project, heroines.ca, or Rise Up: A Digital Archive of Feminist Activism.[2] Nonetheless, the different approaches to networked modes of production that these three initiatives have adopted serve to illustrate some of the strengths and limitations of contemporary projects designed to capture feminist histories (Conrad and Mullally 2010). They also offer important starting points for theorizing how new histories of the second wave might move away from conventional modes of production and dissemination to contest embedded power relations and to reach new authors and audiences.

The Orlando Project

The Orlando Project is a digital archive of women's writing in the British Isles that was conceived around 1991, first funded in 1995, and finally released in 2006 (Brown, Clements, and Grundy 2006). It is a collaboratively produced, interdisciplinary database that uses new digital tools for critical literary and historical research.

While the historical documents housed in the Orlando Project are neither particularly Canadian (although it is a collaborative project led by scholars at the University of Alberta and the University of Guelph) nor focused on the history of the second wave, this archive does have particular strengths that could serve as a model for Canadian second wave histories. The project moves beyond the production of feminist archives as a site of mere feminist "presence" and visibility and towards mediated contextual materials (Wernimont 2013; Brown, Clements, and Grundy 2006). It adds valuable context by attaching semantic mark-up to textual materials in the form of elaborate XML tags to identify categories such as relationships, location, occupations, race, and sex. Although this approach provides rich contextualization of the materials, the development team has noted that this practice of categorization affirms Geoffrey C. Bowker and Susan Leigh Star's (2000) insights about classification – that some points of view are valorized in the archiving process while others are silenced (Brown, Clements, and Grundy 2006).

The Orlando Project was initially conceived as a book project. The material limitations of a paper-based project, however, proved too constraining for its envisioned scope so it was brought online. The move away from print also enabled the team to provide additional functionality such as searching or dynamically reordering texts as well as offering deeper and more mobile contextualizations. That said, the project is traditional in its epistemological approach; while activist in nature, it is positivist in that the goal of the project is to shine a light on the (silenced) work of women rather than to narrativize women's experiences.

Although the Orlando Project is online, it has remained closed-access. The high costs of the technical production phase has been cited as the reason (Brown, Clements, and Grundy 2006) and this situation has presumably resulted in the establishment of a pay structure to recoup the upfront expenditures. One important lesson, then, is that highly valued technical expertise commands a high price, which can be a constraining factor for projects looking to explore the networked model of scholarly production.

Women Suffrage and Beyond

In 2011, a group of scholars at the University of British Columbia's Institute for Gender, Race, Sexuality, and Social Justice, led by feminist historian Veronica Strong-Boag, established a website called *Women Suffrage and Beyond: Confronting the Democratic Deficit*. The site is designed to draw attention to how historical struggles for women's suffrage are represented and remain relevant to contemporary questions about democracy. In part, *Women Suffrage and Beyond* has sought to

challenge attempts to limit academic freedom, unconventional histories, and knowledge production under a restrictive federal government and works to connect activism and scholarship through the lens of women's suffrage and democracy. The website is largely comprised of single-authored profiles of countries, organizations, or people or posts on one of three themes: activism, the democratic deficit, or race, class, and sexuality.

In some ways, *Women Suffrage and Beyond* replicates the conventional model of scholarly production with (mostly) single authors posting short articles written in an academic style with APA references and vetted for style and content by site editors. Though this is not, by any means, traditional double-anonymized peer review, the movement of knowledge from one author to the website audience through a relatively conventional editorial process re-inscribes commitments to traditional forms of scholarly production ("Submission Guide" 2015).

Women Suffrage and Beyond, however, does engage with the networked model of scholarly production in a number of important ways. The website focuses on open access and information exchange, hoping to make knowledge about the gendered politics of suffrage and the franchise available to a lay audience. It does so by sharing knowledge across platforms and including technology for sharing resources. Further, although the individual contributions are single authored, the website contests conventional notions of authorship by drawing together contributions and establishing a single digital resource that "eschews all pretense of impartiality and employs scholarship to raise public consciousness about democracy and social justice" (Strong-Boag and Johnstone 2013).

Wikipedia

Wikipedia has, for years, been the focus of much hand wringing among scholars. It seems clear, however, that no amount of critique will change the fact that its popularity has increased as it grows larger, becomes more comprehensive, and is less error-filled and error-prone. Traditional gatekeepers of knowledge, such as teachers, librarians, and book publishers, are often highly critical of and express consternation about Wikipedia (former ALA head Michael Gorman predicted a destructive "digital tsunami" due to the influence of Wikipedia), while digital technophiles invested in "disrupting" ossified forms of education and knowledge production usually offer praise (Lovink and Tkacz 2011). Ignoring Wikipedia comes at scholars' own peril since it represents far-reaching changes to scholarly production and contemporary epistemologies (Fitzpatrick 2010).

Of the three initiatives under discussion, Wikipedia best represents the possible synergies between the networked model and feminist scholarship. It has demonstrated pedagogical value, enabling students to engage with high-impact collectivized authorship of under-studied areas, including Canadian feminist histories. Similarly, it offers scholars a public venue for scholarly production that is available to all; in the case of the Wikipedia Zero project (not without its own issues), it provides free-of-charge access through mobile phones in the Global South. Wikipedia expands authorship by elevating all contributors to the same status with little or no need for traditional forms of expertise (Wikipedia contributors are usually anonymous or pseudonymous). The actual mode of production is discrete and piecemeal with algorithmic "bots" and humans collectively making changes, sometimes adding only a word or a sentence. Moreover, many of Wikipedia's production techniques extend to other projects such as Wikisource or Wikidata, which do not take the shape of an encyclopaedia entry, but are key to its comprehensive approach. The collective result is a diffuse form of multi-vocality, free of traditional authorial intention and bias.

One of the authors of this article has used the collaborative editing of Wikipedia in the classroom in an effort to improve the quality of articles on Canadian feminism (Cattapan 2012). Through the process of challenging the instructor/student hierarchy (helping to legitimate students' experiences and perspectives), creating connections beyond the classroom, sharing knowledge through collective sense-making, and addressing power relations, students and instructor alike gained a deeper appreciation for visible knowledge production. Benefits for the students included making their work tangible and real, (training for) identifying gaps in existing literature, and writing for a public audience in an encyclopaedic style. Since this early example, the use of Wikipedia in the academic classroom has become more commonplace and both authors have incorporated the practice into our own syllabi.

In practical terms, developing and fixing Wikipedia is a kind of public service that we believe all academics should perform.

Even though a core principle of Wikipedia is the "Neutral Point of View" (no bias), this principle can be problematic for feminist scholarship. As discussed above, many feminist scholars valorizes the experiential and interpretive, which, seemingly, has no place on Wikipedia. In fact, all academic scholarship (feminist or not) is produced from a specific perspective and militates against "factualist" accounts (Rosenzweig 2006). The worst cases of error on Wikipedia, however, are not the easily corrected "facts," but rather systematic and subtle bias. To address bias, errors, and other issues, Wikipedia has developed "working groups" called WikiProjects, including one that addresses feminist or gender issues. It should be noted that neutral writing is still a requirement and even stressed for those involved in WikiProjects.

None of the above digital initiatives perfectly bring together feminist historical contributions and the networked model of scholarly production. The Orlando Project is not open access and reproduces a traditional positivist epistemology rather than a more experiential one (although both are appropriate epistemologies for feminist histories). *Women Suffrage and Beyond* retains some elements of the traditional peer review process and conventional understandings of authorship. Wikipedia, as a site of scholarly production, emphasizes factual and "citeable" forms of knowledge to the exclusion of non-traditional sources and experiential, perspectival forms of knowledge. Further, while Wikipedia works to contest the peer review process and to expand authorship through its networked approach, it is important to note that editing on Wikipedia remains a male-dominated domain and is shaped by an in-group (masculine) etiquette (Lam et al. 2011).

Despite these and other limitations, the networked model of scholarly production does offer important possibilities. In some cases, the cost of production can be lowered significantly—especially when piggy-backing on existing technologies such as ready-built academic systems (for example, journal or conference systems) or general purpose systems (for example, Wikipedia or blogs). The (potential) lower cost may also broaden readership and, when combined with new attitudes about the review process and authorship, expand the scope of who can contribute, which is especially important for recovering women's voices where they have been silenced. Finally, the relative ease of sharing electronic academic resources through non-academic venues is equally important and especially for the dissemination of feminist knowledge and work.

Conclusion

The networked model of scholarly production does not address all issues related to the production and dissemination of feminist histories of the second wave. There are important concerns about barriers for authors and readers, including access to the Internet, technological skill, and a general willingness to engage—which could be significant. Yet, these barriers could also be translated into opportunities for new generations of younger feminists who are more familiar with new technologies as well as others who are not closely aligned to feminist pursuits (Conrad and Mullally 2010, 48). The stakes are particularly high in the Canadian context where Canadian feminist historical and other scholarly work is often overshadowed or subsumed by American scholarship. Canadian feminist historians and scholars deserve their own (cyber)space.

At the same time, the networked model of scholarly production may contribute to a rethinking and expansion of feminist approaches to scholarly work by encouraging more collaborative authorship, challenging conventional peer review practices, and broadening readership beyond academia. If it is not always clear whether "feminism is relevant to considerations of digital technologies" (Petty and Crow 2008, 3), the parallels drawn here between the goals of feminist epistemologies and the projects of digital production demonstrate how the networked model of scholarly production can serve as a metaphor, even when the barriers are significant, for what scholarship could be when its very foundations are opened up for reconsideration.

The insights that feminist historians might gain from digital projects, specifically those produced in the digital humanities, and the principles that the digital humanities might learn from feminist epistemologies are substantial. Feminist scholars have been at the forefront of theorizing about technology (looking back to the pioneers of cyberfeminism), but are less involved in material technological pursuits, especially

in the area of scholarly production. Digital humanities, as a discipline, excels at large-scale projects, but some scholars have noted that it does not engage sufficiently with critical forms of scholarship (see Liu 2013). Digital humanities scholarship needs to be much more attentive to feminist and critical intersectional understandings of all markers of difference (gender, race, sexuality, (dis)ability, and so on), which might provide scholars, especially junior and early-career scholars, important inflection points to make real contributions. In some ways, this change is occuring. As this article was being prepared for publication the issue of how, and *if*, digital humanities can contribute to critical forms of scholarship has exploded, in rather public ways; and while we do not want to add to the infighting, we recognize that digital humanities has the potential for reform and therefore for making significant critical contributions (see Allington, Brouillette, and Golumbia 2016). We see a rising tide of young feminists who possess unique interests, approaches, and skills, who are working to realize feminist and other critical projects under the networked model of scholarly production.

Much hard work, however, remains to be done. Projects like the Orlando Project, *Women Suffrage and Beyond*, and bringing feminism to Wikipedia are real advances, but they must struggle against existing values associated with scholarly production. Issues related to career advancement, fame and egoism, funding, peer review, authority and credentialing, and closed-access work (Cook and Fonow 1984) will continue to haunt any project that attempts to deploy the networked model of scholarly production. While we offer few solutions here, one intervention might involve intergenerational collaboration: established senior scholars should work with junior scholars to fight for the networked model and engage with its outputs. The validation of new models, and the recognition of the legitimacy of scholarly projects growing out of them, must come from above and below. The more radical the approach, the greater the possibility that it might fail and jeopardize the broader goal, but also the greater possibility that change will occur. Despite the hard work and obstacles ahead, we see feminist and digital humanities scholars as ideally positioned to assist each other in mutually-supportive goals.

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank Constance Crompton, Lisa Boucher, and Susan Brown for their comments on drafts of this article. We also benefited from the presentation of this work at the 2015 INKE gathering on "Sustaining Partnerships to Transform Scholarly Production."

Endnotes

[1]Please note that the authors contributed equally to this article. Their names are listed alphabetically.

[2] Since this article was submitted for publication, Alana Cattapan has been on the organizing group of Rise Up: A Digital ARchive of Feminist Activism. This online archive, which launched in October 2016, chronicles the history of feminist activism in Canada from the 1970s to the 1990s. See riseupfeministarchive.ca.

References

Allington, Daniel, Sarah Brouillette, and David Golumbia. 2016 "Neoliberal Tools (and Archives): A Political History of Digital Humanities." *Los Angeles Review of Books*, May 1. https://lareviewofbooks.org/article/neoliberal-tools-archives-political-history-digital-humanities.

Alcoff, Linda, and Elizabeth Potter, eds. 1993. *Feminist Epistemologies*. London, UK: Routledge.

Andrew, Caroline, and Sanda Rodgers, eds. 1997. *Women and the Canadian State*. Montreal, QC and Kingston, ON: McGill-Queen's University Press.

Backhouse, Constance. 1992. "The Contemporary Women's Movements in Canada and the United States: An Introduction." In *Challenging Times: The Women's Movement in Canada and the United States*, edited by Constance Backhouse and David H. Flaherty, 1-15. Montreal, QC and Kingston, ON: McGill-Queen's Press.

Backhouse, Constance, and David H. Flaherty. 1992. *Challenging Times: The Women's Movement in Canada and the United States*. Montreal, QC and Kingston, ON: McGill-Queen's Press.

Bingham, Craig. 2000. "Peer Review and the Ethics of Internet Publishing." In *Ethical Issues in Biomedical Publication*, edited by Anne Hudson Jones and Faith McLellan, 85-111. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Bowker, Geoffrey C., and Susan Leigh Star. 2000. *Sorting Things Out: Classification and Its Consequences*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

Brandt, Gail Cuthbert. 1991. "Postmodern Patchwork: Some Recent Trends in the Writing of Women's History in Canada." *Canadian Historical Review* 72 (4): 441-470.

Brown, Susan, Patricia Clements, and Isobel Grundy. 2006. "Sorting Things in: Feminist Knowledge Representation and Changing Modes of Scholarly Production." *Women's Studies International Forum* 29 (3): 317-325.

Burnet, Jean R. 1986. *Looking into My Sister's Eyes: An Exploration in Women's History*. Toronto, ON: Multicultural History Society of Ontario.

Burt, Sandra D., Lorraine Code, and Lindsay Dorney. 1988. *Changing Patterns: Women in Canada*. Toronto, ON: McClelland & Stewart.

Carstairs, Catherine, and Nancy Janovicek, eds. 2013. *Feminist History in Canada: New Essays on Women, Gender, Work, and Nation*. Vancouver, BC: UBC Press.

Cattapan, Alana. 2012. "(Re)Writing 'Feminism in Canada': Wikipedia in the Feminist Classroom." *Feminist Teacher* 22 (2): 125-136.

Cleverdon, Catherine Lyle. 1950. *The Woman Suffrage Movement in Canada*. Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press.

Code, Lorraine. 1991. *What Can She Know? Feminist Theory and the Construction of Knowledge*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Cook, Judith A., and Mary Margaret Fonow. 1984. "Am I My Sister's Gatekeeper? Cautionary Tales from the Academic Hierarchy." *Humanity and Society* 8 (4): 442-452.

Conrad, Margaret, and Sasha Mullally. 2010. "Women, History, and Information and Communications Technologies." *Atlantis: Critical Studies in Gender, Culture & Social Justice* 34 (2): 43–54.

Doucet, Andrea, and Natasha S. Mauthner. 2006. "Feminist Methodologies and Epistemologies." In *Handbook of 21st Century Sociology*, edited by Clifton D. Bryant and Dennis L. Peck, 26-32. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Dua, Enakshi, and Angela Robertson, eds. 1999. *Scratching the Surface: Canadian Anti-Racist Feminist Thought*. Toronto, ON: Women's Press.

Dumont-Johnson, Micheline. 2012. *Feminism Á La Québécoise*. Ottawa, ON: Feminist History Society.

Dumont-Johnson, Micheline, and Collectif Clio. 1982. *L'Histoire des femmes au Québec depuis quatre siècles*. Montréal, QC: Quinze.

Earhart, Amy E. 2012. "Can Information Be Unfettered? Race and the New Digital Humanities Canon." In *Debates in the Digital Humanities*, edited by Matthew K. Gold, 309-318. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Eckert, Stine, and Linda Steiner. 2013. "Wikipedia's Gender Gap." In *Media Disparity: A Gender Battleground*, edited by Cory L. Armstrong, 87-98. Plymouth, UK: Lexington.

Fembot Collective. 2015. "Submission Guidelines" *Ada: A Journal of Gender, New Media, and Technology*. http://adanewmedia.org/submissions/.

Fitzpatrick, Kathleen. 2010. "Peer-to-Peer Review and the Future of Scholarly Authority." *Social Epistemology: A Journal of Knowledge, Culture, and Policy* 24 (3): 161–179.

Friedman, Susan Stanford. 1998. *Mappings: Feminism and the Cultural Geographies of Encounter*. Princeton,

NJ: Princeton University Press.

Fulford, Margaret, and Canadian Women's Movement Archives. 1992. *The Canadian Women's Movement, 1960-1990 : A Guide to Archival Resources*. Toronto, ON: ECW Press.

Guédon, Jean-Claude, and Raymond Siemens. 2002. "The Credibility of Electronic Publishing: Peer Review and Imprint." *TEXT Technology* 11 (1): 17-35.

Karakker, Mary M. Wilkes, and Barbara Elden Larney. 1984. "Sociology and Women: Building Toward the New Scholarship." *Humanity and Society* 8 (4): 497-505.

Kirschenbaum, Matthew G. 2008. *Mechanisms: New Media and the Forensic Imagination*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Lam, Shyong, Anuradha Uduwage, Zhenhua Dong, Shilad Sen, David Musicant, Loren Terveen, and John Riedl. 2011. "WP: Clubhouse? An Exploration of Wikipedia's Gender Imbalance." WikiSym'11, Mountain View, CA, October 3-5. http://grouplens.org/system/files/wp-gender-wikisym2011.pdf.

L'Espérance, Jeanne, Public Archives Canada and National Library of Canada. 1982. *The Widening Sphere: Women in Canada, 1870-1940*. Ottawa, ON: Public Archives of Canada.

Liu, Alan. 2013. "The Meaning of the Digital Humanities." *PMLA* 128 (2): 409-423.

Lovink, Geert, and Nathaniel Tkacz. 2011. "The 'C' in CPOV: Introduction to the CPOV Reader." In *Critical Point of View: A Wikipedia Reader*, edited by Geert Lovink and Nathaniel Tkacz, 9-13. Amsterdam, NL: Institute of Network Cultures.

Loyer, Stacey. 2006. "Preserving Records, Creating Memories, Shaping Research: Inside the Canadian Women's Movement Archives." Master's Thesis, University of Ottawa, Ottawa, ON.

Luxton, Meg. 2001. "Feminism as a Class Act: Working-Class Feminism and the Women's Movement in Canada." *Labour/Le Travail* 48: 63-88.

Marino, Mark C. 2014. "10 Reasons Professors Should Start Writing BuzzFeed Articles." *Buzzfeed*, October 23. http://www.buzzfeed.com/markcmarino/10-reasons-professors-should-start-writing-buzzfee-12dly.

Misra, Joya, Jennifer Hickes Lundquist, Elissa Holmes, and Stephanie Agiomavritis. 2011. "The Ivory Ceiling of Service Work." *Academe* 97 (1): 22-26.

Mohr, Petra M. 2012. "Feminist Practices in Editing: A Case Study of the Feminist Teacher Collective." Master's Thesis, University of Wisconsin-Stout, Menomonie, WI.

Nadeau, Mary-Jo. 2009. "Troubling Herstory: Unsettling White Multiculturalism in Canadian Feminism." *Canadian Woman Studies* 27 (2/3): 6-13.

Parr, Joy, and Mark Rosenfeld, eds. 1996. *Gender and History in Canada*. Toronto, ON: Copp Clark.

Pedersen, Diana Lynn. 1996. *Changing Women, Changing History: A Bibliography of the History of Women in Canada*. Montreal, QC and Kingston, ON: McGill-Queen's Press.

Petty, Sheila, and Barbara Crow. 2008. "Introduction to Digital Feminisms." *Atlantis: Critical Studies in Gender, Culture & Social Justice* 32 (2): 2-5.

Pfister, Damien. 2011. "Networked Expertise in the Era of Many-to-Many Communication: On Wikipedia and Invention." *Social Epistemology* 25 (3): 217-231. http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/commstudiespapers/10.

Pierson, Ruth Roach. 1991. "Experience, Difference, Dominance and Voice in the Writing of Canadian Women's History." In *Writing Women's History: International Perspectives*, edited by Karen M. Offen, Ruth Roach Pierson, and Jane Rendall, 79-106. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

Pierson, Ruth Roach, Marjorie Griffin Cohen, Paula Bourne, and Philinda Masters. 1993. *Canadian Women's Issues: Volume I: Strong Voices*. Toronto, ON: Lorimer.

Prentice, Alison, Paula Bourne, Gail Cuthbert Brandt, Beth Light, Wendy Mitchinson, and Naomi Black. 1988. *Canadian Women: A History*. Toronto, ON: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Raymond, Eric S. 2001. *The Cathedral and the Bazaar: Musings on Linux and Open Source by an Accidental Revolutionary*. Sebastopol, CA: O'Reilly Media, Inc.

Rebick, Judy. 2005. *Ten Thousand Roses: The Making of a Feminist Revolution*. Toronto, ON: Penguin Canada.

Rosenzweig, Roy. 2006. "Can History Be Open Source? Wikipedia and the Future of the Past." *The Journal of American History* 93 (1): 117-146.

Sangster, Joan. 1995. "Beyond Dichotomies: Re-Assessing Gender History and Women's History in Canada." *Left History* 3 (1): 109–121.

____. 2000. "Feminism and the Making of Canadian Working-Class History: Exploring the Past, Present and Future." *Labour/Le Travail* 46: 127–165.

Strong-Boag, Veronica. 1978. "Raising Clio's Consciousness: Women's History and Archives in Canada." *Archivaria* 1 (6): 70-82.

Strong-Boag, Veronica, and Anita Clair Fellman, eds. 1986a. *Rethinking Canada: The Promise of Women's History*. Toronto, ON: Copp Clark Pitman.

____. 2006b. "Introduction." In *Rethinking Canada: The Promise of Women's History*, edited by Veronica Strong-Boag and Anita Clair Fellman, 1-6. Toronto, ON: Copp Clark Pitman.

Strong-Boag, Veronica, Sherrill Grace, Joan Anderson, and Avigail Eisenberg, eds. 1998. *Painting the Maple: Essays on Race, Gender, and the Construction of Canada*. Vancouver, BC: UBC Press.

Strong-Boag, Veronica, and Tiffany Johnstone. 2013. "Taking History to the People: Women Suffrage and Beyond." *ActivistHistory.ca*. http://activehistory.ca/papers/history-papers-14/.

"Submission Guide." 2015. *Women Suffrage and Beyond*. http://womensuffrage.org/?page_id=485.

Vanstone, Gail. 2007. *D Is for Daring: The Women behind the Films of Studio D*. Toronto, ON: Sumach Press.

Wernimont, Jacqueline. 2013. "Whence Feminism? Assessing Feminist Interventions in Digital Literary Archives." *Digital Humanities Quarterly* 7 (1). http://www.digitalhumanities.org/dhq/vol/7/1/000156/000156.html.

Wine, Jeri Dawn, and Janice L. Ristock, eds. 1991. *Women and Social Change: Feminist Activism in Canada*. Toronto, ON: Lorimer.