Let's set expectations
Let's set expectations

- I am not an expert on feminism
- This is not going to be comprehensive
- I am sharing insights and inspiration I have found in the feminist movement, that I think would be relevant for our strategic focus on knowledge equity
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- Archivist and librarian
- Margaret Sanger papers
- "The decisions of today will determine what's there tomorrow."
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Let's define terms
"Feminism is a range of political movements, ideologies, and social movements that share a common goal: to define, establish, and achieve political, economic, personal, and social equality of sexes" --[[Feminism]]
Asked to assess the impact of the women's movement on the world, **Gloria Steinem** said:

"It is like being asked to describe the universe and give three examples"
Many struggles; many aspects
Many struggles; many aspects

- Suffrage (the right to vote)
- Property and inheritance rights
- Equal pay; equal terms
- Equal employment opportunities
- Equal access to education
- Reproductive rights
- Freedom from harassment
- Recognition and representation in art and history
- ...
And even...

Men's liberation
Lesson 1:
The Problem Is Real
and some people need convincing...
Most people believe the world is basically just, and follows orderly rules wherein people get what they deserve and deserve what they get.

To sustain this belief, people are willing to alter their assessments of merit, to [even retroactively] justify existing social arrangements.
The "no problem" problem

For many (most?) Wikipedians, systemic bias and effective (even if unintended) exclusion of minorities or marginalized people and knowledge is either not a problem, or not their problem.

Rhode 1991
The "no problem" problem

- "There is no problem" (naive vs. wilful)
- "There is a problem, but we have no responsibility for causing it, or fixing it."
  - We are for inclusivity and equity in principle, but we dismiss initiatives toward it as 'unworkable', 'impractical', 'unaffordable', etc.
  - "Not for us to solve." and [[WP:GREATWRONGS]]
The de-valuation of difference

- Minimizing actual differences of needs, approaches, meanings, values is a way of obstructing genuine equity (fairness)
- "Equality in formal rights masks inequality in daily experience" ("anyone can edit!")
- Demanding fairness should not equal agreeing to conform to all the pre-existing norms.
  ("maybe women just don't want to edit!"; "Where are all the Africans?")

Rhode 1991
Denying Responsibility

- Acknowledging we have a serious problem, but it's elsewhere. Not on our wiki; not in our WikiProject; not at our events; not in our edits.
- Assigning responsibility elsewhere. Educators, governments, families, religions, victims, ...
Denying Responsibility

● Some marginalized people internalize the marginalization and deny there's a problem.
  ○ Acknowledging victimhood can come with loss of self-esteem and other costs.
● It can be difficult to demand, or imagine having, what one never had before.
Relocating Responsibility

- Blaming the victim
  - Bias is easy to miss or excuse if some blame can be found in the victim (unfair treatment of mistakes)
  - This creates a further, sometimes deeper victimhood

- Claiming non-responsibility and nothing else
  - "Reliable sources on African topics are a big problem, but Wikipedia can't be expected to solve it."

Rhode 1991
Resisting Alternatives

Apparent intractability is often resistance to review and revise priorities

Rhode 1991
Resisting Alternatives

● Conceding the premises but dismissing solutions
  ○ "Yeah, it's not fair, but that's just how it is."
● Considering status quo as given and immutable, but the needs of the marginalized as negotiable.
● "We just can't afford what it would take to change" (but can afford continued bias, monoculture, lost contributions, lost perspectives, etc.)

Lesson 2: Documentation matters
Let's play a game!

- Name five classical music composers
- Now name one classical music composer who was a woman
  - No?
  - Some help: Clara Schumann, Fanny Mendelssohn, Hildegard of Bingen, Francesca Caccini, Barbara Strozzi, and many more
- Why was this so hard?
Other invisibilities

- "The discovery of America in the 15th century"
- "In the 18th century, when Australia was first settled..."
- "Americans" meaning citizens of the USA. (also: "the States", "the United Kingdom")
- ...
Available sources influence, sometimes determine, what gets told, counted, included.
The World According to Sources

- "Without knowledge of women in history as actual history, dead women are sheer ghosts to living women - and to men." -- Mary Ritter Beard (1876-1958)
- And as Nintendo warned us:

```
Everything not saved will be lost.
```

public domain
US National Archive collection
"No documents -- No history!"

- Beard labored to create the World Center for Women's Archives. Founded in 1937, but shut down in 1940 for lack of funding.
- Beard continued to encourage citizen archiving and archive collection. Eventually gained recognition by establishment librarians, advising on collection strength.

Voss-Hubbard 1995
"No documents -- No history!"

- With Margaret S. Grierson of Smith College, Beard succeeded in founding a lasting "Historical Collection of Books by and about Women", later renamed the Sophia Smith Collection.
- (ironically, Beard considered her own letters and manuscripts of little interest, and did not preserve them.)
Beard warned that the archives would only succeed if faculty incorporated them in their teaching.

But in the early days of the collection (1940s-1950s), most faculty avoided using the collection, and steered their students away from it.

Today, the Sophia Smith collection holds more than 700 different collections, over 3 thousand linear meters and is a major source of reliable information.

"No documents -- No history!"

Lesson for us

- Lack of sources, and too-narrow definitions of "reliable sources" and "notability", are hindering us today, and should be reviewed, and probably revised.
- But at the same time, a long-term strategy is to create more documentation, that in time and with increased standards of curation, will become recognized as a reliable source.
Lesson 3: Allies, opponents, and the silent majority
The Importance of Allies

- Dominating cultures and dominating norms usually have the force of numbers
- The numbers often come not from active oppressors or members of a privileged class, but from the silent cooperation of the majority
- Allies to marginalized groups are a key resource in resisting oppression and increasing equity.
We've heard about the importance of encouragement and support for the marginalized, and the importance of invitations and accommodation of difference.

Our wikis have their share of bigots (racists, sexists, etc.), like most groups of humans, but they are always a minority themselves. Bigotry triumphs only with the silent assent of non-bigots.
Use Your Privilege!

- Feminist males acting as allies (not just having benign opinions) help bring about equity.
- Especially in highly unequal situations, those with privilege can be powerful allies to liberation and equity.
- If you have privilege (whether real-world or wikiprivilege), please use it to help us all.
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works in all forms and media, and [[:en:WP:NONENG|in any language]]. Availability of secondary sources covering the subject is a good test for notability, if the subject's culture/country is generally well-covered in secondary literature.

A modest proposal

Just a couple of months ago, I made this change to the English Wikipedia's Notability policy page. I thought it was an evidently reasonable way to qualify that statement.

I was reverted.

So I explained on the talk page.
"I think the sentence "Availability of secondary sources covering the subject is a good test for notability." as it stands is in fact false; it is only a good test for notability where the subject's culture/country/context is *generally* well-covered in secondary sources. If they are, and this subject is not covered in those secondary sources, the subject is perhaps not notable. But when the whole country/culture/context is *generally* not well-covered in secondary sources, then the lack of secondary sources about *this* subject is *not* a good test for *this* subject's notability. I think my change reflects this logic."

Use Your Privilege!
But other established editors interpreted my proposed change as an attack on any limitation of notability, or that I proposed to accept original research, and said:
Use Your Privilege!

"When a country or other context does not have a literature of reliable sources that covers its important topics, it's sad, but it means those topics are not notable by our standards."

"It doesn't matter why references are or not available, only whether they are."

"For years the Wikimedia Foundation has been floating the idea of improving coverage of under-represented cultures by allowing oral histories and other primary/unconventional sourcing. It always goes down like the Hindenburg under assault by a battalion of flamethrower-wielding editors."
Use Your Privilege!

So with 7 supporters of my change and 10 against it, status quo remained.

With more allies, we can have the numbers.
Sources
Sources

Thank you for listening

(share this!)

asaf@wikimedia.org