



Everyday
decolonialities of
feminist publishing
A social cartography

By Juliana Santos de Carvalho and
Carolina Oliveira Beghelli

THE
GRADUATE
INSTITUTE
GENEVA

GENDER
CENTRE

Gender Centre Working Paper 14 | 2021

About the authors

Juliana Santos de Carvalho is a PhD candidate in International Law with a minor in International Relations and Political Science at the Graduate Institute of International and Development Studies, Geneva (Switzerland). She is a holder of a Swiss Government Excellence Scholarship for Foreign Scholars and a research assistant at the Albert Hirschman Centre on Democracy at the Graduate Institute. She holds an LL.M in Law and Politics of International Security from the Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam (Netherlands) and an LL.B from the Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Norte (Brazil). Her current research interests include legality, feminist epistemologies, and the production of knowledge.

Carolina Oliveira Beghelli holds a master's degree on Transitional Justice, Human Rights and the Rule of Law from the Geneva Academy of International Humanitarian Law and Human Rights (Switzerland), having specialised in security systems' reform from a gender perspective. She also holds an LL.B from the Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Norte (Brazil). Over the past years, Carolina has been working with civil society support in the Latin-American region, focused on women human rights defenders and protection strategies.



Schweizerische Eidgenossenschaft
Confédération suisse
Confederazione Svizzera
Confederaziun svizra

**Swiss Agency for Development
and Cooperation SDC**

This working paper provides findings from a research conducted at the Graduate Institute's Gender Centre with support from the Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC).

To cite this document

Santos de Carvalho, Juliana and Carolina Oliveira Beghelli. 2021. *Everyday decolonialities of feminist publishing: A social cartography*. Working Paper 14 | 2021. Geneva: Gender Centre, The Graduate Institute of International and Development Studies. <http://repository.graduateinstitute.ch/record/299325>

This working paper is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution – NoDerivatives 4.0 International License (CC-BY-ND).

Cover image: © Amy Johansson / Shutterstock.com

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS	4
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....	5
1. INTRODUCTION	7
2. OUR CARTOGRAPHICAL WORK.....	8
2.1 Re-drawing the initial “theoretical legend” of our map: collectively constructing what is “international”, “feminist” and “decolonial” for academic publishing practices.....	9
2.2 Getting the journals involved	10
3. “A ROOM OF OUR OWN”: CREATING FEMINIST SPACES IN ACADEMIC PUBLISHING.....	12
4. “PERTENECER AL MUNDO ACADÉMICO SIGNIFICA DOBLEGARSE A SUS REGLAS”: CHALLENGES AND OPPORTUNITIES FOR TRANSBOUNDARY FEMINIST PUBLISHING PRACTICES	16
5. ADDRESSING THE POLITICS OF ITALICISATION: TRANSLATIONS AND TRAVELS IN ACADEMIC FEMINIST PUBLISHING	20
6. DECOLONIAL EVERYDAY UTOPIAS	24
7. CONCLUSIONS.....	26
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	27
REFERENCES	27

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

AJWS	Asian Journal of Women Studies
CAPES	Coordenação de Aperfeiçoamento de Pessoal de Nível Superior (Coordination for the Improvement of Higher Education Personnel)
CNPq	Conselho Nacional de Desenvolvimento Científico e Tecnológico (National Council for Scientific and Technological Development)
CRGS	Caribbean Review of Gender Studies
IFJP	International Feminist Journal of Politics
NGO	Non-governmental organisation
REF	Revista Estudos Feministas
SciELO	Scientific electronic library online

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This working paper elaborates a social cartography of feminist academic journals that seek to serve as a site for transboundary feminist reflection and knowledge production. By taking feminist journals as spatialities, it explores how feminist journal editors create, maintain, and imagine spaces of feminist knowledge production and dissemination in their embodied and locally constructed environments. We focus on how these journals reflect and apply decolonial critique and praxis to their work, recognising, however, that this process is plural, fallible, and heavily dependent on the contexts and limitations of each editorial team. We studied 15 feminist journals for the elaboration of this working paper and conducted semi-structured interviews with the editors of eight of these.

We found that the space-making endeavour involved in creating these feminist journals has been intrinsically collective and dialogical. In this sense, their creation has been the result of an intricate fabric of interactions within and across collective public and private spaces of feminist reunions, discussions, and friendship. Moreover, this space-making exercise of all the journals was also marked by a constant discussion of the “boundaries” that would characterise their journals. Among the most common “boundary” debates, the issue of disciplinary and epistemological orientations stood out. All the journals involved in this study were explicitly inter- and multi-disciplinary in content scope, composition of the teams, and editorial profile. However, the most salient boundary discussion among the journals related to the commonly drawn division between academia and practice. These journals have, since their beginnings, incorporated the concern of creating spaces in which the standards of academic knowledge could be redrawn, especially through the construction of bridges between theoretical and activist work.

Maintaining collaborative, multidisciplinary and activist-attuned practices of editing and reviewing allows for richness and alliances between different feminist generations and strands of thinking. However, this also brings specific challenges and tensions for feminist academic publishing. The tension between being a feminist journal and still striving for academic legitimisation, prestige, and resources was ubiquitous in our study. On top of this, all of our participants highlighted the constant struggle of feminist journals in securing funds, support, staff, and contributions. Further, the journal members also noted the increasing dependence of academic publishing to the university and how it curtails the creativity and diversity of the publications involved.

Despite the constraints brought by the norms of academic knowledge production and dissemination, the editorial teams also demonstrated an active preoccupation with creating spaces for subversion within the system through specific practices. These practices varied according to the realities of each journal: they either meant continuing with publishing a variety of materials despite the standardisation pressures from universities; maintaining a system of partial reviewing; or yet involving their teams with external evaluation committees in order to change the standards of academic indexation and classification.

The journals also shared problems related to language, translation, and travelling. Perhaps the most common concern pertained to the relationship between local languages and English as the academic *lingua franca*. While for some the dominance of English meant fewer tools for publishing and disseminating knowledge in local languages, for others it allowed a broader audience reach. The editorial teams also highlighted barriers to travel, both for individuals and texts. Multi-sited editorial boards, for instance, raised the issue of how racialised and colonial borders affected board members differently. Some have implemented practices to ameliorate this situation, including targeted travel funding for graduate students from underrepresented countries and polycentric conferences. Moreover, the challenges of the COVID-19 pandemic have also opened up new horizons to the organisation of fully online conferences. Further, the journal editors underscored epistemic injustices relating to

the ways in which texts are “translated” from local to global. One practice that has allowed to curb these injustices has been the incorporation of more reviewers from the Global South.

In our interviews with the eight different journals studied, we asked the editors to define their aspirations for doable or utopian landscapes of decolonial feminist publishing practices. One aspiration was the expansion of feminist academic publications to further incentivise North-South and East-West interactions and inter-connections, as well as to disseminate feminist ways of publishing that are based on collaboration and plurality. Radical changes in the peer-reviewing system were also suggested. One of those was the complete removal of anonymity in manuscript submissions, as this would allow editors and reviewers to better understand the positionalities, context, and interlocking identities of authors.

The most sensitive topic that arose in all of the discussions regarded the often unseen and unpaid work of reviewers and editors. Many journals agreed that those involved in the editing process should more be compensated for their work, be it financially or with rewards in terms of career progression. Editors also raised the importance of further engaging with digital tools to make feminism more broadly available to students in a continually expanding digital world. All these aspirations highlight the need for continuous political mobilisation and transboundary solidarity so feminist knowledge can thrive and remain a space of critique, care, collaboration, and hope.

EVERYDAY DECOLONIALITIES OF FEMINIST PUBLISHING

A social cartography

1. INTRODUCTION

Whereas feminist and postcolonial pedagogy has a rich and long scholarly tradition, the same cannot be said about studies on academic publishing. With a few notable exceptions produced by the journals themselves,¹ there is limited (conceptual) engagement with the topic, especially on a transnational level. In an increasingly competitive and marketised world of academic knowledge production and dissemination, what does it mean to create and maintain a feminist academic journal nowadays? What epistemic and material inequalities do different feminist editors face in their own local contexts? What are the shared or contrasting trajectories, objectives, practices, and aspirations of these journals?

This paper aims to answer these questions by studying feminist publishing practices with a special focus on journals that seek to serve as a site for trans-boundary feminist reflection and knowledge production. It does so by taking such practices as space-making efforts of feminist researchers in the academic world, in an attempt to provide a social cartography of such feminist spaces in knowledge production and dissemination. This entails analysing what are the borders that define this world; how feminist journals navigate those with their editorial practices; and how they re-draw and re-imagine the boundaries of academic editing and publishing within feminist circles and beyond. We devote specific attention to the epistemological boundaries and inequalities in academic knowledge production that derive from colonial legacies, indicating, however, the “everyday decolonialities” these journals adopt in their editorial work. By “everyday decolonialities” we mean the active and resistant practices implemented by the editorial teams that aim to destabilise North-South divides within the constraints and different perspectives of each journal. We thus take “decolonising” not as a stable or final destination but as a continuous practice undercut by the limitations and opportunities of the journals’ contexts and locations.

In **Section 2**, we reflect on feminist publishing as a spatial practice, explaining the opportunities and challenges involved in applying a social cartography approach. We also sketch a “theoretical legend” for our social map, indicating what we mean by “feminist publishing”, “international”, and “decolonial practices”. Moreover, we provide a detailed account of our process of selecting the journals and getting the editorial teams involved in this research. **Section 3** looks closely at the active production and re-sketching of spaces by feminists and the feminist journals that emerge from their contributions. In this segment, we explore how journals create their own spatialities of feminist knowledge production and communication. In **Section 4**, we summarise how the journal editors who collaborated in this exercise helped us understand the specific challenges they faced in their work. We also identify key practices that have helped their journals survive in an increasingly competitive and marketised academic environment while still committed to feminist praxis in their reviewing and publishing work. **Section 5** explores the issues of “translation” and “traveling” for feminist journals. It compiles the reflections of the editorial teams in relation to exchanges and circulations – both of people and texts – across different axes: North-South, South-South, and epistemological borders. Finally, **Section 6** brings us to re-imagine the contours of (feminist) academic knowledge production and dissemination. For this exercise, we

¹ All of the journals we analysed here have produced, to some extent, editorials and reflections on feminist publishing practices. The *Revista Estudos Feministas (REF)*, however, has caught our attention for their prolific production in this regard, including special issues reflecting on the different experiences and practices of feminist publications. Scavone (2013) provides a comprehensive profile of the academic production of the *REF* from 1999 to 2012. She notes that the second most common theme of academic publications of the journal belonged to the broader theme of culture, education and media, comprising 26% of the total publications within the period (Scavone 2013, 590-591). This theme is important as it encompasses works on feminist publications, which compose 30% of this theme – that is, 7.8% of the total of *REF* publications in the period under analysis (Scavone 2013, 590-591). Moreover, the *REF* has produced issues reflecting on the experiences and publishing practices of feminist publications around the world (see, for instance, their volume no. 12 of 2004).

asked our partner journals to describe utopian landscapes where their most pressing aspirations would be fulfilled.

We conclude by noting that the contribution of feminist epistemological critiques goes beyond the content of publications. Rather, it paves the way for the meaningful inclusion of knowledge from the margins to academic production and dissemination. The conversations that constructed the data in this research showed that the refusal of feminist publications to conform to top-down determinations of academic publishing enables a debate and a plan of action to counter continuing everyday colonial approaches to knowledge production and dissemination.

2. OUR CARTOGRAPHICAL WORK

Decolonial approaches have often engaged with spatial metaphors – something that has rendered the field increasingly and intrinsically geographical (Chambers 1996; Jacobs 1996; Loomba 1998; McClintock 1995). Having a shared interest in decolonial approaches, we embraced this spatial trend to engage with space, spatiality, border-crossings, and the encounters between “worlds” for the study of feminist publications (McEwan 2003). Our journey kickstarted with discussions on how to comprehend spaces, feminist and decolonial publishing practices, and the relationships therein. We were aware that our research involved “physical” spaces, in the sense that our focus was feminist publishing practices in the “South” and the material realities shaped by their distance, disconnections and disruptions with the “North”. However, we were also conscious that one cannot fixate the notion of the South as a mere physical and monolithic space. Indeed, the “South” comprises diverse territories and struggles, which can hardly find a cohesive thread of connection (Tomlinson 2003). Further, distances between South and North are relative and can be much “closer” than what traditional maps may suggest (Herath 2008; Jong 2017; Thérien 1999). Moreover, we were aware that we were dealing with knowledge production and dissemination, and thus speaking of “abstract” spaces of dialogue and communication.

When describing how we understand the spaces around us, Soja (1985, 92-100) affirms that an empiricist approach that sees them merely as physical and natural objects is limited. The author then explains that such spaces are not automatically “grasped”. Rather, they are made into discernible elements through cognitive and social doings – a process he terms as the transformation of spaces into *spatialities*. In this sense, our material environments and the “frictions of distance” of our positionalities are never understood and experienced as detached from our social and cognitive realities and practices. Because of this, such spatialities are subject to being restructured and reconstituted by the social actors involved in these spaces and their relationships (Soja 1985, 94). This allows us to see the possibility of space-making, that is: active and resistant (re-) writings of (geographically or colonially marked) spaces and worlds (Quayson 2020).

Our objective here is to zoom in on feminist publishing as spatialities, that is: products of feminist space-making in academic knowledge production and dissemination. In such an endeavour, we will be attuned to the efforts of feminist journals and carving out spaces for feminist knowledge in the academic world, all the while noting the material and physical “frictions of distance” that limit their space-making effort (Castells 1983, 4; Soja 1985, 93). A useful methodology to explore feminist journals as such is to do a *social cartography*. This means “connect[ing] the social production of space to the cultural politics of difference” when studying such practices (Paulston 1996, xvi-xvii; Soja and Hooper 1993, 184). Accordingly, with the present study we aim to provide a “social map” of Southern feminist knowledge production and dissemination in the embodied and situated environments of the journals studied.

Producing a social map also brings specific responsibilities, however. As explained by critical cartography, maps are not mere illustrations of geographical or social materialities, but also “thick” texts that can write and “re-present” realities (Caquard 2013; Crampton 2001; Harley 2009, 129; Kitchin, Perkins, and Dodge 2011, 22; Pickles 2004, 67).² In order to avoid perpetuating (or generating) new epistemological violences through our social/spatial re-presentations, we had to critically

2 On the political implications of representational knowledge, see also Spivak (1999, 249-266) and Jazeel (2011, 178-179).

re-imagine our map-authorship. In that reimagining exercise, the notion of methodological collaboration across borders developed by Nagar in consultation with Ali (2003) was particularly helpful. By establishing Farah Ali and the Sangatin women's collective not as "objects of research" but as consultants,³ Nagar challenged the representational limitation of the subject (professional researcher)/object of research relationship, advocating instead for a research based on the partnership between the individuals involved (Nagar and Ali 2003). Inspired by such an approach, the conceptual and analytical directions of our research were co-constructed as we engaged with the materials produced as well as with the editorial teams of the journals under analysis. This process allowed the co-construction of three main concepts that were of fundamental importance to delimiting the scope and analytical direction of this study: "international", "feminist", and "decolonial".

2.1 Re-drawing the initial "theoretical legend" of our map: collectively constructing what is "international", "feminist" and "decolonial" for academic publishing practices

We came to this research with the objective of looking at the "decolonising" publishing practices of journals from the Global South or in direct dialogue with the Global South that had an international orientation. While simple at first, those scope contours were soon complicated as the research went further. The first complication was what we understood as "international orientation". We began with a pre-selected list of journals but had the task of expanding it as much as possible. In the beginning, we thought of excluding journals that had only a national or regional scope and reach. However, this proved problematic. While global-to-local connections and impacts are generally seen as "more salient", local-to-global connections and circulation of knowledges are also relevant and influential.

Moreover, overlooking this local-to-global connection can often slip into turning a blind eye to the colonial politics of knowledge circulation – that is, which communities, epistemes, and theories are able to be labelled and construct themselves as "international" (C. de L. Costa 2003; C. de L. Costa and Alvarez 2013). For that reason, and after our desk research on the pre-selected list provided, we decided to drop the "international orientation" direction and identify feminist journals that sought to serve as a site for transboundary feminist reflection and knowledge production – be it as a primary or secondary objective. This opened up the inclusion of regional journals, or yet of journals that initially began as nationally oriented but that engaged in transboundary reflections later on in their trajectory. However, given resource limits, we stuck with the decision of excluding those journals with a purely national scope.

The other concept that merited attention and caution was what we meant by "feminist publishing practices". What would characterise a "feminist journal" for the delimitation of our scope and selection of collaborators in the research? The issue here was not necessarily that there would not exist common practices that could help us identify feminist journals, but to what extent we could define those *a priori*. But we soon came to realise that our concern was misplaced. Rather than a step to orient us in our selection of journals, we learned that feminism was in fact the very analytical object of our cartographical work. We could not pre-decide what feminist publishing practices were without engaging and listening to the journals that overtly declared themselves as feminists. This enabled us to concretely apply our preoccupation with the representative dynamics of research, thus not speaking *before* nor *over* the individuals whose experiences and practices we were trying to represent in this study. Inspired by Braidotti (2000, 724), we recognised that feminist theory and practice travelled and were locally transformed for each of the self-declared feminist journals we were studying. We then tried to co-travel with these journals, adopting a "nomadic" strategy for understanding what it means to be feminist in the academic editorial world (Braidotti 2000).

Another concept that we had to revise and re-adjust throughout our research was what we understood as "decolonising publishing practices". This was a reflection

3 Farah Ali is the pseudonym of Richa Nagar's interviewee (and consultant) for her research on Indian NGOs that worked on issues of domestic and dowry-related violence. Ali was a victim of domestic violence that had filed but later withdrawn her case with an NGO because she did not agree with the procedures recommended by the NGO counsellors. The Sangatin was a collective of rural women activists working through a state-funded women's organisation in Sitapur, India.

specifically prompted by one of our respondents. In our first interview, Brooke Ackerly (co-editor-in-chief of the *International Feminist Journal of Politics*) directly challenged our initial title for this research: “Decolonising Feminist Publishing Practices”.⁴ She asked what we meant by that, noting that this could lead us into pitfalls in our research. “Decolonising”, she asserted, is a dangerous metaphor (see especially Tuck and Yang 2012). In the specific case of feminist publishing practices, if we sought to decolonise them altogether, she explained, this could mean doing away with the unpaid labour of editing, the inscription of feminist journals into metric systems of ranking and evaluation, the predominance of English as the language used in publishing – all of which comprise global standards that influence the prestige and reach of journals and the papers published therein. In an increasingly marketised academic environment, such elements also heavily impact the progression and opportunities of feminist researchers in academia. “Decolonising” feminist publishing practices could then backfire against major goals of feminist journals, namely: creating spaces for the broader dissemination of feminist knowledge; and supporting the careers of feminist research(ers).

Indeed, our initial approach tended to understand decolonising as some sort of final, stable destination that could be reached if following the right practices. This entrapped us into a binary scheme between “decolonial” and “non-decolonial”, as if colonial schemes of power could be cleared off of our map. This was, of course, untenable. The more we talked with the editorial teams, the more we realised the relationship between decolonial/non-decolonial was complicated by their local and institutional contexts: what was understood as decolonial/non-decolonial for some did not travel easily into other spatialities. Not only that, but some editors were also suspicious of the label “decolonial”, preferring instead to speak of “libertarian” practices of feminist publishing.⁵ Moreover, the issue with survival rendered this relationship even more complex. Some journals actively subsumed to mainstream practices of academic publishing for their continued survival and relevance, despite being aware that such practices could be regarded as (re-)producing colonial schemes. Nevertheless, all editorial teams we engaged with expressed, in one way or the other, their aspirations of committing to decolonial practices in their own manner, given their own contexts and limitations.

Inspired by such reflections and commitments, we decided to move away from the search for “decolonising publishing practices” to an approach of looking at the “everyday decolonialities” of these journals. For that, we drew from Davina Cooper’s (2014, 4) understanding of “everyday utopias”, in which she highlights that these utopias “share [an] emphasis on what is doable and viable given the conditions of the present [...] also captur[ing] a sense of hope and potential, in what they anticipate something more, something beyond and other to what they can currently realize”. In this sense, we shifted from an understanding of decolonising as a stable and final destination to a process which is plural, fallible, and heavily contingent. With that shift, we aim to better represent the challenges and efforts of the journals in incorporating decolonial critique and praxis into their editorial work, as well as the “decolonial utopias” they wanted for the future despite their limitations.

2.2 Getting the journals involved

As already explained, our study began with a pre-selected list of journals. We expanded it by starting with what we knew, that is: feminist journals from Latin America and, more specifically, Brazil. For that we accessed the Latindex⁶ and searched for all the indexed journals on the subtheme of “gender studies”. We

4 Interview with *IFJP* co-editors-in-chief, Brooke Ackerly and Elisabeth Jay Friedman on 14 April 2021. On file with the co-authors.

5 In our conversation with Hortensia Moreno from *Debate Feminista*, she affirmed: “Digamos que acá yo discutiría el término ‘decolonial’, pero entiendo en qué contexto ustedes lo están utilizando, lo están planteando. Yo hablaría de prácticas editoriales libertarias, de prácticas editoriales feministas, de prácticas editoriales posmodernas y de un montón de cosas que tienen que ver con lo que ha ocurrido con *Debate Feminista* [...] Pues sí, creo que tenemos prácticas editoriales...Yo no voy a amarrarme con ‘decoloniales’ porque a ver, yo diría bueno, somos decoloniales porque el primer sujeto colonizado son las mujeres, no?” In English: “Well, I would here discuss the term ‘decolonial’, but I understand the context in which you are using it and proposing it. I would rather talk about libertarian publishing practices, feminist publishing practices, postmodern feminist practices and a bunch of other things that have to do with what has happened with *Debate Feminista* [...] Because yes, I believe we have publishing practices... I wouldn’t tie myself with ‘decolonial’ because well, I would say we are decolonial because the first colonised subject are women, no?”. (Interview with *Debate Feminista*’s editorial director Hortensia Moreno and editorial assistant Paola Ortega on 26 April 2021. On file with the co-authors).

6 <https://www.latindex.org/latindex/bAvanzada/envio>

narrowed the results down by geographical balance (choosing between one or three journals of each country) and feminist orientation (we selected only journals that openly declared themselves as doing or contributing to “feminist” work in their aims and scope). For other regions, we also made use of the GenderWatch⁷ database, as well as web searches. Finally, we also adopted a “snowballing” strategy to look for these journals. We did so by either looking for other journals cited in the works or editorials published by the ones we had already listed, or yet by receiving recommendations from the editorial teams we contacted first.

This selection process was not straightforward, however. We would often go back, strike out or add journals once we had already started to study their editorials. Although we tried to remain as comprehensive as possible in our selection, we know our final list has glaring omissions. Indeed, it would be hard to say we have even reached a “saturation” of our possible respondents, as we would find (and hear about) new names each time we discovered a new database or had a new conversation with the journal editors selected. Nevertheless, we had to remain realistic as to the time and resources we had at our disposal and decided to cap our list at 20 journals maximum – which yielded 15 journals after the deselections we made. In any case, our work here by no means purports to be exhaustive. Instead, we would be delighted to see this initial map further expanded by other researchers interested in exploring the rich landscape of transboundary feminist publishing. The final list of journals selected, disaggregated by location of their editorial coordination, is as follows:

Table 1 – Final List of Selected Journals

Name of Journal	Location of editorial coordination
<i>Al-Raida</i>	Lebanon
<i>Ártemis</i>	Brazil
<i>Asian Journal of Women Studies (AJWS)</i>	South Korea
<i>cadernos pagu</i>	Brazil
<i>Caribbean Review of Gender Studies (CRGS)</i>	Trinidad and Tobago
<i>Debate Feminista</i>	Mexico
<i>Feminist Africa</i>	South Africa, Ghana
<i>Gender, Place and Culture</i>	Sweden, Turkey, United Kingdom, Canada
<i>Íconos</i>	Ecuador
<i>Indian Journal of Gender Studies</i>	India
<i>International Feminist Journal of Politics (IFJP)</i>	United Kingdom, United States, India
<i>Journal of Middle East Women’s Studies</i>	United States
<i>La Ventana</i>	Mexico
<i>Nomadías</i>	Chile
<i>Revista Estudos Feministas (REF)</i>	Brazil

We contacted editors of all the listed journals, and eight were available for a conversation during the period of research: *Al-Raida*; *Ártemis*; *Caribbean Review of Gender Studies*; *Debate Feminista*; *Gender, Place and Culture*; *Íconos*; *International*

⁷ <https://about.proquest.com/products-services/genderwatch.html>

Feminist Journal of Politics; and *Revista Estudos Feministas*.⁸ The conversations were held online, either synchronously through videoconferences or through audio and email replies to our questions. Prior to each conversation, we would compile a journal profile based on the editorials of each of them, especially anniversary editorials. We also elaborated the profiles of the journals that did not respond to our conversation invitation or were not available. The compilation of these profiles was extremely important for us to elaborate tailor-made questions to each of the journals with which we spoke, as well as to allow us to identify common experiences, challenges, and aspirations – all of which we address in the following sections. Finally, while most of the interviewees agreed to be quoted by name for this paper, we clarify that in our conversations, they expressed their personal opinions and therefore did not purport to act as representatives of their journals. We include the interviewees' current positions in relation to the journals only to give a better sense of their geographical and organisational localities.

3. "A ROOM OF OUR OWN": CREATING FEMINIST SPACES IN ACADEMIC PUBLISHING

On the occasion of the 10th anniversary editorial of the *Asian Journal of Women's Studies (AJWS)*, Khullar (2005, 16) underscored that despite the efforts and pressures of gender mainstreaming in academia and practice, there was still the need to have "a room of our own". In her reflection, she indicated that the journal sought to "give voice and visibility to women's studies issues in Asia", as well as to "Asian scholarship with a feminist perspective". The *AJWS* was then created as a specific place for feminist and Asian contributions that would otherwise have "limited opportunity for expression in the wider international context of academic and feminist publishing" (Khullar 2005, 8).

12

The idea of "creating a room of our own" resonated throughout our exploration of other journals' editorials and the conversations we had with the editorial teams. As we noticed, this space-making endeavour has been intrinsically connected to the professional and personal commitment of feminist researchers in establishing their own spaces amidst an increased academic attention towards feminism and gender studies. In that regard, many of the journals studied have been created at points in time when feminist studies – be it at the global or regional levels – were flourishing but still incipient in terms of institutionalisation.

In the first editorial of the *Caribbean Review of Gender Studies*, for instance, Mohammed (2007, 1) explained that the journal had been established to provide a space where the growing community of feminist researchers from the Caribbean could disseminate, discuss, and exchange their works. Likewise, the establishment of the *International Feminist Journal of Politics* was linked to the growing production of and interest in feminist international relations theorising in the 1990s (Pettman 2009). More specifically, it grew within the remit of the International Studies Association's Feminist Theory and Gender Studies (FGTS) section. In 1996, Routledge approached some members of the FGTS, proposing the possibility of creating a feminist international relations journal (Pettman 2009). Similarly, A. de O. Costa (2004) explains that the *Revista Estudos Feministas (REF)* emerged in a seminar promoted by the Fundação Carlos Chagas (Carlos Chagas Foundation) in São Roque, Brazil, in November 1990. This seminar was a direct result of the growing interest and activities of feminist academia and practice in the country (A. de O. Costa 2004, 206-207). In that gathering, the Ford Foundation subsidised four working groups to develop proposals regarding the furthering of feminist studies in Brazil. Moreover, the creation of *La Ventana* was concomitant with the creation of Guadalajara University's Centre for Gender Studies, marking the beginning of an institutional experience of interdisciplinary efforts to develop reflections and achieve policy changes within and outside of the academic environment (López 1995).

In the first editorial of *Feminist Africa*, Amina Mama (2002, 1) also delineated that the idea of creating a journal for feminism in continental Africa was the result of a special "feminist momentum" on the continent. In 2002, the African Gender Institute sought to build a collective space for reflection on feminist scholarship and

⁸ See Santos de Carvalho and Oliveira Beghelli (2021) for the profiles of transboundary feminist journals.

analysis of feminist strategy, bringing together over 30 women scholars on gender studies and feminism through the Strengthening Gender and Women's Studies for Africa's Transformation initiative. Later that year, the Council for the Development of Social Science Research in Africa (CODESRIA) symposium "African Gender Research in the New Millennium: Perspectives, Directions and Challenges" was held. Finally, the Women's and Gender Studies Department at Makerere University hosted the Women's World Congress in July 2002, in which over 2,500 women and men from 94 countries participated, especially from Africa (Mama 2002, 1). Within that context, *Feminist Africa* was launched with the objective to provide "a forum for the intellectual activism that has always been as intrinsic to feminism in Africa as to feminisms anywhere else" (Mama 2002, 1).

Moreover, the *Indian Journal of Gender Studies* was developed as an outcome of the Report of the Committee on the Status of Women in India in 1974. This report marked the beginning of a social debate on the unfair roles and expectations that Indian society placed on women. The rapporteurs explicitly requested that social scientists continue the work it started to help broaden the social debate envisioned. The Indian Council of Social Science Research promptly responded by creating a research programme on the matter, generating engagement from scholars who would otherwise not see the opportunity to explore the status of women in India as an academic and social issue. In 1980, a Centre for Women's Development Studies was created, the only one explicitly focusing on gender at the Indian Council of Social Science Research. The *Samya Shakti Journal of Gender Studies*, which later became the *Indian Journal of Gender Studies*, was created amidst a second phase of the Indian women's movement, which was perceived as more connected to academic discourse (Editorial 1994).

In Chile, *Nomadías* was founded in 1995, when academics from the Chilean University made a joint effort to put in writing non-conformist knowledge production on politics and gender that gained momentum after the 1990 re-democratisation (Nomadías n.d.). The publication was developed with a reader-oriented view and has thus consistently included works that do not conform to the norms of academic indexing. According to their former director, this has paved the way for "processes of re-signification and artistic-political re-appropriation" (Vaccaro 2020).

In several of these examples, scholarly gatherings and exchanges for feminist space-making in academic publishing were fundamental. Larger public conferences such as the ones just described were fruitful sites to "signal collective interests, agglutinate shared aspirations and previously dispersed demands, as well as construct channels of expressions to them" (A. de O. Costa 2004, 205). However, more personal and intimate spaces of feminist exchange also played a crucial role for the establishment of these journals. For instance, Mariza Corrêa (1998, 47) explains that the idea of establishing the *cadernos pagu* started as a "cafeteria conversation" of Brazilian feminist researchers with a shared enthusiasm in commenting critically on international feminist scholarship. She tells about their shared interest in deconstructing the "poor woman" trope so common in Brazilian women's studies at the time, which culminated not only in the establishment of the journal but also in the creation of a dedicated research centre for gender studies: the Núcleo de Estudos de Gênero Pagu at the Universidade de Campinas (Unicamp, Brazil). Likewise, in the 50th issue of *Debate Feminista*, Hortensia Moreno (2014) recounts her personal story with the journal, narrating her intimate friendship with the journal's founder, Marta Lamas. She talks about the hard work involved in the publication of *Debate Feminista*, all the while interwoven with gifts and cosy house gatherings (Moreno 2014, 11). In this sense, feminist publishing space-making seems to be an intricate fabric of interactions within and across collective public and private spaces of feminist reunions, discussions, and friendship.

This collective aspect of feminist publishing also brings specific challenges to the teams. While diversity and collective decision-making were highlighted as fundamental characteristics for all the journals involved, they have also entailed lengthy and at times conflict-ridden editorial processes. Minella (2008, 108–9) captures these challenges in relation to the *REF*'s editorial management, indicating that while the plurality of backgrounds, views, and interests of the editorial teams is important, it can also spur conflict and reinforce the need for a coordination team that is able to re-articulate the political productivity of these clashes (Minella 2008, 115). Likewise, in our conversation with the *Debate Feminista*, Hortensia Moreno indicated that different – and often confronting – feminist perspectives among

Mexican feminists are what has made the journal so unique and, ultimately, live up to its name. For journals with multi-sited editorial boards, such as the *IFJP*, the plurality of views and locations of the team was highlighted as a crucial element in maintaining a feminist editorial perspective that is plural and consensus based. The current team of co-editors-in-chief, for instance, includes Marysia Zalewski (based in the institutional home of the journal, Cardiff University), Brooke Ackerly (based in the United States), Elisabeth Jay Friedman (based in the United States as well), and Krishna Menon (based in India). While this has required more frequent meetings and juggling different time-zones from the early days of the *IFJP* (Eschle and Whitworth 2018; Pettman 2009), the current board sees these issues as a “relatively small sacrifice that is so critical to consensus decision-making. It represents the ideas and knowledge of the four of us as we represent and come from different positions”. Moreover, it has allowed them to take micro decisions collectively (among the co-editors-in-chief), thus enabling them to focus on more substantive issues in their consultations with the wider board of the journal.

This preoccupation with diversity and debate by the journals involved was also a major factor that rendered the creation of their spaces inherently trans-boundary. Indeed, the “space-making” exercise of all the journals involved was marked by a constant discussion of the “borders” that would make a feminist journal *feminist*. In this regard, for example, many editorial teams recount that their early conversations when setting up these initiatives were characterised by lively debates on name, scope, and purpose. For instance, A. de O. Costa (2004, 208) explains that a hotly debated issue at the time of the establishment of the *REF* was whether the journal’s title should have either the term “gender” or “feminist”. This discussion was marked by the arguments that, on the one hand, “feminist” could make explicit the political principle delineating the journal and, on the other, “gender” was more appropriately “academic” (A. de O. Costa 2004). Likewise, the history of the *IFJP* has been marked by a continuous reflection on what it means to be a “feminist”, “international”, and “political” journal (Hawkesworth 2009; Youngs, Jones and Pettman 1999, 8). Such discussions have not only fomented important decisions in terms of editorial processes, but also highlighted the importance of keeping the journal’s foundational borders constantly adaptive, flexible, and in motion (Pettman 2009, 5; Pande 2018, 489).

While the editors’ reflections on their own geographical localities and distances will be further explored in Section 5, perhaps the most common “boundary” debates of feminist journals were in relation to their disciplinary and epistemological orientations. All the journals involved in this study were explicitly inter- and multi-disciplinary in scope, composition, and profile. However, the most salient boundary discussion among the journals was related to the commonly drawn division between academia and practice. While the publications explored in this study purported to produce and disseminate academic knowledge, they were often conscious of the gatekeeping work involved in academic knowledge production (Khullar 2005, 10). More specifically, they were aware that academic standards function to the detriment of overtly feminist and, more specifically, to Southern feminist knowledge production.⁹ These journals have, since their beginnings, incorporated the concern of creating spaces in which the standards of academic knowledge could be redrawn, especially through the construction of bridges and border crossings between theoretical and activist work.

Part of this concern stemmed from the background of their local feminist academia or of the editors individually. Likewise, in our conversation with the Debate Feminista, Hortensia Moreno indicated that different – and often confronting – feminist perspectives among Mexican feminists are what has made the journal so unique and, ultimately, live up to its name. *Al-Raida’s* editorials have also commented on the participation of Arab women in other international conferences, such as the Rio Summit (Abul-Husn 1992), as well as several issues dedicated to women’s activism in the region.¹⁰

Khullar (2005, 22-23) explores the relevance of this academia-practice relationship for the *AJWS*. She indicates that this is an important characteristic of women’s studies in Asia, as a lot of research relies on the first-hand experience of past and contemporary activism for theoretical developments (Khullar 2005,

9 See Section 5 *infra*

10 Issues 97-98, 2002; issue 100, 2003; issues 109-110, 2005; issue 124, 2009; issues 148 to 150, 2015/2016.

22-23). She notes that the academic/practice divide has been blurry, as several academics have carried out activist work in their respective countries and in policymaking fora. Through their sections on Personal Narratives and Contemporary Issues, she explains that the *AJWS* is open to the activist voice all the while having other works that can adhere to more scientific rigour (Khullar 2005). In a similar fashion, the *Journal of Middle East Women's Studies* began to publish in 2015 challenges faced by field-based feminist collectives under its "Third space" section. This section has also included interviews and political commentaries on topics that moved public opinion, always with a view towards exploring gender relations (Hasso 2018).

In the *CRGS'* first editorial, its founding editor Patricia Mohammed questioned how Caribbean scholars could engage with exchanges between theory and praxis. She noted in particular the gap in feminist thinking that has emerged between academia and practice, and how academic knowledge production has become an elitist space and somewhat provincial (Mohammed 2007, 2). She then explained that the establishment of the journal arose from these questions, seeking to provide a space to re-view gender "through dialogues that concern gender in the academy and communities we serve, and to ensure that these are reviewed critically by users both within and external to the Caribbean" (Mohammed 2007, 2). She highlighted that while theoretical developments are relevant and should be rigorous, those should always be interlinked with a wide collective of users in the "non-academic" world in order to have a specific impact. She also underscored the importance of having a place where this inter-connected knowledge could be produced with a distinctive Caribbean voice and lens (Mohammed 2007, 3).

This academia-practice border-crossing was also visible in the Latin American journals we studied. In its presentation page, the *Debate Feminista* affirms that its intended audience is not only academia, but also members of organisations and civil society in order to make the discussions on gender and sexuality richer both at the local and global levels (Centro de Investigaciones y Estudios de Género n.d., 2). In the 15th anniversary issue of the *REF*, Wolff (2008, 82) described the journal's initial mission as wanting to present to the social movements what was being discussed at the academic level. The goal was to make accessible to these movements the new debates and international discussions on gender and to allow them to use such theoretical frameworks for their own political action (Wolff 2008, 82). Also in Brazil, the *Ártemis* journal was born out of partnership secured by Loreley Garcia between the Núcleo Interdisciplinar de Pesquisa e Ação sobre Mulher e Relações de Sexo e Gênero (Nipam)¹¹ from the city of João Pessoa and the NGO Cunha - Feminist Collective. The Nipam accepted to assist the Cunha Collective in providing written evaluations on their activities combatting gender violence to their donor. Through the initiative of Garcia, the Nipam used the amount paid by the Cunha Collective for the assistance to fund the establishment of *Ártemis*. The objective of creating the journal was to provide a space for academic feminists from João Pessoa to share and exchange their critical research on feminism and gender studies. As explained by Garcia and Schneider (2013, 597-598), the connection between academia and political feminist movements is still crucial for the journal's work and knowledge production.

These border-crossings between academia and activism have also entailed a differentiated reviewing process for these journals. In their effort to incorporate different perspectives into academic knowledge, many of these journals have structured their reviewing processes more as a form of mentorship than the adversarial process of mainstream publishing. This differentiated stance regarding the review process has strong political dimensions. First, it allows the journals to maintain the theoretical-activist connection, through a dialogical reviewing process that enables the acceptance of "empirical" and "activist" manuscripts that would otherwise not meet academic standards. In this regard, for instance, *IFJP* editors have noted that research produced from the Global South has been often dismissed as "too empirical" or "too activist" (Carver 2009, 33; Pande 2018, 490-491). The journal has then tried to open its publishing space for such engagements, publishing for instance a special issue on water that brought together contributions that did not fit into traditional moulds of academic knowledge production (Carver 2009, 33; Pande 2018, 490-491).

11 In English: Interdisciplinary Research and Action Centre on Women and Sex and Gender Relations.

Second, it permits an active support of early career feminist researchers. In this regard, Khullar (2005, 12-13) explains that while the *AJWS* has usually had one or two papers that needed little editing, several others needed drastic changes and were ready only a few days prior to print. She underscored that the editing process was particularly burdensome, as it meant “an exchange of several emails to clarify problems regarding concepts and information and this often implies protracted long-distance e-discussions with authors” (Khullar 2005, 12-13). She also highlighted that they often have edited works to an extent that may have gone well beyond their responsibility as editors (Khullar 2005, 15). In the *REF*'s work, Minella (2008, 108-109) also explains that when submissions do not follow a scientific format – that is, do not have empirical results or a systematic theoretical or methodological approach – but still bring in new ideas, the editorial team incorporates the work as an essay.

Such mentor-driven approaches to reviewing, however, come with specific challenges. Several journal editors have underscored that this has rendered the reviewing process much lengthier and heavier in terms of workload (Khullar 2005, 15; Minella 2008, 108; Pande 2018, 489; Pettman 2009, 5). Nevertheless, while some editorial teams have reflected that this has often led editors to actively re-shape the texts along with the authors, some have still affirmed their commitment to “editing” instead of “crafting” the papers.¹² Moreover, some editors have also expressed concern with mentoring, which can easily slip into patronising modes of reviewing. In this respect, Krishna Menon from the *IFJP* asserted that “[the] process of mentoring, [is] not just reviewing [...] [it] can't be unilaterally imposed. It is not for us to say that you need to be mentored. That's an unfeminist thing”.¹³

In sum, maintaining collaborative, multidisciplinary, and activist-attuned practices of editing and reviewing allows for richness and alliances between different feminist generations and strands of thinking. However, they also render the editorial work much more arduous and expensive. Feminist academic publishing from (or in connection with) the South has then a strong dependence on significant resources to be maintained. This requires an additional effort, from the editorial teams, to juggle between their feminist commitments and adhering to certain practices and norms of contemporary academia in order to have access to the necessary support for their survival. In the following section, we address the specific challenges and opportunities feminist journals encounter as they seek to survive in the academic world of publishing.

4. “PERTENECER AL MUNDO ACADÉMICO SIGNIFICA DOBLEGARSE A SUS REGLAS”: CHALLENGES AND OPPORTUNITIES FOR TRANSBOUNDARY FEMINIST PUBLISHING PRACTICES

On the occasion of the 10th anniversary of *Gender, Place and Culture*, its founding editor, Liz Bondi (2004, 5), quoted Susan Friedman to reflect that “being an academic is impossible without compromising feminist principles, and being a feminist is impossible without compromising academic principles”. This tension between being a *feminist* journal and still striving for academic legitimation, prestige, and resources was ubiquitous in our study. The editorial teams raised several challenges concerning this landscape. One of the most salient obstacles highlighted was the conflictual relationship between the journals and their institutional ties with donors, universities, and platforms of journal evaluation. In this sense, most of the journals studied seemed to share the same challenge: how to remain feminist – and, more specifically, attuned to the needs of Southern feminist research(ers) – while at the same time needing to survive (and thrive) in an increasingly competitive and marketised academic world?

Several of the journals, especially those located in the Global South, shared an increasingly difficult financial situation – which more often than not were related to their own country's economic and political contexts. As explained by *Íconos*' editor-in-chief Jenny Pontón, much of the academic knowledge published is directly or indirectly funded by states, especially for the journals located in the

12 Interview with *IFJP*'s co-editors-in-chief Brooke Ackerly and Elisabeth Jay Friedman (note 4).

13 Interview with *IFJP*'s co-editor-in-chief Krishna Menon on 16 April 2021. On file with the co-authors.

Global South.¹⁴ In *Al-Raida*, for instance, one of the editorial team members highlighted that, with the economic situation in Lebanon, “everybody’s trying to get out of the country, so it’s just become even more difficult to find reliable staff over the long-term. The brain drain and the need to publish in refereed journals also robs us of the ability to attract contributors. We sometimes have to circulate the call for papers several times to receive the needed entries and at other times we solicit articles directly from authors to be able to issue a volume. Despite the fact that the university funds everything related to publishing fees and the hiring of a managing editor and guest editors when the need arises, very many editorial tasks are done in-house like the translation, editing, and final copyediting and proof-reading.” Moreover, she highlighted the tensions that might arise from the options the journal has for funding and that relate to de-colonial feminist publishing. She noted that “some contributors and scholars are critical of those of us who work with international donors.” However, she affirmed that “working with an array of donors is essential and allows us to continue the work we do at the Institute and indirectly sustains the publication.”

This tension between feminist commitments and institutional ties was also underscored by the editorial team at the *Revista Estudos Feministas*. After losing the initial financial support from the Ford Foundation,¹⁵ the only way to give continuity to the journal was to institutionalise it and move it from the state of Rio de Janeiro to Santa Catarina. This move was motivated by the interdisciplinary profile of feminist researchers from the Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina (UFSC), as well as their experience with organising academic conferences on gender studies. Nevertheless, the attachment of the *REF* to an institutionalised university did not come without feminist tension. As explained by A. de O. Costa (2004, 209), the journal’s founders had been explicitly against a proximity to any university affiliation as the original proposal was for the journal to be a place where the collective voice of gender studies in Brazil could flourish. Nevertheless, Wolff underscores that institutionalisation became important for the establishment of the Instituto Estudos de Gênero (IEG),¹⁶ which now integrates the *REF*:

[A ideia de institucionalização] demorou um pouco pra gente porque é essa coisa meio feminista sim da gente não fazer coisa muito institucionalizada. No começo, [houve] uma certa resistência de institucionalizar. A gente queria manter essa coisa do coletivo e tal, mas aos poucos a gente foi sentindo a necessidade de ter sala e ter uma secretária e isso foi exigindo que a gente pudesse ter uma certa institucionalização.

In English: We took a while to take in [the idea of institutionalisation], because there is this feminist thing of not doing anything to be institutionalised. In the beginning, [there was] a certain resistance to institutionalising. We wanted to maintain that collective thing and all, but little by little we felt the necessity to have a room and a secretary; and that required us to have a certain institutionalisation.¹⁷

Paradoxically, while this institutionalisation opened some resources to feminist publications, it also shut out others in the long run. For instance, to get financing from Capes and CNPq¹⁸ – two of Brazil’s most important public research funding agencies –, the *REF* had to adhere to specific standards of publishing and indexation. This meant having to publish at least five original works for each of their

14 Interview with *Íconos* editor-in-chief Jenny Pontón on 07 May 2021. On file with the co-authors.

15 Grossi (2004, 211-213) explains that the *REF* lost its Ford Foundation funding after the report of two Latin-American researchers contracted by the organisation to provide an overview of gender studies in the country in the 1990s. The report, which had limited access, concluded that the field of gender studies was already quite established and in no need of external funding. The report also criticised feminist academia in Brazil, saying that Brazilian academics had been co-opted by academic institutions and had lost their critical capacity. This report was influential for the *REF* to lose their Ford Foundation funding and move from Rio de Janeiro to Santa Catarina.

16 In English: Gender Studies Institute. Cristina Wolff later explained that when the *REF* moved from Rio de Janeiro to Santa Catarina in 1999, it was housed by UFSC’s Centre of Philosophy and Humanities and it had a small room and an administrative employee. The IEG was formally created in 2005 and since then it incorporates the *REF*, the postgraduate programme on gender studies, their Documentation Centre on journals and other materials on feminism and gender studies, the organisation of the *Fazendo Gênero*, among other initiatives. (Conversation with Cristina Wolff via email on 26 June 2021, on file with the co-authors).

17 Interview with the *REF*’s coordinating editors Cristina Scheibe Wolff and Mara Coelho de Souza Lago on 23 April 2021. On file with the co-authors.

18 Coordenação de Aperfeiçoamento de Pessoal de Nível Superior (CAPES, Coordination for the Improvement of Higher Education Personnel) and Conselho Nacional de Desenvolvimento Científico e Tecnológico (CNPq, National Council for Scientific and Technological Development).

issues. This put their practice of translating pivotal feminist works at risk, since these translations did not count as original pieces (Minella 2008, 108-109). Their indexation to the SciELO Social Sciences platform – required both to access public research grants and to broaden the visibility of the *REF* – also demanded some practices that later backfired and deteriorated the journal’s financial situation. This is because SciELO demands the indexed journals to be open access, which ended the *REF*’s long-standing practice of selling subscriptions that comprised a significant portion of their budget throughout the years. This shift from subscription to open access made sense at the time of their indexation, as previous federal administrations were pushing for greater expansion and broader access of academic knowledge production in the country through grants that required open access.¹⁹ As recounted by *REF*’s editorial coordinators, in the context of Bolsonaro’s overtly anti-scientific and anti-feminist administration, there are few to no resources geared towards universities and academic journals, even less towards those in the humanities and gender studies.²⁰ Nevertheless, Wolff still highlighted the positive impact that indexation brought to their journal, both in terms of visibility and cross-regional alliances. In our conversation, Wolff affirmed:

Nós temos uma relação muito forte com a América Latina. Isso tem a ver também com a vinda delas [acadêmicas feministas latino-americanas] nos nossos Fazendo Gênero. Nós trocamos muito né. [...] Eu acho também que isso também foi um resultado muito da indexação. Um trabalho muito grande que a Claudia [...] fez, um trabalho incrível de indexação da revista nos principais índices principalmente de coisas latinas e latino americanas. [...] Então a *REF* ela acaba sendo uma das revistas feministas melhor indexadas.

In English: We have a very strong relationship with Latin America. This also has to do with them [Latin-American feminist researchers] coming to our Fazendo Gênero events. We exchange a lot, right. [...] I also think this is a result of the indexation. It was a huge work that Claudia did, an amazing work of the journal’s indexation in the main indexes mainly of Latin and Latin-American stuff. [...] So the *REF* ends up being one of the better indexed feminist journals.

While the indexation and further institutionalisation of feminist journals have propelled forward the visibility and importance of gender and feminist studies in academia, this has also created a sort of “feminist drain” in academic publishing. This relates to the growing prominence and appetite for gender and feminist studies within the mainstream of disciplines and journals. While this attests to the success of feminist journals and collectives in opening the doors of mainstream knowledge production and dissemination to feminist perspectives, it also widens the competition for feminist publishing practices (Khullar 2005, 24-25). This was captured by one of the editorial team members at *Al-Raida*, who explained that “there are so many demands on academics to publish original work in high-quality, fully peer-reviewed journals, and this makes it very hard [for our work]”. This difficulty is tied to the increasing competitiveness in academia, which pushes scholars to publish in high-ranked generalist journals. As a result, Southern feminist journals struggle not only to secure financial resources, but also to attract submissions in the face of an increased competitive publishing market.

On a more optimistic note, however, Paola Ortega from the *Debate Feminista* highlighted that feminist journals cannot be easily replaced by mainstream journals recently discovering feminist studies. In that regard, she explained that even though the mainstream has become more “gender-friendly”, there was a distinctive “feminist ethics” in editing and publishing that is hard to be replaced:

Porque yo percibo que actualmente hay muchas, no sólo publicaciones, sino discursos que están vaciando de contenido a lo que se supondría o esperaríamos de los discursos feministas y de género. Por qué? Pues por las cuotas de género,

¹⁹ This period of greater expansion and broader access of academic knowledge production in Brazil was particularly salient during the Worker’s Party administrations between 2002 and 2016. Loreley Garcia from *Artemis* also indicated that in 2011 there was a public call from the government’s Institute of Research on Applied Economics that granted funding for journals in the humanities. *Artemis* benefitted from this public call, which allowed them to publish two editions on paper. (email conversation with Loreley Garcia, editorial coordinator at *Artemis*, on 26 June 2021. On file with the co-authors).

²⁰ According to our searches, CAPES and CNPq issued their last public call for grants geared towards editing and publication of academic journals in 2018 (still during the Temer administration, see link [here](#)). Now the concession of grants seems to be *ad hoc* (see [here](#)), through requests made via the Plataforma Carlos Chagas.

todo esto que sabemos. Por eso es fundamental la forma en que Hortensia hace la corrección. Porque si se requiere una formación y una experiencia y una ética contundentes.

In English: Because I perceive that currently there are many, not only publications, but discourses that are emptying of content what we would suppose or expect from feminist and gender discourses. Why? Because of gender quotas, all this we know. That is why the way in which Hortensia makes the editing is fundamental. Because it requires training and experience and strong ethics.

The rules of academia have also pressured for compromises in relation to the diversity of works published. Meenakshi Gopinath (former co-editor-in-chief of the *IFJP*), told us that “publishing has become franchised to the academy in a sense. It’s become more or less in the service of the academics basically”.²¹ This dependence of academic publishing to the university has been noted as curtailing the creativity and diversity of the publications involved. This, for instance, has pressured the journals to publish more academic pieces over other manuscripts, given the pressure of universities for their journals to remain as “scientific” as possible. In this regard, for instance the *Al-Raida* team mentioned the pressure from the Lebanese American University to have the journal publish more academic works, as well as how the journal was often overlooked by university researchers and faculty because of not having a fully refereed system of reviewing.

In the case of *Íconos*, a national law in Ecuador that limited resources to indexed journals led the journal to cease its policy of incorporating a broader range of works that served academic and non-academic audiences. At its creation in 1997, the publication aimed to “ground” academic constructions, interacting with discussion workshops of the Facultad Latinoamericana de Ciencias Sociales’ (FLACSO) Democracy and Development group (Carrión and Burbano 1997, 1). In order to better its chances for funding and ensure its survival, the journal changed its publication strategy to focus on research papers containing social critique regarding Ecuador and Latin America.

This issue was also salient in our conversation with the editors of the *Debate Feminista*. When the journal’s founding editor and “driving motor”, Marta Lamas, retired in 2014, the journal was in a delicate financial situation. As explained by Hortensia Moreno in her conversation with us, the only financial way not to let the journal die was to institutionalise it further within the remit of the Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México (UNAM). The journal then became a heritage of the university, but this entailed a specific adherence to the institutional normativities of knowledge production:

El tema [de tensión entre prácticas feministas y reglas institucionales académicas] tiene que ver también con la lucha de la academia feminista [...] con la legitimidad que tienen todos los campos del conocimiento dentro del conjunto de la vida universitaria. Entonces sí, desde luego hay una tensión y hay una contradicción interna entre un pensamiento, pues reivindicador de derecho libertario [...] pero que se instala al cobijo de una institución. [...] O sea, por ejemplo, [...] las normas ortográficas. Bueno, pues las normas ortográficas de dónde provienen? Pues de un establishment varonil, heteronormativo, donde quienes dictan cuáles son las reglas, pues son los académicos de la lengua, por ejemplo. Y nosotras consultamos el diccionario de la Real Academia Española para saber cómo se escribe una palabra. De acuerdo? Pues sí. Por qué? Porque pertenecer al mundo académico significa doblegarse a sus reglas. Y si no, pues entonces te sales de la universidad. No puedes estar haciendo un incendio adentro de tu casa, ¿no? [...] Bueno, pasa que desde luego pertenecemos a la institución académica, nos identificamos con la institución académica y obedecemos la normatividad académica.

In English: The issue [of tension between feminist practices and academic institutional rules] also has to do with the struggle of feminist academia [...] with the legitimacy that all fields of knowledge have within the whole of university life. So yes, of course there is a tension and there is an internal contradiction between a thought that reclaims libertarian rights [...] but that is installed in the auspices of an institution. [...] For example, [...] spelling rules. Well, where do spelling rules come from? Well, from a masculine, heteronormative establishment, where

21 Interview with *IFJP*’s former co-editor-in-chief Meenakshi Gopinath on 19 April 2021. On file with the co-authors. At the request of the interviewee, all her quotes have been edited for style and form.

those who dictate the rules are the academics of the language, for example. And we consult the dictionary of the Royal Spanish Academy to know how to spell a word. Is that right? Yes, we do. Why is that? Because belonging to the academic world means to bend to its rules. And if you don't, then you get out of the university. You can't start a fire inside your own house, right? [...] Well, what happens is that of course we belong to the academic institution, we identify with the academic institution and we obey the academic rules.

In spite of the constraints brought by the norms of academia, the editorial teams also demonstrated an active preoccupation with creating spaces for subversion within the system. For the *Debate Feminista*, this subversion has been effected by the cutting-edge pieces they publish. Right after giving the quote above, Moreno asserted that the way she “discharged” her guilt of submitting to the normativities of the university was by putting out issues of the *Debate Feminista* whose contents were always calling for change, self-criticism, and structural reflections on the rules of knowledge production. Likewise, the editors of *Al-Raida* also highlighted the importance of the journal to remain plural in the works they publish, as a means to fend off the standardising pressures of academic production. In that regard, one of its editorial team members especially underscored the importance of sticking to a partial referee system of reviewing, as it allowed them to avoid “hierarchising” different types of submissions:

I worry that if we become a fully peer-reviewed journal, how are we going to keep these other [non-academic] pieces? [...] That is exactly what we are not supposed to be doing, which is to say enforcing a hierarchy of publishing. No, we're not differentiating between types of value or knowledge and the values of different types of knowledges.

20

Moreover, there was a visible effort to re-shape and re-draw the boundaries of these academic norms. This can be illustrated, for example, by the arduous and repetitive work undertaken by the editorial team of the *REF* to change Qualis²² standards of evaluation. Since the *REF* is an interdisciplinary journal and Qualis has its evaluation system divided by disciplines, Wolff explains that it took not only a lengthy back-and-forth between the *REF*'s team and the evaluation committees to discuss and review the evaluation criteria, but also the very own involvement of the *REF* editors in those evaluation committees to change the system from within. In this sense, while to belong and survive in the academic world there is the need to bend to its rules, feminist ingenuity and collective action also proved to be effective in re-shaping and creating new rules in the academic setting.

5. ADDRESSING THE POLITICS OF ITALICISATION: TRANSLATIONS AND TRAVELS IN ACADEMIC FEMINIST PUBLISHING

In the 10th anniversary editorial of the *REF*, Claudia de Lima Costa (2003) reflected on the transnational politics of translation and theory travelling. She noted that there is a need “to investigate which texts, originally written in Spanish or Portuguese, are made available, in translation, to the readership in the Global North, and which texts, written in English, circulate translated (or not) in Latin American journals” (C. de L. Costa 2003). She specifically considered the role of journals as sites and channels for text and theory travelling and translation. She then argued that journals should “establish a counter-canon regarding gender through radical inter- (or anti-)disciplinary experimentations and through situated knowledges”, posing the following question: “How can we, from the place of the *Revista Estudos Feministas*, in the transnational circuits of ideas and values, develop a practice of cultural translation that simultaneously answers both to the local contingencies and the global fluxes of gender and feminism discourses?”

Different issues of language, translation, and travelling were shared among the journals we studied. Perhaps the most common ones were the concerns regarding the relationship between local languages and English as the academic *lingua franca*. Several of the participating journals started out of the interest of

22 Qualis is a Brazilian system of journal evaluation, sustained by CAPES.

Southern feminist researchers in translating for their own academic community pivotal feminist works originally in English.²³ This translation interest did not have just a dissemination purpose. Rather, it also carried a strong re-presentation value through which translation was a productive means of critically reading – and re-authoring – elite theories from the Global North through the lenses of local realities (Piscitelli, Beleli, and Lopes 2003). This translation effort also had a function of investigating, imploding, opening, and questioning “First World theories” with the concerns and inquiries from the “colonies” (Piscitelli, Beleli, and Lopes 2003). However, as noted by Wolff in our conversation with the *REF* editors, this practice of translating pivotal feminist works in English became somewhat obsolete with the advent of the internet. Before, the translations carried out by scientific journals were the only way a national audience could get access to such pieces. Now, articles all over the world are much more accessible to the public via online platforms. Therefore, she explained, the *REF* is now more focused on publishing works from other regions of the Global South, in order to create further South-South bridges of feminist knowledge production and dissemination.

Aside from North-South translations, the journals have also engaged in South-North translations as well as bilingual publishing. The *REF*, for instance, sought from the beginning to publish English versions of Brazilian works to help the international dissemination of national authors. However, this local-to-global translation had to be abandoned due to, among other reasons, lack of financial means (Piscitelli, Beleli, and Lopes 2003).²⁴ Beleli (2013, 639-640) from the *cadernos pagu* agrees that there has been a notable lack of public resources and support to aid in the translation of texts from “local” languages into English, despite the increasing pressure towards internationalisation. When questioned about the possibility of striking a balance between a decolonial approach to publishing and the need to adhere to the English-centrism of contemporary academia for visibility and prestige, Wolff provokingly asserted:

Agora, [entender] o inglês somente como uma coisa ligada aos Estados Unidos, à Europa, ao Norte [Global], não é verdadeiro. Porque, por exemplo, na medida em que a gente publica em inglês, a gente também fica acessível para vários países africanos para vários países da Ásia – o que não seria possível só com [a publicação em] português e espanhol. Então [deve-se] também pensar essa questão linguística de uma maneira um pouco mais ampla.

In English: Well, [to understand] English merely as a thing related to the United States, to Europe, and to the [Global] North is not true. Because, for instance, as we publish in English, we also get accessible to several African countries and to several countries in Asia – something that would not be possible just with [the publication] in Portuguese and Spanish. So [there’s the need to] think of this linguistic question in broader terms as well.

Similarly, *Al-Raida* started as a publication in English that included a 4-page leaflet in Arabic in order to ensure a wider circulation of ideas between the Arab region and abroad (Lebanese American University 1982). Nevertheless, Khalaf (2003, 2) explains that *Al-Raida* had to stop publishing in Arabic in the 1980s due to censorship constraints, the limited number of subscribers in the Arab world, as well as financial difficulties. The current team of editors explained that although *Al-Raida* had to abandon the regular translation of their issues into Arabic due to those reasons, they still try to incorporate Arabic as much as they can into the journal. Funding from the Open Society Foundation allowed them to translate nine issues into Arabic, and they now try to accept submissions in Arabic and do an in-house translation to English as much as possible. The editorial team indicated that continuing to give Arabic a space in their journal was important not only because of their position as an Arab feminist journal, but also to build stronger relationships between Arab authors that submit works to *Al-Raida* in their mother tongue.

23 In telling about the history of the *Debate Feminista*, Dora Cardaci points out specifically that the work of critically reviewing and translating international feminist scholarship was what drew her to working with the journal (Cardaci 2014, 14). Likewise, Mariza Corrêa recounts the early days of *cadernos pagu* as a group of Brazilian feminist researchers who shared an enthusiasm in commenting critically on international feminist scholarship (Corrêa 1998, 47).

24 Later with the support of SciELO, the *REF* was able to publish five special issues in English: two in 2006, one in 2007, one in 2008, and the last in 2010 (Lago 2013, 645-646).

Another problem highlighted by the journals related to the specific challenges of translations in their own national context. One of the editorial teams interviewed indicated how difficult it was to find not only a good translator, but one that “knew the nuances of translating gender jargon”. Moreover, they also encountered technical limitations linked to the Anglo-European centrism of modern technologies. One editor explained that the Western European company they work with to host their website, post the pieces, and get the DOI – all requirements that are needed to make the journal go up the ladder of academic rankings – uses a software that cannot process their local language. The journal’s team tried to come up with a solution, but the task just proved too arduous to be handled. Expressing her frustration with this situation, one editor noted:

And it’s one of those things, again, legacy of the way the world has been built and colonialism, as we all know... But as of right now, ... it’s just way too difficult. [...] I can’t tell you enough how devastating it is to me when I hear from a multimillion-dollar organisation that they can’t figure out how to put a script in our mother tongue on a website. That to me is ridiculous. There’s an entire part of the world, there’s an entire billion sets of folks that use our language online every day... There’s no way you can convincingly tell me that you just don’t have the time to figure this out. And what it is of course is that you just don’t want to, because it’s not what makes the money.

Another issue that affected the circulation of the works and ideas published in these journals was, of course, the question of travelling. Here we talk about travelling in two senses. First, the more conventional meaning of travelling, that is: the movement of people (in our case, authors, editors, reviewers, and readers) across physical spaces through conferences, for instance. Second, *text* travelling from local contexts to global audiences, that is: how texts travel across different boundaries (such as North-South, academia-practice, and so on). This also means looking at which practices can help texts travelling from local-to-global to maintain their originality, diversity, and heterogeneity in contrast with a globalised pressure for standardisation (C. de L. Costa 2003; C. de L. Costa and Alvarez 2013).

First, the “conventional” travelling. In the 20th anniversary issue of the *IFJP*, Pande (2018, 487-488) describes the contrasts and challenges she experienced as an editor of the *IFJP* based in India. She specifically recounts the hurdles of getting a visa to participate in a conference of the journal in the United States, thus illustrating the specific “frictions” of locality and distance that impacted her as an editor of an international journal but based in the Global South (Pande 2018, 487-488). In our conversation with Brooke Ackerly and Elisabeth Jay Friedman (current editors-in-chief of the *IFJP*), they also reflected on the racialised borders that affected their multi-sited editorship, authorship, and audience. In this regard, they commented specifically on the annual conferences organised by the journal and the practices that have been adopted in order to address larger structures of geographical inequality. They indicated that they have implemented targeted travel funding for graduate students from underrepresented countries, as well as organised polycentric conferences. Krishna Menon also commended these polycentric conferences. She affirmed they have been a great discovery to bring together new people to the network of the *IFJP* – people that would otherwise not be able to participate if the events had been in one place only (especially if this place were in the Global North). The challenges of the COVID-19 pandemic also opened up new horizons for the journal’s annual conference, which in 2021 had to go fully virtual. This completely online experience, while challenging for some in the editorial board, was taken by others as an indispensable step moving forward. While recognising the value of in-person meetings, Brooke Ackerly highlighted that:

I cannot see ever hosting a conference that has the *IFJP* name on it that doesn’t have a significant [portion] if not a hundred percent virtual. And this is because as much as I love hugging people, a hug is a privilege. And I think that we need to do as much as we can to break down [the] politics around who gets to be there, who gets to be a well-networked woman – to use a phrase that has been part of my vernacular for a while. If you are one of the well-networked women [as] we are, then what is your obligation to those who are not well networked? [...] I

think that *IFJP*, if it chooses to continue with the conferences – and I think the conferences give us community –, I think we need to think about how do you do community virtually.

Second, the issue of text travelling. Here we go back to C. de L. Costa's (2003) (see also C. de L. Costa and Alvarez 2013) reflection of which texts and works can travel across different boundaries (i.e., North-South, academia-practice, and so on), which visas allow them to travel, what is lost on the way, and which practices can help local-to-global travels keep the heterogeneity and diversity of such works as intact as possible. Regarding these issues, we were particularly inspired by the conversations we had with Meenakshi Gopinath (former co-editor-in-chief, *IFJP*) and Krishna Menon (co-editor-in-chief, *IFJP*). The two raised similar and poignant reflections about the limitations, capacities, and possible opportunities for more comfortable text-travelling promoted by feminist publications. In summarising the *IFJP*'s active concern for incorporating – and not merely “including” – Global South perspectives in their publishing, Menon highlighted the need to attune to the “politics of italicisation”:

[O]ne way of talking about the Global South in the editorial could be: “and now let's turn to India and see what's going on there”. That's one style. The other is to bring it into the discussion just as you would bring in American experiences without an explanation. [...] See, one is a self-conscious way of saying, it's a bit like in when let's say a Brazilian writer is writing in English but uses words from the local language [...] When you feel the need to italicise it and explain it, that's one [way of doing it]. Another is when you have the self-confidence to talk about your experience and assume that the reader will make sense of it from the context. What I think *IFJP* editorials have succeeded in doing is not to make the experiences and illustrations from outside the Global North as exceptional or as unique examples from the Global South, but really as part of the spectrum of experiences that human societies are going through. [...] I think we are trying to move away from that. [...] [Because usually] if I say we were celebrating Diwali, I would have to italicise [it] [...] I think we should just stop doing these kinds of things. I mean, this is a very small example, but I'm sure you understand the politics behind it.

23

The “politics of italicisation” was noted not only in relation to phrases and terms, but also in relation to modes of reasoning that are given easier “free-pass” than others. In this regard, Gopinath underscored the often-unconscious preference given to specific epistemological and methodological paths, frequently connected to Northern modes of producing knowledge. She remarked that:

[V]ery often I would tell my colleagues that when we were either rejecting or accepting a paper, that we had to be a little more conscious about the method of reasoning. So whether it's inductive or deductive or whatever, it's different. The method of reasoning itself is different when it comes to... I can definitely speak about South Asia. I can't speak confidently about Latin America and Africa, but certainly from where I come from the method of reasoning is very different. So what ended up happening? And this, again, this was not an overt bias. I'm just reading between the lines and maybe doing a little more excavation than is necessary... but what was happening was that even as we were speaking about inclusion by virtue of the structures that we had to adhere to [...] we were excluding a particular kind of logic because we were giving pre-eminence to specific modes of reasoning.

In order to curb these epistemic injustices, Gopinath explained that one practice that has allowed the *IFJP* to resist the politics of italicisation was to get more reviewers from the Global South. She noted, however, that the blind peer-reviewing system can be detrimental to epistemic justice when making the texts travel from the locality of the author to international audiences. She describes that, with the double-blind review process, the idea of the person's location as well as their locally embedded intersubjectivities and interlocking identities are largely lost. Another challenge that she explained in this respect was the tension between the pressure of an international publication like *IFJP* to publish pieces in “good English”

and incorporating writings by non-English native speakers. She indicated that they tried to open up for cross-cultural exchange by, in humility, asking the authors what they meant when they used a specific term or phrase. This also meant requesting, whenever necessary, an explanatory footnote to elucidate to the reader the local universe the author was trying to convey. By doing so, she noted, they were able, even if tentatively, to keep the “flavour, [the] sense of the place” from where the author sat.

6. DECOLONIAL EVERYDAY UTOPIAS

In all the eight interviews conducted, we asked journal editors to define their aspirations for (feminist) publishing practices, setting the compass for utopian landscapes of everyday decolonialities. This exercise provided for enthusiastic debates on feminism, society, and academia. The main inputs from editors were gathered into three main strands, namely: i) the increasing need for feminist spaces; ii) the importance of nourishing feminist collaborations; and iii) the relevance of reflecting what a feminist access to knowledge looks like.

The first utopian scenario drawn was kickstarted by the editors at the *Debate Feminista*, who expressed their hope to see feminist publications getting closer to newer generations of feminists. Similarly, the editorial team at *Al-Raida* affirmed that it was important to change the generational hierarchies of academic practices. This would give hope and support to marginalised young voices instead of naturalising multiple rejections of early career researchers in their attempt to publish their work. The same idea was captured by Patricia Mohammed from *CRGS*, who shared:

24

Feminist and gender studies should not be a club that you are admitted to if you know the right words and jargon, it should be accessible to a wider audience to enter and challenge us, the current thinkers, as this will also be the mechanism by which the discipline and its boundaries may be breached to reach to new knowledge. So I would like to see us invent new ways of publishing data and narratives, with some of the usual checks and balances, but which reach out to newer audiences, perhaps a younger audience who have already grown up accepting gender equality but now are learning how to manage this and the responsibility of doing so.²⁵

Thus, feminist editors identified a need to move feminist academic publications from the niches in which most of them started, destabilising disciplinary boundaries and encouraging innovative and even disruptive knowledge production. As Hortensia Moreno from the *Debate Feminista* argued in our conversation, the feminist movement aims at combatting totalitarian thinking and is deeply associated with freedom of thought and expression. In light of increasing hostility towards feminism in today’s political scenarios around the world, she argued it was important to maintain feminism as a libertarian place for plurality and injustice redress.

Accordingly, there was unanimity that institutions, especially universities, need to be more open and representative in their everyday practices and in the composition of their boards. As explained by the editorial team at *Debate Feminista*, more feminist and plural universities lead to stronger institutional support for feminist practices. According to Jenny Pontón from *Íconos*, this increased plurality in universities could foster the creation of more feminist publications, which in turn could further reflections on diversity and inclusion in the academic setting.

Moreover, the expansion of feminist academic publications was regarded as a crucial step to incentivise further North-South and East-West interactions, collaborations, and inter-connections. As highlighted by Loreley Garcia in our conversation with the editorial team of *Ártemis*,²⁶ such increased cooperation could not only enhance the diversity of publications in general but also disseminate feminist

²⁵ Asynchronous email conversation with *CRGS*’ executive editor Patricia Mohammed from 19 April 2021 to 01 May 2021. On file with the co-authors.

²⁶ Interview with *Ártemis*’ editorial coordinators Loreley Garcia and Luciana Calado Deplagne on 23 April 2021. On file with the co-authors.

ways of publishing that are based on collaboration and plurality. As explained by the editors of *Al-Raida*, this could also entail a shift of editorial processes, whereby feminist ways of reviewing and publishing focused on the development and support of researchers could supersede the adversarial inclination of conventional academic reviewing. According to the *Debate Feminista* editorial team, this also entailed paying attention to notions of mutual care and processes of active listening during the editorial process.

Both Krishna Menon and Meenakshi Gopinath from the *IFJP* suggested a radical change of the peer review system: the removal of anonymity. As explained by Gopinath, removing anonymity would allow editors and reviewers to better understand the positionalities, context, and interlocking identities of authors. In this regard, Gopinath recognised that anonymity is strongly linked to the notion of “objectivity” that academia purports to provide. She challenged such a notion and proposed a conceptualisation of knowledge production and dissemination based on trust and collective production instead. According to her, this would be a fruitful path towards regaining “the joy of writing, the joy of sharing, the joy of articulation, the pains, the pleasures, and the and ecstasy of writing”. In this regard, she also suggested a submission process that would invite authors to write a short paragraph “to express what they went through emotionally while [writing] the article”. This way, she argued, the submission process could provide more information so editors and reviewers could visualise a wider map of how different feminists come together for knowledge production and what they share among themselves.

A number of other issues were mentioned as important for making knowledge production and dissemination more plural and accessible. The team at the *Debate Feminista*, for instance, highlighted the need to pay attention to “tiny efforts” that still made all the difference in providing a more human and caring space for knowledge production and dissemination, such as adopting gender-inclusive editorial practices. Pontón from *Íconos* stressed that there is a need for better institutional support to ensure a more attentive and respectful reviewing process. More specifically, she indicated the relevance of investing in qualified academic personnel as journal editors, especially to provide authors with responses regarding their submissions within a reasonable timeframe.²⁷ Pontón also stressed the relevance of universities in more adequately preparing students for publishing, especially regarding publishing formats, academic writing, and referencing styles. According to her, having to deal with such matters drains the time and resources of reviewers while also making visible regional disparities when it comes to investment in the training of researchers. Both Pontón from *Íconos* and Lena Grip from *Gender, Place and Culture* also highlighted the need to strive for more accessible access of published materials rather than having them “locked behind paywalls”, in an effort to curb North-South inequalities that favour those associated with expensive Northern universities.²⁸

The most sensitive topic that arose in all of the discussions regarded the often unseen and unpaid work of reviewers and editors. The editorial team members of *Íconos*, *Gender, Place and Culture* and *Debate Feminista* agreed that those involved in the editing process should be more compensated for their work, be it financially or with more substantial rewards in terms of career formation. On the other hand, the editors at the *Revista de Estudios Feministas* understood that volunteer work was important to maintain the “collective” and “collegial” spirit of editorial teams – noting, however, that administrative and marketing work needed and should be paid to better aid in the coordination and support of the editorial work.

Another utopian landscape sketched for feminist publishing practices was markedly virtual. In our conversation with Patricia Mohammed from *CRGS*, she indicated that there is potential in engaging with “digital feminism” for feminist journals, that is: incorporating social media and online tools in order to “expos[e] students and others to knowledge of different kinds”. The editorial teams at *REF* and *Íconos* similarly indicated that they would like to count with dedicated professionals for outreach and online communication through online videos and interviews with authors. Jenny Pontón from *Íconos* also mentioned the relevance of specialised IT

27 Asynchronous email conversation with *Íconos* editor-in-chief Jenny Pontón, between 28 June 2021 and 05 July 2021. On file with the co-authors.

28 Interview with *Gender, Place and Culture*'s managing editor Lena Grip on 04 May 2021. On file with the co-authors.

support for academic publications to build their capacity, give feedback, and share learnings across publications to enrich the field.

All these suggestions exemplify the long way feminist publishing still has to go and the amount of help needed to get there. No publication will be able to build these utopian landscapes alone. In sum, transboundary coalitions and cooperation are fundamental if the current social cartography of (feminist) academic knowledge production and dissemination is to be redrawn in more plural, inclusive, and socially equal contours.

7. CONCLUSIONS

In mapping transboundary feminist journals, we were able to observe connecting landscapes, challenging formations, disrupted borders, and directions for the future. First, we observed that feminist publishing practices are notoriously collective and multidisciplinary, with editorial teams constantly relying on open, diverse, and friendly spaces for discussion. Moreover, the journals studied actively challenged the borders between academia and practice in their feminist space-making in publishing. This was animated by the understanding that feminist academia could not be separated from activist work, as well as the willingness of feminist researchers to carve out new epistemologies away from the hierarchical (and colonial) spaces of traditional academic knowledge production and dissemination.

These specific features of feminist spaces in academic publishing have prompted mounting challenges to their survival. The journal editors have highlighted the financial and institutional constraints they face in their specific contexts. This has allowed us to observe how the journals address and struggle with their commitment towards feminist and decolonial practices, showing that holding on to such practices is never straightforward or stable. The study also enabled a closer look at the efforts of the journals to create spaces for subversion and for a freer circulation of people and texts across epistemological and geographical divides. These everyday feminist and decolonial practices varied according to the realities of each journal: they either meant continuing to publish a variety of materials despite the standardisation pressures of universities; maintaining a system of partial reviewing; or yet changing from the inside the criteria of journal evaluation committees.

In asking journal editors to imagine doable utopian landscapes in (feminist) publishing, we sought to push forward the project of space-making according to their own socio-political interests and creativity. One of these utopian landscapes related to the need of continuously bringing feminist publications closer to newer generations of feminists. Another imagined utopia was a world in which feminist practices of collaboration and plurality in academic publishing were meaningfully incorporated into academic publishing more generally. Valorising the unseen and unpaid work of reviewers and editors emerged as a common issue in the journal's utopias. Finally, editors raised the importance of further engaging with digital tools in order to make feminism more broadly available to readers in a continually expanding digital world.

What this study shows is that the contribution of feminist journals goes beyond the content of publications. To borrow Melo's (2003) words, feminist publishing is a political action and commitment. This means that editing a feminist journal is not merely a matter of maintaining a protected and isolated space for feminists in academia. Rather, it involves active re-writings of epistemological and material borders of knowledge production and dissemination more broadly. This highlights the need for continuous political mobilisation and cross-boundary solidarity so feminist knowledge production can thrive and remain a space of critique, care, collaboration, and hope.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We are thankful for the financial and mentoring support of the Gender Centre of the Graduate Institute of International and Development Studies, especially to Professor Elisabeth Prügl for trusting us to conduct this research, as well as for her insightful comments, masterful editing, and good-humoured meetings even at the peak of the COVID-19 pandemic. We also thank Emmanuelle Chauvet and Ruth Harding for their editorial and administrative support, as well as their kind solicitude throughout our research. Last but definitely not least, we would like to give a heartfelt “thank you” to all the editorial team members that participated in this research. They have not only dedicated precious time in responding to our questions, but also demonstrated incredible support and willingness to provide us with information and materials that we would otherwise not have been able to acquire.

REFERENCES

- Abul-Husn, Randa. 1992. **Editorial – Arab Women at the Rio Summit?** *Al-Raida Journal*. (58): 4. (Last consulted 24 July 2021).
- Beleli, Iara. 2013. **Publicações Feministas: Velhos e Novos Desafios.** *Revista Estudos Feministas*. 21(2): 637-641. (Last consulted 24 July 2021).
- Bondi, Liz. 2004. **10th Anniversary Address For a Feminist Geography of Ambivalence.** *Gender, Place and Culture*. 11(1): 3-15. (Last consulted 24 July 2021).
- Braidotti, Rosi. 2000. **The Way We Were: Some Post-Structuralist Memoirs.** *Women's Studies International Forum*. 23(6): 715-728. (Last consulted 24 July 2021).
- Caquard, Sébastien. 2013. **Cartography I: Mapping Narrative Cartography.** *Progress in Human Geography*. 37(1): 135-44. (Last consulted 24 July 2021).
- Cardaci, Dora. 2014. **La revista sigue...** *Debate Feminista*. 50: 14-15. (Last consulted 24 July 2021).
- Carrión, Fernando, and Felipe Burbano. 1997. **Las Razones de Íconos.** *Íconos*. (1): 3-6. (Last consulted 24 July 2021).
- Carver, Terrell. 2009. **Whither Diversity?** *International Feminist Journal of Politics*. 11(1): 30-34. (Last consulted 24 July 2021).
- Castells, Manuel. 1983. Crisis, Planning, and the Quality of Life: Managing the New Historical Relationships between Space and Society. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*. 1(1): 3-21.
- Centro de Investigaciones y Estudios de Género. n. d. **Debate Feminista: Objetivo y Alcance.** (Last consulted 24 July 2021).
- Chambers, Iain. 1996. Waiting on the End of the World? In *Stuart Hall - Critical Dialogues in Cultural Studies*. (Eds.) David Moorley and Kuan Hsing Chen. Oxford: Polity.
- Cooper, Davina. 2014. *Everyday Utopias: The Conceptual Life of Promising Spaces*. Duke University Press.
- Corrêa, Mariza. 1998. **Uma pequena voz pessoal.** *Cadernos Pagu*. (11): 47-54. (Last consulted 24 July 2021).
- Costa, Albertina de Oliveira. 2004. **Revista Estudos Feministas: Primeira Fase, Localização Rio de Janeiro.** *Revista Estudos Feministas*. 12(spe): 205-210. (Last consulted 24 July 2021).
- Costa, Claudia de Lima. 2003. **As Publicações Feministas e a Política Transnacional Da Tradução: Reflexões Do Campo.** *Revista Estudos Feministas*. 11(1): 254-264. (Last consulted 24 July 2021).
- Costa, Claudia de Lima, and Sonia E. Alvarez. 2013. **A Circulação Das Teorias Feministas e Os Desafios Da Tradução.** *Revista Estudos Feministas*. 21(2): 579-586. (Last consulted 24 July 2021).

- Crampton, Jeremy W. 2001. **Maps as Social Constructions: Power, Communication and Visualization**. *Progress in Human Geography*. 25(2): 235-252. (Last consulted 24 July 2021).
- Editorial**. 1994. *Indian Journal of Gender Studies* 1(1): i-ii. (Last consulted 24 July 2021).
- Eschle, Catherine, and Sandra Whitworth. 2018. **Feminist Scholarship, Feminist Institution-Building, Feminist Friendships**. *International Feminist Journal of Politics*. 20(4): 492-495. (Last consulted 24 July 2021).
- Garcia, Loreley, and Liane Schneider. 2013. **Ártemis: por um feminismo crítico, artístico e libertário**. *Revista Estudos Feministas*. 21: 597-603. (Last consulted 24 July 2021).
- Grossi, Miriam Pillar. 2004. **A Revista Estudos Feministas Faz 10 Anos: Uma Breve História Do Feminismo No Brasil**. *Revista Estudos Feministas*. 12(spe): 211-221. (Last consulted 24 July 2021).
- Harley, John Brian. 2009. Maps, Knowledge, and Power. In *Geographic Thought: A Praxis Perspective*. (Eds.) George Henderson and Marvin Waterstone. 129-148. London; New York: Routledge.
- Hasso, Frances S. 2018. **Editorial Introduction**. *Journal of Middle East Women's Studies*. 14(1): 1-2. (Last consulted 24 July 2021).
- Hawkesworth, Mary. 2009. **Institutionalizing Insurgency**. *International Feminist Journal of Politics*. 11(1): 10-20. (Last consulted 24 July 2021).
- Herath, Dhammika. 2008. **Development Discourse of the Globalists and Dependency Theorists: Do the Globalisation Theorists Rephrase and Reword the Central Concepts of the Dependency School?** *Third World Quarterly*. 29(4): 819-834. (Last consulted 24 July 2021).
- Jacobs, Jane M. 1996. *Edge of Empire: Postcolonialism and the City*. London; New York: Routledge.
- Jazeel, Tariq. 2011. The Geography of Theory: Knowledge, Politics, and the Postcolonial Present. In *Postcolonial Spaces: The Politics of Place in Contemporary Culture*. (Eds.) Andrew Teverson and Sara Upstone. 164-184. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Jong, Sara de. 2017. *Complicit Sisters: Gender and Women's Issues across North-South Divides*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Khalaf, Mona Chemali. 2003. **The Way It Evolved...** *Al-Raida Journal*. XX(100): 2. (Last consulted 24 July 2021).
- Khullar, Mala. 2005. **Asian Journal of Women's Studies: Ten Years and Beyond**. *Asian Journal of Women's Studies*. 11(4): 7-31. (Last consulted 24 July 2021).
- Kitchin, Rob, Chris R. Perkins, and Martin Dodge. 2011. Thinking about Maps. In *Rethinking Maps: New Frontiers in Cartographic Theory*. (Eds.) Martin Dodge, Rob Kitchin, and Chris R. Perkins. 1-25. London: Routledge. Routledge studies in human geography.
- Lago, Mara Coelho de Souza. 2013. **Narrar a REF e Fazer a REF: Uma História Coletiva**. *Revista Estudos Feministas*. 21(2): 643-653. (Last consulted 24 July 2021).
- Lebanese American University. 1982. **Future Plans for IWSA**. *Al-Raida Journal*. (19): 1. (Last consulted 24 July 2021).
- Loomba, Ania. 1998. *Colonialism/Postcolonialism*. London ; New York: Routledge.
- López, Raúl Padilla. 1995. **Inauguración del Centro de Estudios de Género. Palabras del Rector General de la UdeG (1989-1995)**. *La Ventana*. (1): 86-88. (Last consulted 24 July 2021).
- Mama, Amina. 2002. **Editorial**. *Feminist Africa*. (1): 1-5. (Last consulted 24 July 2021).
- McClintock, Anne. 1995. *Imperial Leather: Race, Gender, and Sexuality in the Colonial Contest*. New York: Routledge.
- McEwan, Cheryl. 2003. **Material Geographies and Postcolonialism**. *Singapore Journal of Tropical Geography*. 24(3): 340-355. (Last consulted 24 July 2021).
- Minella, Luzinete Simões. 2008. **Fazer a REF é Fazer Política: Memórias de Uma Metamorfose Editorial**. *Revista Estudos Feministas*. 16(1): 105-116. (Last consulted 24 July 2021).
- Mohammed, Patricia. 2007. **Introducing the Caribbean Review of Gender Studies**. *Caribbean Review of Gender Studies*. 1(1): 1-8. (Last consulted 24 July 2021).

- Moreno, Hortensia. 2014. **25 años de debate**. *Debate Feminista*. 50: 7-12. (Last consulted 24 July 2021).
- Nagar, Richa, and Farah Ali. 2003. **Collaboration Across Borders: Moving Beyond Positionality**. *Singapore Journal of Tropical Geography*. 24(3): 356-372. (Last consulted 24 July 2021).
- Nomadías. n. d. **Sobre la revista**. *Nomadías*. (24 July 2021). (Last consulted 24 July 2021).
- Pande, Rekha. 2018. **An Odyssey with an International Feminist Journal**. *International Feminist Journal of Politics*. 20(4): 486-491. (Last consulted 24 July 2021).
- Paulston, Rolland G. (Ed.). 1996. *Social Cartography: Mapping Ways of Seeing Social and Educational Change*. New York: Garland Pub.
- Pettman, Jan Jindy. 2009. **IFJP Tenth Anniversary Reflections: In the Beginning...** *International Feminist Journal of Politics*. 11(1): 2-9. (Last consulted 24 July 2021).
- Pickles, John. 2004. *A History of Spaces: Cartographic Reason, Mapping, and the Geo-Coded World*. London; New York: Routledge.
- Piscitelli, Adriana, Iara Beleli, and Maria Margaret Lopes. 2003. **Cadernos Pagu: Contribuindo Para a Consolidação de Um Campo de Estudos**. *Revista Estudos Feministas*. 11(1): 242-246. (Last consulted 24 July 2021).
- Quayson, Ato. 2020. **Introduction: Postcolonial Spatialities**. *Interventions*. 22(8): 967-976. (Last consulted 24 July 2021).
- Santos de Carvalho, Juliana and Carolina Oliveira Beghelli. 2021. **Profile of Transboundary Feminist Journals**. Geneva: Gender Centre, Graduate Institute of International and Development Studies.
- Scavone, Lucila. 2013. **Perfil Da REF Dos Anos 1999-2012**. *Revista Estudos Feministas*. 21(2): 587-596. (Last consulted 24 July 2021).
- Soja, Edward W. 1985. The Spatiality of Social Life: Towards a Transformative Retheorisation. In *Social Relations and Spatial Structures*. (Eds.) Derek Gregory and John Urry. 90-127. London: Macmillan Education UK.
- Soja, Edward W., and Barbara Hooper. 1993. The Spaces That Difference Makes: Some Notes on the Geographical Margins of the New Cultural Polities. In *Place and the Politics of Identity*. (Eds.) Michael Keith and Steve Pile. 183-205. London; New York: Routledge.
- Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty. 1999. *A Critique of Postcolonial Reason: Toward a History of the Vanishing Present*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.
- Stephan, Wafa. 1985. **Arab Women and the Women's Decade**. *Al-Raida Journal*. (31): 2-3. (Last consulted 24 July 2021).
- Thérien, Jean-Philippe. 1999. **Beyond the North-South Divide: The Two Tales of World Poverty**. *Third World Quarterly*. 20(4): 723-742. (Last consulted 24 July 2021).
- Tomlinson, B. R. 2003. **What Was the Third World?** *Journal of Contemporary History*. 38(2): 307-321. (Last consulted 24 July 2021).
- Tuck, Eve, and K. Wayne Yang. 2012. **Decolonization Is Not a Metaphor**. *Decolonization: Indigeneity, education & society*. 1(1): 1-40. (Last consulted 24 July 2021).
- Vaccaro, Kemy Oyarzún. 2020. **Palabras Cómplices**. *Nomadías*. (29): 1-2. (Last consulted 24 July 2021).
- Wolff, Cristina Scheibe. 2008. **Estudos Feministas e Movimentos Sociais: Desafios de Uma Militância Acadêmica Em Forma de Revista**. *Revista Estudos Feministas*. 16(1): 81-86. (Last consulted 24 July 2021).
- Youngs, Gillian, Kathleen B. Jones, and Jan Jindy Pettman. 1999. **New Spaces, New Politics**. *International Feminist Journal of Politics*. 1(1): 1-13. (Last consulted 24 July 2021).



The Gender Centre

is the Graduate Institute's centre dedicated to research and dissemination of knowledge on gender in development and international relations. Through its research, training, and outreach activities, the Gender Centre seeks to advance solutions to pervasive problems of gender injustice, discrimination and exclusion.

Gender Centre

Graduate Institute of International and Development Studies
Chemin Eugène-Rigot, 2 | P.O. Box 1672 | 1211 Geneva 1 | Switzerland
T: +41 22 908 57 00 **M:** gender@graduateinstitute.ch

graduateinstitute.ch/gender