

Anarcha-feminist process and publishing in Ireland: The RAG Collective

Debi Withers with the RAG collective

ABSTRACT

This article examines the working processes of RAG – the Dublin-based anarcha-feminist group who create a magazine every year. Seeking to enact as well as represent the working practices used by the group, the article, which sees members of the RAG and the author working together to edit the article, reflects on the process of writing that is shaped by collective voices. The article also situates RAG's work within the wider context of Irish feminist publications and comments on factors which can be a barrier to collective working, such as time and skill specialisation.

Keywords *Anarcha-feminism, magazines, process, collective-working, time*

RAG (Revolutionary Anarcha-feminist Group) is a publishing collective based in Dublin, Ireland. They have been working together since 2005 and collectively publish an annual magazine *The Rag* that melds feminist and anarchist concerns within an Irish (but nonetheless globally orientated) context. There have been five issues of the magazine since 2006, although this article will focus on the production of the first three. The main focus will be the processes behind the production of the magazine. Its content – which covers diverse feminist topics such as transgender and feminism, rape culture and sexual violence, combating drug-use in communities, feminist art and book reviews – will be referred to minimally. The title of the magazine itself is an example of the type of playful humour the collective bring to their written politics; 'Rag' refers, within colloquial UK/ Irish humour, to the idea of a consistent publication (the 'daily rag' is a newspaper), but it can also mean 'being on the rag,' which is a synonym for female menstruation.

Debi Withers with the RAG collective

10

The magazine's production is subject to a particular set of processes in which a non-hierarchical, consensus based method is placed at the forefront of their publishing concerns. This is a central part of the anarchy-feminism which the group enact in creating the magazine. In the first issue of *The Rag* this method is described as follows:

The first issue has taken over a year to produce, and has been an important and fulfilling process. We have taken time to get to know one another, to become comfortable talking in groups and to discuss and develop our ideas. While some women in RAG have been long-time political organisers, others have approached the group from a range of diverse backgrounds.

We have remained committed to non-hierarchical structures within the collective, with revolving facilitators, skill sharing, group editing, mutual support and respect, and, whenever possible, consensus based decision making (*The Rag 1*, 2006, 1).

This statement foregrounds the importance of a particular process that RAG privilege, which carries within it a relationship to time. Over a year in the making, this working space the group consciously created to produce their first magazine enabled relationships to develop in ways that are 'important and fulfilling', and as such foregrounds the importance of 'taking time to do things' as a central part of the group's method. This is interesting not only in the way it challenges dominant capitalist working methods (as I will explore in more depth later in this article), but also in how this sets RAG apart from the more visible parts of the contemporary DIY feminist media landscape. Such a media landscape is largely populated by the speed driven, instant gratification of blog posting as the main, visible avenue through which individual and collective voices are melded. Thus the methodical, group orientated and 'real time' approach RAG takes can seem like an anomaly in this context.

This is not to suggest that using either format is better (RAG still use a blog, for example, to inform people about the activities of the group (<http://ragdublin.blogspot.com/>); or that blogs are inherently more participatory and enable greater possibility for collective action (Gunnarson-Payne, 2008). It is merely to suggest that in the contemporary feminist media landscape – anarchist or otherwise – there is a predominance of digital over print media, and it is also more widely read (for example the UK feminist e-zine *The F-Word* has over 150,000 hits per month, while approximately 1,500 copies of each issue of *The Rag* are printed

and distributed). The collective do have plans to put PDF copies of the magazine on their blog but they are 'notoriously bad at the technology side of things' (Marianne, personal correspondence, 2010). Nevertheless, the group's working methods provide an example of a temporal intervention into product-fixated capitalist society. It is a commitment to the politics of process, and 'slowing down' (Stengers, 2008, 49) relational and productive economies, that inspires this article and its aspirations.

This article will critically engage with the difficulties the collective face in producing a 'process heavy' magazine within the context of late capitalism and the demanding work cultures (paid or unpaid) which constitute it. For example, issues relating to the politics of work and time will be examined as a key site where the ideals of anarcha-feminist working methods are tempered by everyday commitments (such as work and family). The extent to which non-hierarchical methods and a commitment to skill sharing and group editing can be maintained will also be explored, taking into account how the relationships to these processes have shifted as the magazine has developed over a three year period.

As well as the more representational analysis of RAG's methods, the aim of this article is to *enact* the process of collective writing that RAG deploys in the production of their magazine. As AnneMarie Mol asserts, 'if an object [...] is real this is because it is part of a practice. It is a reality *enacted*' (Mol, 2002, 44, emphasis in original). Here

Timeline of Process

May 2008. Email RAG and ask if they want to do the article with me – they agree.

July 4th, 2008. Interview Shonagh in Dublin. Other RAG members unavailable for comment.

July 2008. Request email interview with other collective members. Time and other commitments combine to not generate a response.

November 29th, 2008. Interview Eve and Clare at *The Rag* issue 3 launch in Dublin. It is agreed to send Debi the RAG code of conduct developed by the collective during the summer. Initial deadline for article is set for the end of February (if not before) in order to receive detailed feedback on the ideas in the article.

February 27th, 2009. Debi sends first draft of article so that it may undergo process of collective editing.

March 25th, 2009. Debi receives annotated text from RAG editorial meeting.

March 30th, 2009. Debi begins reworking essay in light of comments, inserting text boxes and editing the main body of the text. She sends it off for more comments later that day.

May 4th, 2009. Debi receives further editing suggestions from RAG members, incorporates suggestions and submits it to a publication as a first draft.

Feb 2010. Debi hears that the publication Grassroots Feminist Media in Europe has been abandoned and submits to *Anarchist Studies*.

Feb 13th 2010. *Anarchist Studies (AS)* express interest and send it off for review.

March 15th 2010. Debi receives reviewer comments and sends them to the RAG for feedback.

April 20th, 2010. Debi edits essay in light of reviewer comments and feedback from the RAG and submits to *AS*.

I am referring to *The Rag* as an object, not as a singular, isolated artefact, but as active part of circuits of relational connections that can be used to understand the situated process of anarcha-feminist media production. In other words, the magazine as an object as it is connected in a relationship with the people that produce it.

This article is a collaborative project that began in May 2008. The research is comprised of interviews, experiences of attending events organised by the group and email exchanges between my-self and the collective. The breadth of collective knowledge that the article draws upon is also limited, given that I managed to conduct three in-depth interviews (with Clare, Eve and Shonagh), and received only one interview via email with Marianne, prior to undergoing collective editing where there was the opportunity for more members of RAG to have an input into this article. I also only received one response to the questions posed by the *Anarchist Studies*' reviewers.

The article attempts to re-create the same editing processes that the collective undertake, and is documented in the boxes accompanying the main body of the text. This is, however, subject to limitations, given that I was not physically able to attend meetings, most of the editorial exchange happened over email, and feedback was received after the discussion took place, (i.e., not in 'real time'). This inevitably affected the success of this particular process, as well as impacting on the relational quality of the experience. Text boxes one and two highlight the collective's feelings about these exchanges during the time the article was being written and edited.

From my perspective, attempting to analyse the working patterns of the group and be faithful to their processes was difficult over email. I never felt part of the collective in the sense of 'working within' or 'being part of' the group and the distance was heightened by a geographical divide between us. Because I was occupying the position of critique, this also created distance, and I did feel uncomfortable at times analysing the actions and working methods of people, some of whom I would call my friends. There was also a sense of frustration created by communicating via email, as gaining clarification on small points can take longer, and there isn't a sense of 'real time' engagement.

Nevertheless it was important to try and convey the working processes of the

We had kind of a long discussion here about it being weird not having you there to receive editing of your own article – especially if your article is supposed to be about the process of editing – you are not really getting that – or wouldn't be able to capture it in little boxes anyway – or if maybe we could record our conversation or do it by skype for future edits? (let us know what you think) – ariel almost started recording but then someone else felt weird about that so we stopped (notes from the first editorial meeting, received 24/ 3/ 09).

group. The article therefore seeks to communicate the steps that have been taken to produce this article, interspersing dialogue and analysis, narrative and commentary, in order to engage with the mechanics of writing production within a group orientated, anarcha-feminist context. Through this analysis, I hope to establish how the process is not fore-grounded over the product in anarcha-feminist media production.

Furthermore, RAG's methods can be appreciated for the different working temporalities they produce, and for how they shape voices through individual and collective articulation.

We noticed that our tone of editing was not as respectful as it would be if the writer were present to receive edits. Not that we were being derisive or mean or anything – just not so respectful ... Some of us had noted this before when we edited other articles with the writer absent – this phenomenon is independent of the quality of the article and doesn't reflect on yours by the way ... We had a bit of a discussion around the possible reasons for this and whether it was healthy or not ... we realised we were processing about processing and continued on – picking the tone back up (notes from the first editorial meeting, received 24/ 3/ 09).

A NOTE ON METHOD OF 'READING PROCESS' IN THIS ARTICLE

Although efforts are made within *The Rag* to communicate to the reader the nature of processes that are behind the production of the magazine, the text remains 'a flat board', and is subject to the same aesthetics of representation that are inherent to the written word when it is depicted on a page. In other words, as readers we are still treated to *The Rag* as a final product – we are not *fully* aware of all the conversations and editing that produced the finished articles and magazine. To include all these steps in the final magazine would, of course, severely undermine its format and not exactly make it a scintillating read. A magazine is there, after all, to provide interesting, accessible and well conceived articles that are not subject to the same discursive conventions as within, say, academic writing.

Aoife: if I was doing it, I'd get a different RAG article – show first draft, interim drafts, and discuss process that way – seems like it'll be so complicated to try to understand when the process is on the article that's writing about the process ... (notes from the first editorial meeting, received 24/ 3/ 09).

Some people had problems understanding paragraph above. I didn't record dialogue around this – just that it would probably be ok for an academic audience but we'd probably try to edit it down simpler if it were for the Rag – but it's your call obviously (notes from the first editorial meeting, received 24/ 3/ 09).

As a result, some of the examples of process that are included in this article may seem unnecessary, indulgent or just plain banal to your reading eyes. Nevertheless, they *are* important for understanding all the steps it takes to make a collaborative piece of writing; it is a refusal to yield to the limitations of text-based representation which isolate ‘the final product’ from the relational web of action and discussion which produced it. This article will ‘tell the story of the object’ (Feigenbaum, 2008; Haraway, 2008), through an affective engagement with its processes of production that recast temporality and relation as a consequence of method. Thus, it is an attempt to add dimensions to language, to dislodge it from a merely representational space and connect it to enacted processes of writing (Mol, 2002) that is fundamental to RAG’s working methods (which is also the main inspiration behind writing this article). In so doing, the writing will embody the sentiment that anarcha-feminism is something you do as well as say, and will cast a co-constructive web outside of the main body of the text where it would normally be contained.

PRODUCING ARTICLES FOR *THE RAG*

The first meeting that I went to was an editing meeting of Deidre’s article in *Rag* 1 and she wrote about sexual violence and [at] that stage everyone ha[d] read the original text and gone through it all and brought it back to the meeting and paragraph by paragraph it went through. People gave their suggested changes, what they thought worked well and what they wanted clarification on. There would be an initial meeting on an article and then there would be a follow up meeting so in that way, while we don’t have any set position as a group on particular issues, just having that follow up and editing process just kinda makes each article a little bit more representative of what the group feels, or at least brings more people’s opinions to bear [on it] ... (Shonagh, personal correspondence, 2008).

In the above quotation, Shonagh describes the process of collective editing that RAG aspire to use in their magazine. As each idea for an article emerges from monthly open discussion meetings, and is subject to this type of editorial review, the articles are all shaped by these dynamics of exchange and development. This is what, Eve suggests, gives the ‘collective sense of the magazine’ (Eve, personal correspondence, 2008), highlighting the complex forms of relationality which connect individual and collective voices in the anarcha-feminism of RAG. In issue 2 of the magazine the collective write: ‘Again for this issue, we held discussions based on

most of the topics we planned to write about, to help us explore our ideas fully. However, each article is written by the individual and is not necessarily the opinion of the collective' (*The Rag* 2, 2007: 1). While this statement is often cited in magazines as a disclaimer to allow for accountability of individual opinion, within an anarcha-feminist context where liberationist individualism can be played against collective working, it produces an interesting tension that requires further qualification. As Clare states:

Every article is an individual voice but the line between individual and collective is fuzzy because those articles might have come out of workshops and discussions or feeding into each other for ideas ... we'd have a discussion and each one of us would bring something new to it, in that sense we were moving each other along, not saying that we'd all end up in the same place but there would definitely be a huge influence on each other (Clare, 2008).

The process that RAG use suggests there is a collective responsibility to develop ideas in relation, manifesting by 'feeding into each other' and 'moving each other along,' as Clare states. Although the group affirm that they are a 'diverse group of anarcha-feminist women in Dublin' (*The Rag*, 2007: 1), the 'we' that they invoke is always situated in terms of feminism, anarchism, a commitment to developing feminist ideas and distributing them. The practice of 'intra-active' (Barad, 2007, 33) relationships – where subjects are formed through the dynamism of mutual making of the self in-relation – is an important, constitutive aspect of anarcha-feminism within RAG. This poses a challenge to alienated patterns of relationality embedded within rationalistic, neo-liberal capitalist, patriarchal society. Here collective working is discouraged and people are often encouraged to work in competition *against*, as opposed to with, each other. As an alternative to this, the working methods practised by RAG 'construct [...] alternatives which are more than symbolic – they have created space for empowerment, non-alienating production, mutual aid and struggle', which produce different social relationships that are not exclusively tied to capital (Holtzman *et al.*, 2007, 45-47).

The working preferences of RAG can be seen as symptomatic of trends within the history of grassroots feminist media, particularly within the Women's Liberation Movement, that use working methods which have tended to undermine individualistic structures and hierarchical working methods. Within the history of the Irish Women's Liberation Movement (IWLM), RAG's working methods are convergent with publications such as *Banshee* (1976-1980) and

Wicca (1978-1980). As Linda Connolly and Tina O'Toole write about the editorial process of *Banshee*:

After the publication of *Banshee* 1, and in response to criticism from outside the editorial group about the way that articles were solicited from individuals, the editors endeavoured to publish articles that were written collectively or from coming out of workshops on the issues involved. This underlines the suspicion with which individual opinion, as opposed to ideas and policies arrived at collectively, was regarded by feminists at that time (Connolly and O'Toole, 2005, 129).

Connolly and O'Toole also describe the fluidity of collective members within *Wicca*, with over 40 members working on the magazine in its lifetime. The politics of the IWLM as deployed in such publications, with its emphasis on breaking down hierarchies of knowledge and redistributing skills, resonate with the DIY anarcho-feminism of RAG in the present:

Feminist activists involved in these magazines worked to demystify the skills and techniques involved in journalism. They illustrated that anyone could learn to publish a magazine; provided opportunities to women who wanted to write, create artwork or take photographs to publish their material; and worked together to learn the skills of magazine production (Connolly and O'Toole, 2005, 133).

Thus, there is continuity between Irish feminists working in the 1970s and 1980s and contemporary Irish anarcho-feminism. This allows us to locate the anarcho-feminism in the IWLM, and the working practices of the IWLM in anarcho-feminism today.

RAG's methods are also similar to another central tenet of the Women's Liberation Movement: consciousness raising. Consciousness raising used 'closed' collective discussions in order to build solidarity and personal-political transformation. Furthermore, the slowed down, developmental process of creating an article for *The Rag* (from its proposal at the initial meeting, to writing, to paragraph by paragraph feedback from the group) also provides a fertile ground for personal and collective development. As Eve describes, editing in this way 'gives you confidence in your writing and helps you define your ideas further' (Eve, personal correspondence, 2008), while Marianne states, 'when you think like that and talk like that your ideas and opinions get stronger and you are better at putting across your ideas to others or defending them' (Marianne, personal correspondence, 2008).

Shonagh is more explicit about the potential role consciousness raising plays in the politics of RAG at a more everyday level: 'getting together with your mates [to talk about] how you experience life as a woman [...] is such an empowering thing [...] [to be able to feel] safe to talk about your shared experiences of sexism can free your brain space to think ... even if it doesn't lead anywhere it does lead *somewhere*' (Shonagh, personal correspondence, 2008, emphasis added). Despite these similarities, members of the collective were unsure if they saw their politics as being directly related to Second Wave, or Women's Liberation Movement activity in Ireland, which they saw as being connected to legislative change, 'reliant on the state as the healer of all ills' (Shonagh, personal correspondence, 2008). Marianne did highlight the group's desire to be 'situated within the Irish historical feminist context' (Marianne, personal correspondence, 2008). This was demonstrated by the Feminist Walking Tour of Dublin (and subsequent publication) that the group organised with pro-choice organisation Choice Ireland in 2008, and Choice Ireland and another Dublin based feminist magazine collective Lashback, in 2009.

The emergence of RAG in 2005, and the need for a specifically anarcho-feminist analysis, arose from the lack of feminist engagement within the anarchist scene in Dublin, where continuing problems with unacknowledged sexism were making it difficult for women to take an active role in the local political culture. As the collective state in issue 1, 'we hope the magazine will contribute to a change in anarchists' organising, on all levels. We desire a fully participatory role for women in anarchism' (*The Rag* 1, 2006, 1). Later, in *The Rag* 2, they impress that the feminist 'struggle needs to fought alongside other forms of oppression, not treated as an afterthought or as a distraction', which is suggestive of a minority voice speaking to the male dominated 'mainstream' (*The Rag* 1, 2006, 1) anarchist scene. Challenging the male domination of anarchist scenes can be seen in continuity with other forms of anarcho-feminist media throughout history, in particular the Canadian based publication *Bevy of Anarcha-feminists (BOA)*, who produced four copies of their magazine from 1986-1991 (Antliff, 2004, 22-31).

Within this understanding of the group's background, the processes of discussing ideas between members of the collective should be understood as part of creating a safe(r) space for women to share their experiences. In so doing, it will empower and raise the confidence of RAG members to take feminism into less accepting circles. As Shonagh states: 'You get so much aggression as well, you know, that we're a women identified, women only group, and just by being a feminist group, and an anarcho-feminist group' (Shonagh, personal correspondence, 2008).

Marianne further echoes this point: ‘Talking in a group as RAG makes it easier to talk in groups outside RAG’ (Marianne, personal correspondence, 2008).

CHANGES IN PROCESS: THE POLITICS OF TIME

Definitely the discussions, *when we have them*, help me to take time to think
(Marianne, personal correspondence, 2008, italics mine).

From interviews with members of the collective it appears that the ‘important and fulfilling process’ that the collective reflect upon in the introduction to issue 1 of *The Rag* became harder to maintain with each subsequent issue. This was, in part, due to a sense of familiarity with procedures that Marianne reflects upon: ‘I found the discussions and debates more exciting and challenging at the beginning’ (Marianne, personal correspondence, 2008). Clare, on the other hand, reflects that the changes in working methods arose from the immense confidence the collective gained from working on and releasing issues 1 and 2. The success of these magazines meant they approached issue 3 with a ‘we will do it, we can do it’ (Clare, personal correspondence, 2008) attitude. Moreover, the fact that RAG had become a well known publication globally – with its net of dissemination reaching as far as Japan – both within grassroots anarchist and feminist ‘scenes’ – meant that potential contributors for later issues knew what to expect content wise. This meant they could submit their articles with less need for collective clarification. As Clare comments, the ‘wide range [of] academic, personal [and comic illustrations] allowed people to think that they could fit into any one of these categories and cover any topic, and we didn’t have to discuss many of the articles because people knew what they were doing so there was less process involved at this stage’ (Clare, personal correspondence, 2008).

However, the main problem impacting on being able to collectively edit the magazine is the issue of time. This factor was also noted by Jitka Kolarova, who has conducted research on anarcha-feminist magazines in the Czech Republic. She argues that the ‘routines of media production’ (Kolarova, 2008), which are premised upon hierarchical working methods, specialisation and ‘getting things done’, creep into the methods of the group over time. Despite best intentions and commitment to working otherwise, the ‘cores of power structures in the media production process’ (Kolarova, 2008) are re-instated, due to a lack of time to work through them.

Issue 3 of *The Rag* in particular ran behind schedule due to the wealth of other

commitments the group were involved with, both in RAG (2008 saw the aforementioned walking tour of Dublin and the organisation of a large, internationally attended gathering) and outside of it. Eve commented that the group mostly 'aspire' (Eve, personal correspondence, 2008) to a process of group editing. For her, the process could become frustrating due to limited time commitments impacting on the group's capacity to conduct it effectively: RAG ...

... aren't always able to carry out the collaborative process as much as we'd like to and I think that bringing out a magazine is an immense amount of work, especially if you are doing it after work or doing about a million other things, it is really hard for people to get together sometimes and have the time to do it (Eve, personal correspondence, 2008).

As Marianne says in the epigraph to this section, the discussions, when there is time to have them, are 'worth doing in some shape or form', and the fact that they didn't manage to do it as much in Issue 3 made them 'realise why they did do it' (Marianne, 2008). Collective editing, in the method aspired to by RAG, is a hugely time consuming procedure, and one that can fall by the wayside with the pressure of deadlines.

Another way that the pressure of time affects ideal, anarcha-feminist working methods within RAG is in terms of specialisation of roles. Whereas the initial collective were committed to skill sharing as part of the non-hierarchical ethos of the group, with increasing pressures to meet deadlines, sharing skills amongst members of the collective has become less possible. Particularly within a publication like a magazine which requires specialised knowledge (such as design and proof reading skills), there can be a tendency for the roles to fall upon those who are most able to do the job: 'a lot of things become specialised, it's really bad now because we've had to do things so rushed there were things that I knew how to do, and you [i.e., Eve] knew how to do, and we just did them and we didn't bother getting other people involved' (Clare, personal communication, 2008). In comparison with magazine production in the 1970s and 1980s, it is probably easier now for designing magazines to become one person's responsibility. Whereas in the past each page had to be type set individually, making it an arduous task for one person to do alone, in the twenty-first century magazines can be laid out on a laptop using design programmes by one person in a relatively fast manner. This is one way technological changes can affect the nature of collective and individual working within the contemporary context.

Eve also points to the centrality of tight friendships and known ways of working as a reason why tasks and skills did not get broken down in *The Rag* number 3: ‘when you’ve got that time rush, people who know how to do what they have to do and people who’ve been organising [together] for so long just spring into action and it’s like boom boom boom and you get it done, whereas it’s a bit harder to bring in new people, so it might not be as collective as you’d want it to be or you aspire to’ (Eve, personal correspondence, 2008).

Eve’s comments resonate with what Jo Freeman describes in her much discussed 1970 article, ‘The Tyranny of Structurelessness’, as the emergence of elites within so-called unstructured groups: ‘Elites are nothing more and nothing less than a group of friends who also happen to participate in the same political activities’ (Freeman, 1970). Freeman argues that power is often concentrated within groups of friends who are used to working with each other. She highlights the increased easiness of communication that friends share as a site where knowledge and power circulates: ‘these friendship groups function as networks of communication outside any regular channels for such communication that may have been set up by a group’ (Freeman, 1970). While I do not want to name the working practices that Eve describes as necessarily ‘elitist’, her comments do reveal a similar pattern to what Freeman suggests is the ‘tyranny’ of non-hierarchical organising. Instead I would prefer to highlight the importance of relationships for creating *The Rag*, emphasising this as an important site through which social change is created.

Nevertheless the type of situation that both Clare and Eve describe does unwittingly run the risk of replicating dominant capitalist working methods that foster specialisation and elitism – even if RAG ultimately wish to counter these forms of working. It is through this focus on the politics of time that RAG, and other anarchy-feminist collectives, pose the greatest challenge to the temporal logics of late capitalism (whose speed and efficiency has been radically curtailed by the economic downturn of recent years but is nonetheless persistent). However, through replicating a workaholic culture and neglecting self and collective care (Brownfemipower and Hoffman, 2009); the methods aspired to are subject to incorporation by the very system they wish to undermine.

RAG AS A WORK IN PROCESS

RAG is still a collective work in progress; I’m sure we’ll do things differently again this time and learn some new lessons (Marianne, 2008).

As RAG approach issue number 4 of their magazine, they have renewed their commitment to the process of collective editing. This is because through producing issue 3, where it was not at the forefront of their working practises, they became more aware of its value. With the addition of four new members, the group remains a work in

We have had the discussion [about the importance of process] (ask us about the meeting at holly's house) and that we made a re-commitment to reinstating that process ... That when we did without it we realised how important it was (notes from the editorial meeting, received 24/03/09)

progress/process. In this article I have drawn out the importance of process as a valuable political action in itself: it is what sets apart anarcha-feminist and other forms of horizontal organizing from systems which privilege specialism, individualism and authority. I have attempted to make these processes more transparent through enacted, as well as analytical, writing, which has been communicated in the use of text boxes which add their own sense of commentary – and temporality – to the article itself. However what I ultimately want this article to affirm is the importance of process. In particular processes that create space for dialogue, empowerment and the exploration of ideas which can be fed into, be a response to, or are produced within, moments of action. In highlighting process it will make unknowable actions knowable, demystify knowledge and foreground the value of collective working.

This article was originally commissioned for the collected publication Grassroots Feminist Media in Europe: An Anthology, which was subsequently abandoned in February 2010. Having written and researched the essay I wanted to find a suitable place for it to be published and decided to submit it to Anarchist Studies.

Debi Withers is a researcher, writer and artist living in Bristol. She is the author of *Adventures in Kate Bush and Theory* and founder of HammerOn Press. Her academic work has been published in *Feminist Theology*, *European Journal of Women's Studies*, *Feminist Studies* and *Women: A Cultural Review*. Her current research focuses on the cultural activism of the Women's Liberation Movement. She is the project co-ordinator for Sistershow Revisited, a Heritage Lottery Funded exhibition about feminism in Bristol, 1973-1974, taking place in May 2011.

Email: mail@debi-rah.net
www.debi-rah.net

INTERVIEWS AND CORRESPONDENCE

- Clare and Eve. (2008) Interview with Debi Withers, 30 Nov 2008.
 Marianne. (2008) Email interview with Debi Withers, 17 Dec 2008.
 Marianne. (2010) Email interview with Debi Withers, 27 Feb 2010.
 Shonagh. (2008) Interview with Debi Withers, 4 July 2008.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Barad, K. (2007) *Meeting the Universe Halfway: Quantum Physics and the Entanglement of Matter and Meaning*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Brownfeminipower and Hoffman, J. (2009) '(Re)thinking Walking'. Available online: <http://flipfloppingjoy.com/category/rethinking-walking/>. Last accessed: 5 May 09.
- Connolly, L. and O'Toole, T. (2005) *Documenting Irish Feminisms: The Second Wave*. Dublin: The Woodfield Press.
- Feigenbaum, A. (2008) 'Tactics and technology: cultural resistance at the Greenham Common Women's Peace Camp'. PhD thesis. McGill, Montreal.
- Freeman, J. (1970) 'The Tyranny of Structurelessness', Available online: <http://struggle.ws/pdfs/tyranny.pdf>. Last accessed 20 Apr 2010.
- Gunnarsson-Payne, J. (2008) 'The State in/of the Swedish Feminist Blogosphere: Reflections the Politics of Blogging'. Presentation at Civil Media Conference, Salzburg.
- Haraway, D. (2008) *When Species Meet*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Holtzman, B. et al (2007) 'Do it Yourself ... and the Movement Beyond Capitalism' in Graeber, D. and Shukaitis, S. (eds.) *Constituent Imaginations*. Edinburgh: AK Press. pp. 44-62.
- Koralova, J. (2008) 'Ideology and practice of the alternative media'. Presentation at Civil Media Conference, Salzburg.
- Mol, A. (2002) *The Body Multiple*. Durham: Duke.
- Sharon (2004) 'BOA' in Antliff, A. (2004) *Only a Beginning: An Anarchist Anthology*. Vancouver: Arsenal Pulp Press, pp. 22-31.
- Stengers, I. (2008), 'Experimenting with Refrains: Subjectivity and the Challenge of Escaping Modern Dualism'. *Subjectivity* 22, pp.38-59.
- The Rag* (2006)
The Rag (2007)