



## Applying radical empathy to Women's March documentation efforts: a reflection exercise

Gina Watts

School of Information, University of Texas at Austin, Austin, Texas, USA

### ABSTRACT

The Women's March was a global phenomenon, with close to 5 million people participating worldwide. With a protest this complex, it is easy to see that its related records will have historical value. Indeed, many repositories have called for ephemera and stories from the event. But is documenting the event itself enough? The March was criticised for its lack of intersectionality and inclusion: are these criticisms not crucial to future understandings? This article follows the work of bell hooks, Verne Harris, Jarrett Drake and others in the call for social justice in archival work. The work of Michelle Caswell and Marika Cifor on radical empathy is particularly well poised to answer these questions, because of its emphasis on prioritising people over records. Central to radical empathy are an archivist's relationships with four constituents: the creator, the subject, the user and the community. Considering the roles of these stakeholders represent a departure in traditional archival theory, one that the author believes will make archives more equitable. Using these perspectives, this article will explore what it means to document the Women's March in a pluralistic way and suggest pathways to do the same elsewhere.

### KEYWORDS

Feminism; archival activism;  
Women's March; radical  
empathy; intersectionality

The January 2017 Women's March was a global phenomenon. Close to 5 million people across the world participated in 81 countries, with a culmination of 673 different events.<sup>1</sup> With a protest so sweeping in its goals and reach, it is clear that its records will have historical value in the context of women's rights, social movements and the current political climate. Repositories such as the Newberry Library in Chicago and the Minnesota Historical Society have put out calls for ephemera and stories from the event. Members of the Women Archivists Section of the Society of American Archivists (SAA) established the Women's March on Washington Archives Project, with a focus on oral histories and photographs. But what can be done about including the controversial circumstances of the event, which are likely not reflected in items or stories from attendees?

The controversy leading up to the March was primarily about lack of intersectionality,<sup>2</sup> seen by some as an opportunity for white women to comfort themselves after President Donald Trump's election. This follows a long history of white feminists not standing up for women of colour, and some women of colour resented being asked for solidarity at this

juncture. Transmisogyny abounded through emphasis on physical bodies that excluded any women who may not fit the norm. The resulting spotlight on cisgender white women is not compatible either with the diversity of the world or with the stated goals of the March, and these criticisms seem crucial to future historical understanding of this event. This article approaches these ideas from the lens of radical empathy, proposed by Michelle Caswell and Marika Cifor in their 2016 article 'From Human Rights to Feminist Ethics: Radical Empathy in the Archives'.<sup>3</sup> Radical empathy prioritises the people involved with the records over the records themselves. Central to the discussion of radical empathy are an archivist's relationships with four constituents: the creator, the subject, the user and the community. From these four perspectives, this article will explore what it means to document the Women's March in a pluralistic way.

Obviously, this task is not easy. Documenting individual experiences of an event with up to 5 million participants between the original Women's March and the global sister marches is not something that any archives could achieve. Indeed, archives' more typical concern with larger narratives over individual stories is partly due to this impossibility. However, to forego any attempt at including the myriad of voices (which combine to create the narratives we collect) is to silence huge swathes of people across the globe. Hirsch and Smith, in their work on feminism and cultural memory, discuss the high stakes of these kinds of decisions:

the content, sources, and experiences that are recalled, forgotten, or suppressed are of profound political significance. What we know about the past, and thus our understanding of the present is shaped by the voices that speak to us out of history; relative degrees of power and powerlessness ... determine the spaces where witnesses and testimony may be heard or ignored.<sup>4</sup>

Whatever documentation exists as we move past the event should reflect archivists' best effort not to perpetuate the lack of intersectionality that plagued the event.

To start, I will provide a background to the Women's March and an overview of the literature on archives and social justice. This will be followed by an exploration of radical empathy and how its four perspectives can be used as a lens to imagine inclusive documentation strategies for the Women's March. This is driven in part by my own participation in the March in Austin, Texas and my concerns about the criticism. With the questions posed here, I would like to get closer to understanding how we as a profession can include all voices and, in doing so, preserve a version of this event that is reflective of the ecosystem around it.

## **About the Women's March**

The idea for the Women's March came from several women across the United States. As an immediate response to Trump's election on 8 November 2016, several Facebook events appeared encouraging a protest after Inauguration Day; Teresa Shook, a retired lawyer in Hawaii, is credited with the initial post. She posted to Pantsuit Nation, a 3.7 million-member group supporting Hillary Clinton, and had thousands of responses the following day. Experienced organisers Bob Bland, Evvie Harmon, Fontaine Pearson and Breanne Butler took notice and started consolidating the individual events into one.

The event was plagued with doubt from the start, largely in relation to the inclusivity of the event. Rosie Campos was one such critic. She is a writer in Pittsburgh and initially worked on a sister March in Pennsylvania, but stepped down citing issues with the organisation. Her criticisms range from the appropriative name of the event, which references Dr Martin Luther King Jr's 1963 March on Washington, to the silencing of critics on Facebook

through comment deletion by the organisers. Her view is that the organisers simply did not engage with critics, saying that: ‘Statements issued by the national organizers on the issue of inclusion smack of “we hear you [but we’re not listening to you]”’.<sup>5</sup> For an event that was meant to be far-reaching in its social justice goals, Campos was not confident that the organisers could actually practise the needed level of inclusion.

Jamilah Lemieux, a writer from Chicago who covers social justice topics in her work, wrote an opinion piece about the irony of being asked to stand in solidarity when white women historically have failed at that: ‘the absence of that sisterhood never felt more real for me than it did when I learned that 53 percent of White female voters cast a ballot for a man whose bigotry was, perhaps, his greatest selling point’.<sup>6</sup> This lack of trust in both the organisation and the participants meant that she could not attend.

In a 20 November 2016 Facebook post titled ‘Women’s March on Washington: Origins and Inclusion’, Bob Bland acknowledges these criticisms: ‘We have heard concerns voiced that some do not feel adequately represented in the Women’s March on Washington (WMW). We want to state to you clearly: we see you, we hear you, and we understand.’ Assuming Campos’s comments about comment deletion are true, this statement rings hollow. She follows this up with an explicit admission of privilege: ‘The reality is that the women who initially started organizing were almost all white.’ In saying this, Bland seems to recognise the problem in planning an inclusive event without having any diversity in the leadership. The post then documents the addition of experienced organisers who represented more diverse backgrounds. These women included Tamika D Mallory, an African American woman who worked with the Obama administration on civil rights and other issues; Carmen Perez, whose activism has centred around mass incarceration as Executive Director at The Gathering for Justice; and Linda Sarsour, a Palestinian–American Muslim woman who works with racial justice and intersectionality. These women then added their own colleagues to the expanding team of National Co-Chairs. The post concludes with a call-out for white women to ‘understand their privilege, and acknowledge the struggle that women of color face.’ The post garnered 4600 likes and nearly 1000 comments. Not all were positive; there were plenty of women of colour criticising the post as nothing more than lip service, as well as white women feeling defensive at the prospect of considering their own privilege.

The remaining doubts prompted a more specific policy platform to be released on 12 January 2017. The platform addressed intersectional feminist issues, including police brutality and racism in the criminal justice system, economic and class injustice, and environmental and climate concerns. The document was far-reaching and would likely have been more celebrated had it not been released the week of the event. As it stood, its statements did not necessarily reflect the organisers’ actions thus far.

A major feature of the March was the development of sister marches around the globe. These were not organised by the original team but they were officially endorsed by the organisers and listed on the website. These were crucial in making the Women’s March what it was, with solidarity from every corner of the world. Some call it the largest demonstration in American history, with 4 million of the marchers in the US.<sup>7</sup>

With this high level of global engagement and impact, archival repositories understandably are looking to document this event. The Women’s March on Washington Archives Project grew from the SAA Women Archivists Section and was organised by Danielle Russell and Katrina Vandeven.<sup>8</sup> From as many US sister marches as possible, they sought physical materials such as signs, oral histories from participants and organisers, and photographs.

These would be collected on the Archives Project website and in local repositories interested in preserving their specific event. The Newberry Library in Chicago put out a call for ephemera from the event, to build on its developing collection titled ‘Civil War to Civil Rights: African-American Chicago in the Newberry Collection’, which also houses materials from Black Lives Matter protests.<sup>9</sup> The Minnesota Historical Society put out a similar call for photographs and ephemera, asking for diverse voices and personal stories about the varied reasons for marching.<sup>10</sup> However, none of these requests for material explicitly addressed the lack of intersectionality that plagued the event, which would be necessary in a social justice view of the archive.

### About archives, social justice and radical empathy

Radical empathy as conceived by Caswell and Cifor rests on the idea that social justice plays a part in archival work, so I will give some background on the call for social justice as discussed in the profession. To be clear, this article supports the idea that archives have a social justice imperative, owing to their power to legitimise certain histories. The case for social justice in archives is made by many authors, introduced here.

Carol Hanisch wrote the now-famous essay, ‘The Personal is Political’, in 1969. She argues that women’s ‘personal problems’ have a place in political spheres because of the societal structures that create them. Essentially, personal struggle is political by its very nature. Archives specialise in personal stories from records creators, so if these personal stories have political repercussions, archives and their users need to engage with that. This is certainly true of Women’s March records creators, who may have come to the event with hugely varied personal struggles and political leanings. While discussing social justice more broadly, bell hooks says that ‘we need to have a liberatory ideology that can be shared with everyone. That revolutionary ideology can be created only if the experiences of people on the margin ... are understood, addressed, and incorporated.’<sup>11</sup> So not only do we need to do social justice, we need to include everyone in that effort or it is no kind of justice at all. I reference Cricket Keating, whose work on coalitional consciousness-raising builds on the second-wave feminism concept of raising awareness, and improves it by emphasising partnerships, not sameness, amongst different activist groups. Keating’s method attempts to create a model of behaviour and questioning that takes advantage of common goals in activist circles without replicating other forms of prejudice.<sup>12</sup>

Caswell and Cifor’s work on radical empathy assumes that archival work should promote social justice and details a specific pathway to that goal which involves the sorts of questions that archivists should be asking. The authors suggest that:

archivists have *affective responsibilities* to other parties and posit that these affective responsibilities should be marked by *radical empathy* ... empathy is radical if we allow it to define archival interactions even when our own visceral affective responses are steeped in fear, disgust, or anger’ (emphasis in the original)<sup>13</sup>

Essentially, empathy (or ‘the ability to understand and share the feelings of another’<sup>14</sup>) becomes radical if we truly understand the feelings of someone diametrically opposed to ourselves, despite any discomfort or anger we may have toward those ideas. Other terms related to this concept are affective responsibility, or the responsibility we have for the impact of our actions on others, and the framework of an ethics of care, which ‘is acutely attuned to inequities (and seeks to transform such inequities), even as it empathizes with all interested

parties, including those who held and exploited positions of power'.<sup>15</sup> So in this framework it is important to consider the needs both of those with privilege in the archive and of those without. Caswell and Cifor categorise four areas where radical empathy should be applied in an archive: relationships with creators, subjects, users and communities.

These relationships may conflict in dramatic ways if the needs of the creator are vastly different from those of their subjects, for instance, but using radical empathy can guide an archivist to the right questions to ask when processing a collection, ensuring the result is as fair and inclusive as possible. Indeed, Caswell and Cifor address this specifically, saying 'in a feminist approach, each one of these parties is considered empathetically and in relation to each other and to dominant power structures before archival decisions are made'.<sup>16</sup> The different levels of power and privilege between creators, subjects, users and communities reveal whose needs are served by different archival decisions. Radical empathy also allows an archivist to learn from these relationships and change the way they interact with records accordingly, such that decisions about the collection can be reassessed if need be.

In addition to Caswell and Cifor, this essay draws on a large body of work of archival scholars invested in social justice. Verne Harris says that: 'Politics is not the intruder. It is the stuff of daily professional work'.<sup>17</sup> He emphasises that archivists simply cannot ignore the power that archives lend to the stories they preserve. The Women's March is an event that needs this level of awareness on the part of archivists to develop a complete story within a collection. Echoing this thought are Andrew Flinn and David Wallace. Flinn's work on how community archives practices can inform institutional archives is important to consider, as he points out that many community archives such as the Northamptonshire Black History Project in the UK can empower 'a broader mission to democratise and introduce complexity into the national heritage whereby archives, heritage and histories talk of, and speak to, all the people'.<sup>18</sup> Wallace discusses the professional ethics and decisions involved in archives, saying that 'professional codes can offer an easy retreat from questions of individual and collective morality and social responsibility'. Wallace posits that 'an openness to uncertainty and multi-vocality' is necessary to overcome the silencing that could result from this.<sup>19</sup> Finally, Jarrett Drake reminds us that sometimes we may not be the right stewards for some records. In his blog '#ArchivesForBlackLives: Building a Community Archives of Police Violence in Cleveland',<sup>20</sup> he urges well-meaning archivists to consider the implications that asking for records in certain communities may have. Institutional power over records is far from ideal in some situations.

Applying these concepts to a case as large as the Women's March is no simple task and results in more questions than answers. In the following sections, I will explore what a documentation strategy for the Women's March would look like using the radical empathy approach.

## Archivists and creators

When dealing with the record creator, Caswell and Cifor discuss a common experience amongst archivists: 'What archivist, after meticulously sorting through pages of diaries ... has not felt emotionally connected to the creator of a collection?' Caswell and Cifor want to expand this feeling and make use of it:

A feminist approach not only acknowledges this emotional bond, but also hinges an ethical orientation on it. By stewarding a collection, the archivist enters into a relationship of care with

the record creator in which the archivist must do her best not only to empathize with the record creator, but also to allow that empathy to inform the archival decision-making processes.<sup>21</sup>

The ethics of care approach applies to all decision-making processes: acquisition, arrangement, description and restrictions on access. In the case of the Women's March, the creators are varied: organisers, people telling their stories for oral histories, event speakers, critics, and even individual sign-makers among the attendees. So how can our empathy extend to all of them?

The overwhelming focus of repositories' collecting efforts has been on those who attended the event. A common request amongst repositories has been for March ephemera such as signs or buttons. Perhaps this is obvious – what physical material is there to collect from those who did not attend? – but its effect is to silence those protesting the event by not attending.

Addressing this silence is not easy. This was discussed within the Women Archivists Roundtable of the SAA. The Women's March on Washington Archives Project organisers were interested in uplifting the voices of those who did not attend owing to diversity criticisms, but acknowledged the potential lack of trust.

Respondents encouraged the thought behind the idea of reaching out to those who did not attend but pointed out other considerations: perhaps these people would want to create their own community archive or would feel uncomfortable going public owing to privacy concerns. Asking ourselves whom we are helping by documenting an event is crucial; if the answer is our repositories, then we need to rethink. These concerns posed here should be part of any conversation regarding protests, but especially one where people fear deportation, police violence or harassment. A pluralistic and empathetic approach to documenting the Women's March would have a plan for dealing with these dangers, informed by local experts. If locals who did not march wanted to speak about their experience, a repository could include that in its collection. If the solution is making users aware of a separate collection maintained by those who resisted the March, or more generally of the controversy in reference interactions, then that is a way to amplify those voices.

## Archivists and subjects

The subjects involved in Women's March materials may overlap significantly with the creators just discussed. However, the responsibilities of the archivist differ enough in this case that the subject merits its own consideration. Caswell and Cifor criticise the Western archival tradition in this regard, saying it 'too often [ignores] the record subject'.<sup>22</sup> Instead, with a feminist ethics approach, subjects need to be allowed to have a say about the records that involve them, whether that be related to the way they are described, how they are used or if they should even exist. The subjects in the case of the Women's March may be too numerous to consult directly, but it is important to consider two main groups for inclusion: the organisers and those who criticised the event. For the most part, these two groups are talking about each other. If a March organiser speaks about their efforts to include, for example, a local community of immigrants, but the community in question did not feel safe with the police presence at a March, how can these two stories be present together in the archive?

It would be valuable for a more holistic understanding of the event to place these voices next to each other. Whether that means literally, where the archivist speaks to both groups as they develop the collection, or narratively, where these accounts coexist in the records,

there are ways to acknowledge both groups and the potential power differential between them in the representation of the March. This would be mediated on a case-by-case basis, but the first step is always to do research on the different voices involved, ask questions and listen carefully to the answers.

## Archivists and users

The user is one which archivists might be most practised at serving. After all, many archival decisions around description and access are directly tied to imagining the user's needs. However, Caswell and Cifor see responsibilities that go beyond these considerations: 'We can no longer operate as if archival users are all detached neutral subjects without a stake in the records they are using.'<sup>23</sup> If a user in the archive is affected by, for example, offensive language or violent images in a collection, how can archivists care for them? Before sensitive collections are public, there should be an assessment of what training is needed to handle any emotional responses from users. In the case of the Women's March, especially taking into account collection materials like signs, there is potential for an emotional response. One that comes to mind directly is the prevalence of signs that discuss anatomy. A popular sign at the Austin, Texas March, for example, was a play on the 'Come and Take It' sign depicting a cannon, a challenge dating back to the Texas Revolution. At the Women's March (and at previous reproductive rights protests in the state), the cannon is most often replaced with a drawing of ovaries. Other anatomical references included things like costumes that looked like vaginas or signs including the word 'pussy', as taken directly from Trump's commentary on women which emerged in the lead-up to the election. These signs could be perceived to endorse biological essentialism, implying that to be a woman is to have these specific body parts. For a trans woman encountering these signs, it could feel as though she is not welcome.

Focusing on anatomy as a unifier of women dismisses trans women and compounds the way that trans women are already marginalised; in addition, depictions of anatomy or certain words may be considered sensitive material in some repositories, because where some find power in reclaiming derogatory words, others may not. Taking responsibility as an archivist for the experiences this may create for our users means knowing how to talk about things like transmisogyny or the gender binary, and taking care to not subscribe to gender norms when describing materials. For example, the archive could have a policy of using the singular 'they' when needed, or not referring to certain body parts as 'female' or 'feminine'. Most importantly, it means knowing our user communities and anticipating their emotional needs as relating to these collections.

As archivists, we make decisions directly related to what people know in the future. Wallace discusses this responsibility in his 2010 piece on professional ethics:

It is ... imperative that archivists understand social memory as a locus of ongoing contestation, contradiction, and change and examine the roles they play in the politics of legitimizing and denying different forms of memory and their relationships to social justice and structures of political, economic, and socio-cultural domination.<sup>24</sup>

The criticisms of trans women strike me as a good example of this. If the caption of the 'Come and Take It' March sign described earlier acknowledged the way it reinforces the sex and gender binary, the archive would reveal how the March was empowering for some and exclusionary to others, providing equal visibility to both communities while acknowledging the privilege differential.

## Archivists and communities

When thinking about archival communities, it is most useful to think about the people the March claims to support. Caswell and Cifor's definition of community in this context goes beyond the specific users to include 'all parties impacted by archival use – the communities for whom justice or impunity has lasting consequences, the community of people for whom representation – or silencing – matters.'<sup>25</sup> If the March claims to be for a certain community, then the collection should be as well.

An example would be targets of harmful legislation such as Trump's border wall and, relatedly, the attempted executive order limiting travel from certain countries and prioritising Christian immigrants and refugees.<sup>26</sup> The Women's March takes a stand on these issues, saying: 'We believe migration is a human right and that no human being is illegal.'<sup>27</sup> As these actions would have direct consequences on immigrant populations in America in all areas of life, this is something that should be reflected in the collection and in the archives' outreach to the community. How can the archive acknowledge the complex issue of police presence at the March and how it may have been a deterrent for some?

The way to do this, of course, is to include the communities in the development of the collection. Archivists should be seen as professionals that go out in the field, and consult with communities' leaders on difficult issues. Flinn, in discussing the development of community archives, addresses this need: 'in reality the mainstream or formal archive sector does not contain and represent the voices of the non-elites, the grassroots, the marginalised ... the archive rarely allows them to speak with their voice, through their own records.'<sup>28</sup> If an archive wants to collect on the involvement of local immigrants with the Women's March, they should be building a relationship with these community leaders to understand the issues. Radical empathy requires this emotional work from archivists.

## Looking forward

Personally, it is easy for me to feel frozen in the face of uncomfortable conversations about my privilege and how it impacts my work. In an archive, this discomfort has the potential to result in simply leaving people out. A primary goal of starting this conversation is to move past the paralysis and candidly assess the needs that the archive should meet in their community. In light of that, I would like to take the thoughts presented so far and propose some questions that can guide archivists on making their collections more inclusive.

The questions that come to mind when documenting an event like this can be centred on the voices an archivist needs to include. I would say the first question for any archivist is this: Who needs to document this? Is another institution or community archive a better fit for this material? What drives me as an archivist to want to include it?

Drake addresses this concern in his essay on the relationship between #ArchivesforBlackLives and institutional archives. Drake believes that institutions without the proper background to care for a collection have no right to collect in that area, and cites the development of A People's Archive of Police Violence in Cleveland as an example. That community archive remains unconnected with any traditional repository, primarily owing to trust: 'The unbearable whiteness and patriarchy of traditional archives demand that new archives for black lives emerge and sustain themselves as spaces and sites for trauma, transcendence, and transformation.'<sup>29</sup> Archivists were able to assist in the initial



planning but needed to step back once the citizen archivists no longer needed to consult them. Whether or not this is the case with the Women's March critics needs to be evaluated by repositories. We need to ask ourselves if we can do justice to the collections we seek, if our institutions are trustworthy homes for these records or if we have the background to ensure they are appropriately accessible. Part of prioritising people over records is knowing when we cannot represent a collection fairly.

Questions about the collection itself are also important: How would the creators feel about sharing this information? What impact do the creators' records have on other communities or their subjects? What descriptive terms would the archival subjects use for themselves, and what if there are multiple answers to that question? Feminist consciousness-raising can contribute important considerations as well, as shown in Keating's 2005 article. She offers examples such as 'What are the multiple relations of power at play in the scenarios?' and 'Whose interests are served and whose are not by the ways that you and others are/were racialized/gendered/classed/sexualized in the experience?'<sup>30</sup> These examples can help promote the radical empathy process by making an archivist consider the power differentials between, for example, creators and subjects, and how systemic structures like racism and classism are involved. The questions will be driven by the records themselves, but empathising with all involved is a way to stay focused on the project of fair representation.

Further areas of research are plentiful; case studies of documenting the March and the practical application of radical empathy are both areas that deserve more scholarship. I will close with the hope that these conversations continue to grow and that we will have Women's March documentation in the future that reflects the world-as-a-whole. bell hooks tells us that 'feminism is for everybody',<sup>31</sup> so are archives, and it is up to us to make that happen.

## Endnotes

1. Data comes from the Women's March website, available at <<https://www.womensmarch.com/sisters>>, accessed 26 August 2017.
2. Intersectionality: 'The interconnected nature of social categorizations such as race, class, and gender as they apply to a given individual or group, regarded as creating overlapping and interdependent systems of discrimination or disadvantage', from the *Oxford English Dictionary*.
3. Michelle Caswell and Marika Cifor, 'From Human Rights to Feminist Ethics: Radical Empathy in the Archives', *Archivaria*, vol. 81, Spring 2016, pp. 23–43.
4. Marianne Hirsch and Valerie Smith, 'Feminism and Cultural Memory: An Introduction', in Michael Rossington and Anne Whitehead (eds), *Theories of Memory: A Reader*, Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, 2007, p. 226.
5. Rosie Campos, 'Dear White Women: This is Not About Us', Medium.com, 21 November 2016, available at <<https://medium.com/@PghRCampos/dear-white-women-this-is-not-about-us-bc80f8dca74b>>, accessed 26 August 2017.
6. Jamilah Lemieux, 'Why I'm Skipping the Women's March on Washington', 17 January 2017, available at <<https://www.colorlines.com/articles/why-im-skipping-womens-march-washington-opinion>>, accessed 26 August 2017.
7. Sarah Frostensen, 'The Women's Marches May Have Been the Largest Demonstration in History', Vox.com, 31 January 2017, available at <<https://www.vox.com/2017/1/22/14350808/womens-marches-largest-demonstration-us-history-map>>, accessed 26 August 2017.
8. 'Project Spotlight: Women's March on Washington Project', Women Archivists Section, Society of American Archivists, 10 January 2017, available at <<https://womenarchivistsroundtable>>.

- [wordpress.com/2017/01/10/project-spotlight-womens-march-on-washington-archives-project/](https://wordpress.com/2017/01/10/project-spotlight-womens-march-on-washington-archives-project/) accessed 26 August 2017.
9. Timothy Inkleberger, 'Archive Arises out of Protests', *American Libraries Magazine*, 31 January 2017, available at <<https://americanlibrariesmagazine.org/blogs/the-scoop/newberry-archive-womens-march-chicago/>>, accessed 26 August 2017.
  10. Lori Williamson, 'History is Now: Women's March', Minnesota Historical Society blog, 26 January 2017, available at <<https://discussions.mnhs.org/collections/2017/01/history-is-now-womens-march/>>, accessed 26 August 2017.
  11. bell hooks, *Feminist Theory: From Margin to Center*, South End Press, Cambridge, MA, 2000, p. 163.
  12. Cricket Keating, 'Building Coalitional Consciousness', *National Women's Studies Association Journal*, vol. 17, no. 2, 2005, pp. 86–103.
  13. Caswell and Cifor, p. 25.
  14. Definition of empathy, *Oxford English Dictionary*.
  15. Caswell and Cifor, p. 34.
  16. *ibid.*
  17. Verne Harris, "'A World Whose Horizon Can Only Be Justice": Toward a Politics of Record Making', in *Archives and Justice: A South African Perspective*, Society of American Archivists, Chicago, IL, 2007, p. 255.
  18. Andrew Flinn, 'Community Histories, Community Archives: Some Opportunities and Challenges', *Journal of the Society of Archivists*, vol. 28, no. 2, 2007, p. 161.
  19. David Wallace, 'Locating Agency: Interdisciplinary Perspectives on Professional Ethics and Archival Morality', *Journal of Information Ethics*, vol. 19, no. 1, 2010, p. 187.
  20. Jarrett M Drake, '#ArchivesForBlackLives: Building a Community Archives of Police Violence in Cleveland', talk given to the 2016 Digital Blackness Conference, Newark, NJ, available at <<https://medium.com/on-archivy/archivesforblacklives-building-a-community-archives-of-police-violence-in-cleveland-93615d777289>>, accessed 26 August 2017.
  21. Caswell and Cifor, p. 33.
  22. *ibid.*, p. 36.
  23. *ibid.*, p. 38.
  24. David Wallace, 'Locating Agency: Interdisciplinary Perspectives on Professional Ethics and Archival Morality', *Journal of Information Ethics*, vol. 19, no. 1, 2010, p. 175.
  25. Caswell and Cifor, p. 39.
  26. 'Executive Order: Protecting the Nation from Foreign Terrorist Entry into the United States.' WhiteHouse.gov, 27 January 2017; 'Executive Order: Border Security and Immigration Enforcement Improvements.' WhiteHouse.gov, 25 January 2017, available at <<https://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2017/03/06/executive-order-protecting-nation-foreign-terrorist-entry-united-states>>, accessed 26 August 2017.
  27. Women's March on Washington Guiding Vision and Definition of Principles, January 2017, available at <<https://static1.squarespace.com/static/584086c7be6594762f5ec56e/t/587ffb20579fb3554668c111/1484782369253/WMW+Guiding+Vision+%26+Definition+of+Principles.pdf>>, accessed 26 August 2017.
  28. Flinn, p. 152.
  29. Drake.
  30. Keating, pp. 95–7.
  31. bell hooks, *Feminism is for Everybody: Passionate Politics*, South End Press, Cambridge, MA, 2000.

## Acknowledgements

With thanks to Dr Ciaran Trace at the University of Texas at Austin for significant feedback.

## Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author.

## Notes on contributor

*Gina Watts* is a December 2017 graduate of the University of Texas at Austin School of Information. She has a background in academic libraries, archives, and nonprofits, with a goal of combining all three through archival community outreach and activism. Research interests include the intersection of gender and information equity and feminist pedagogy in libraries and archives. She has a chapter in the upcoming book, *The Feminist Reference Desk*, edited by Maria Accardi.