

Post-print:

The Version of Record of this manuscript has been published and is available in *Women's History Review*, published online 11 July 2022, <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/09612025.2022.2090711>

Title:

Rallying Women: Activism, Archives and Affect

Authors:

Vera Mackie*

School of Humanities & Social Inquiry, University of Wollongong, Australia

Orcid ID: <http://orcid.org/0000-0003-3390-6522>

Email: vera@uow.edu.au

Twitter handle: @veramackie

Sharon Crozier-De Rosa

School of Humanities & Social Inquiry, University of Wollongong, Australia

Orcid ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2797-5532>

Email: sharoncd@uow.edu.au

Twitter handle: @S_CrozierDeRosa

* Corresponding author

Abstract:

In January 2017 over 400,000 women marched in Washington DC, USA—while others marched in cities across the world—to protest the election of a misogynistic president and to draw attention to gendered and racialised inequality. Since then, operating as Women's March Inc., the US organisation has staged subsequent Women's Marches which both extend the group's activism and commemorate the original event. Activists have referenced the historical precedents that they believe will help them to successfully construct the group's memory culture and identity and produce the emotion and affect needed to sustain their movement. Cognisant that they are making history through mobilising year after year, they have also developed strategies for archiving that history and making it accessible. In this article, we examine the place of history and historical literacy—both knowledge of history *and* the skills to interpret its significance—in the complex nexus between memory, affect and activism. We find that a lack of historical literacy has the potential to create an exclusive memory culture which risks inflicting trauma on those already traumatized by current and historic events. On the other hand, attention to preserving and making available history as it is being made helps to build pride and solidarity and ensure the intergenerational transmission of feminist knowledge.

Keywords:

Women's March, Historical Literacy, Memory Culture, Affective Strategies, Archiving, Activism

Biographies:

Vera Mackie is Emeritus Professor at the University of Wollongong. Publications include *IVF and Assisted Reproduction: A Global History* (2020, with S. Ferber and N. J. Marks); *The Reproductive Industry: Intimate Experiences and Global Processes* (2019, with N. J. Marks and S. Ferber); *Remembering Women's Activism* (2019, with S. Crozier-De Rosa); *The Social Sciences in the Asian Century* (2015, with C. Johnson and T. Morris-Suzuki); *Ways of Knowing about Human Rights in Asia* (2015); *The Routledge Handbook of Sexuality Studies in East Asia* (2015, with M. McLelland); *Gender, Nation and State in Modern Japan* (2014, with A. Germer and U. Wöhr); *Feminism in Modern Japan: Citizenship, Embodiment and Sexuality* (2003); *Gurōbaruka to Jendā Hyōshō* [Globalisation and Representations of Gender] (2003); *Human Rights and Gender Politics: Asia-Pacific Perspectives* (2000, with A-M. Hilsdon, M. Macintyre and M. Stivens); *Creating Socialist Women in Japan: Gender, Labour and Activism, 1900–1937* (1997).

Sharon Crozier-De Rosa is Associate Professor in History in the School of Humanities and Social Inquiry, University of Wollongong. Her research combines histories of nationalist feminisms, emotions, violence, and memory cultures, in and across Ireland, Britain, Australia and the US. She is author of *Shame and the Anti-Feminist Backlash* (2018), co-author with Vera Mackie of *Remembering Women's Activism* (2019), co-editor with Katie Barclay and Peter N. Stearns of *Sources for the History of Emotions* (2020). Her current project, 'Memory-Keeper: Women Activists' Strategies to Document Their History and Preserve Their Own Memory', was awarded a National Library of Australia Fellowship. She is Deputy Editor of *Women's History Review*, International Federation for Research in Women's History board member and editorial board member of the journal of the Australian Women's History Network, *Lilith. A Feminist History Journal*.

Article:

Introduction

In November 2016, Donald J. Trump defeated Hillary Rodham Clinton in the US Presidential election. Due to openly demeaning women, Trump had gained the reputation of being a misogynist. He was also labelled racist.¹ Yet, more than 40% of the women who went to the polls on Election Day supported him.² The majority of those women were White (according to exit polls, a reported 53% of White women voted for Trump). Black women, as well as a significant number of Hispanic women, largely voted for Clinton.³ It was not simply a case of 'white women voters' versus 'African-American women', 'Latina women' or other 'women of colour', given that other factors such as prior party affiliation, political ideology, class position, educational level, sexual orientation, marital status and religious affiliation played a role. Still, this did not prevent some from arguing that White women 'held sexist and racially resentful attitudes more similar to males supporting Trump than to their female counterparts supporting other candidates'.⁴ One journalist at the time of the election reported that many had responded to the difficult news that Trump had won by claiming 'that this is all the fault of "white feminism"'.⁵

Whatever the accuracy or inaccuracy of statements about White women voters, at the same time that journalists deliberated on who had been to 'blame' for Trump's triumph, feminist activists prepared for his inauguration by planning a Women's March on Washington. They aimed to protest the president's misogyny, reminding him, other Americans, and the rest of the world that 'women's rights are human rights'.⁶ What had been planned as a one-day protest evolved into a political lobbying movement with a highly active social media presence. Its agenda soon broadened to include a whole suite of political issues. It developed from a US-based protest into a global movement, although its social media presence was largely

focused on the unfolding situation in the US. On 21 January 2017, over 400,000 women marched in Washington DC. On the same day Women's Marches were held in 81 nations on all continents of the globe, even Antarctica. An estimated five million people participated in nearly 700 'Women's Marches'.

From the beginning, while building group solidarity, the Women's March was plagued by dissent and controversy. While much controversy centred on the initial failure to include women of colour on the organising committee, there was also criticism of activists' choice of historical precedents. As journalism scholar Carolyn Kitch has noted—based on social media, academic scholarship and her own 'on-site experience' at the 2017 Washington march—the rally was 'threaded with the past' while envisioning 'possible political and social futures'.⁷ One 'older woman' in Washington DC held up a placard that read: 'I Can't Believe I'm Still Protesting This Shit'.⁸ She implied the long history of feminist protests and her own long-term participation in such protests. Activists and media cited events such as past protests on Washington's National Mall, historical figures like suffragists Susan B. Anthony (1820–1906) and Elizabeth Cady Stanton (1815–1902), and past campaigns like the women's suffrage and civil rights movements.⁹ Other groups expressed opposition to what they claimed was the ahistorical co-option of suffragists for causes they would not have supported in their own time, like abortion.¹⁰ Still others noted historical silences and omissions, including the histories of women of colour.¹¹

In this article, we argue that history occupied a crucial place in the complex nexus between memory and activism. Activists' decisions about which pasts to include and exclude as they sought to construct a collective identity had a critical impact on their ability to attract participants to the campaign, while other potential supporters turned away. While the selection of historical figures and events cited was fundamental here, there was another dimension that was equally important, namely activists' articulation of their understanding of the nature of the pasts they cited. We argue that the degree to which activists had knowledge of history and the skills to interpret that history had significant repercussions for the capacity of their memory cultures to be inclusive. We refer to this as historical literacy and will discuss this in more detail below. We find that a lack of initial historical literacy when constructing a collective form of memory rendered an event that was already traumatic for many to be even more so. Women of colour perceived that

their interests were not represented in an event protesting what they had also actively opposed, namely the election of a sexist, racist president.

The organisers of the 2017 march responded to historical controversies by readjusting their approach to the past in the attempt to be more inclusive of diversity. The Women's March movement also continued well beyond 2017. Subsequent Women's Marches were held annually from 2017 to 2020, but this was difficult in 2021 and 2022 due to social distancing protocols during the COVID-19 pandemic. A well-established social media presence meant that the 'Marching On' organisation retained public visibility even when the physical marches could no longer take place.

Subsequent Women's Marches extended the reach of the original activism. Every time they took to the streets again, activists also commemorated the original march. Between 2017 and 2019, Women's March Inc.'s 'Mission' had evolved from standing for the rights of women to harnessing the political power of diverse women, families and communities to create transformative social change, providing intersectional education, and 'creating entry points for new grassroots activists & organizers to engage in their local communities through trainings, outreach programs and events'.¹² This mission facilitated further waves of protest aimed at specific reforms. These included a mass action on Family Detention in June 2018 and the campaign against Brett Kavanaugh's nomination to the Supreme Court.¹³ This had further repercussions for collective memory and identity as the movement adapted and responded to an increasingly diverse set of causes and principles, and potentially a more diverse membership.

In this article, we extend our analysis of the role of history and historical literacy in the 2017 Women's March to include an examination of the marches as they evolved in response to the expanding remit of the Women's March Inc. While we look at post-2017 commemorative Women's Marches, we have also selected an affiliated form of protest, starting with the collective rallies against the 2021 anti-abortion bill in the state of Texas, to further test our theories about the place of history and the importance of historical literacy in building inclusive social movements. As the Women's March website's 'Timeline' records, on 2nd October 2021, 'We [comprising 'more than 100 organizations'] rallied in more than 650 locations, in cities and in rural areas, in all 50 states' to send 'a strong message to the Supreme Court that we will defend access to abortion at all costs'. In Washington DC, '20,000 activists participated in the rally and

marched from Freedom Plaza to the steps of the United States Supreme Court'.¹⁴ Rallies continued into 2022, as more and more states passed similar bills. History was evoked with reference to the 1973 US Supreme Court's ruling on the right to abortion in the case of *Roe v. Wade*. Such references to a historical victory for feminists in the US served to remind activists that women's rights could regress. The acute knowledge that hard-fought gains—that history itself—could be reversed, galvanised diverse cohorts of protesters. Our extended analysis compounds our findings that our knowledge of the past, including diverse pasts, and understandings of the ways in which histories are made, interpreted and used, as well as re-made, has the capacity to inflict or re-inflict trauma on those directly affected.

The original Women's March has attracted scholarly attention for the scale of the mobilisation and the intense feelings aroused by it. Feminist political scientists, sociologists and cultural theorists have examined the rallies for what they reveal about the affective and emotional dimensions of protest. Jessica Gantt-Shafer, Cara Wallis and Caitlin Miles used the marches as a case study to examine how identity, affect and emotion could generate the energy and the 'coalition building necessary to drive a dynamic social and political movement'.¹⁵ Others have investigated the intersectional conflicts that arose out of this specific event.¹⁶ Still others have analysed the 2017 marches for what they reveal about communication, including the efficacy of media and technology, particularly social media, in producing the emotional and material dynamics of mass protest.¹⁷

In our analysis, we consult a range of sources created *by* and *about* the Women's March to investigate how women's marches, organisers, activists and commentators drew on a selection of historical moments and movements to rationalise their campaign, motivate and sustain fellow campaigners, or critique the legitimacy of the protest. We pay attention to the archiving and availability of women's histories, and the possibilities presented by new digital platforms and social media activism. The sources we draw on include: the Women's March website (<https://www.womensmarch.com/>) and social media presence, regular Women's March e-mails, commentary in mainstream media like the *New York Times*, *Washington Post*, *New York Post* and *The Guardian*, online sites like *Refinery29*, *Teen Vogue*, *Jezebel* and *The Cut*, and primary historical sources related to earlier women's marches. We examine the place of historical literacy in

this evolving and diversifying social movement, and in media reporting on it, while being attentive to the emotional and reflexive aspects of protest.

Memory and Affect

Chiara De Cesari and Ann Rigney argue that a form of collective memory is important for supporting a group's social identity, for encouraging feelings of solidarity.¹⁸ The stories and the images that constitute a group's 'memory', however, are uneven, contestable and always in a state of motion. What [Maurice] Halbwachs (1877–1945) termed collective memory, and Guy Beiner calls 'social' remembrance to avoid 'giving an impression of collective homogeneity', is therefore dynamic. Astrid Erll refers to this dynamism as 'travelling memory'.¹⁹ As De Cesari and Rigney explain, 'cultural remembrance involves the continual production, remediation, and sharing of stories about a past that changes in relation to the new possibilities for interpreting it within shifting social frames operating at different scales and across different territories'.²⁰ Groups are not bound to 'a particular identity fixed in the past'. Instead they generate new meanings in the relationship between past and identity.²¹ Ann Snitow, creator of 'The Feminist Memoir Project', describes the process of generating collective memory more bluntly: 'People retell the past, knocking off edges that don't fit how the group desires to name and know itself.'²² The pasts they choose and the way they interpret them reflect group members' own political positioning. Therefore, when groups cite history to cultivate a memory culture, the resulting memory or representation of the past is, Emily Knightly asserts, less of a historical truth-index. Rather, as Red Chidgey writes, it is 'more a fault-line to understanding what these pasts might mean for constituencies in the present'.²³

Historian Sarah Ferber argues that '[t]hinking about the past can facilitate an understanding of the present, for example, by testing claims to novelty and to improvement, to continuity or change.'²⁴ She asserts that: '[d]eciphering both continuities and ruptures with the past is the work of the historian....as trained readers, historians look for silences and omissions as much as they look for declarations and achievements'.²⁵ Constructing memory cultures involves remembering some versions of some pasts, but also forgetting or silencing others. As De Cesari and Rigney put it, creating memory is 'the outcome of ongoing cultural practices and unequal encounters'. It is a generative 'activity that is productive of stories and new

social relations rather than merely preservative of legacies'.²⁶ Gutman, Sodaro and Brown add that, as acts of remembrance are mediated, new narratives might be created but this may displace or marginalise others. Creating fresh perspectives on the past can continually change the grounds on which common futures are imagined.²⁷

Chidgey argues that cultural memory processes 'are driven primarily through the imagination and affect'.²⁸ Those researching social movements have also come to realise the pivotal role of feelings and emotions in protest. Some affective dimensions of movements are spontaneously evoked, such as eruptions of solidarity or shared outrage in response to specific events like brutal acts of violence. Others, however, are more carefully cultivated. Sociologists such as James Jasper, Helena Flam, Debra King and others argue that 'activists appeal to people's emotions in order to mobilise support and engage in other emotional practices that create feelings of belonging, strength for the struggle, solidarity and other feelings vital for collective political action'.²⁹ Whereas an anti-war campaign might cultivate a peace-loving, conflict-averse strain of protest that emphasises love, compassion and understanding, a feminist movement might elicit anger and indignation against ongoing discrimination and inequality. Activists are also aware that cultivating the wrong emotional mix could bring about the demise of a campaign.³⁰ Incorporating a valued version of the past into group memory can help create feelings of pride and connection. It has also been argued, however, that omitting a meaningful past can exclude potential activists from belonging. There are, therefore, limitations to relying on stories of the past to achieve group aspirations. Some past activists have been articulate about these limitations, especially if the stories they wanted to use to inspire participation were not well known or had fallen out of the history canon.³¹

More research is needed to help us understand the evolving nexus between affect, group identity and the strategic cultivations of history in the memory cultures of movements for reform. Recognising that memory cultures reflect the value, meaning and emotional attachment that groups attach to certain versions of chosen pasts, we consider what it means for potential activists when histories that have meaning for them are excluded from protest memory cultures.

Historical Literacy

To analyse the implications of the various inclusions, silences and omissions in memory cultures, we deploy the term ‘historical literacy’. This term was coined by history educators to refer to educating children to know about historical events and to teach the conceptual tools for interpreting those events (including reconciling different perspectives, critically assessing ideas about and accounts of the past, and the importance of working from the primary documents of the time under study).³² The concept of historical literacy has been pulled into a series of public debates over history education and national values and identity, commonly labelled ‘history wars’, in places like Australia, the US and East Asia.³³ Participants in these debates determined that knowing about the nation’s past was key to sustaining the nation’s identity and ethos, thereby fostering national cohesion and identity.³⁴ As historian Anna Clark explains in the Australian context, ‘history’ held nation-building potential. Stories of the past could be used to inspire people to believe in themselves as a collective, as an ‘imagined community’.³⁵ Without knowing the story of national achievement, ‘young people risked being nationally illiterate’.³⁶

Yet, ‘knowing’ the stories of the past is not the same as being ‘historically literate’. History is not simply an account of what happened when. As a discipline, history teaches the complex skills of historical understanding. It invites critical engagement, questioning and repudiation, and the critical evaluation of sources of information.³⁷ During the abovementioned ‘history wars’, this critical approach to history and to historical literacy was not celebrated in the mainstream press. Indeed, as politicians weighed in on the debates, and the mainstream media reported on them, it became increasingly apparent that politicians and journalists alike were not sensitive to historical literacy. Many favoured a view of history as an uncomplicated and uncontested series of facts about the past rather than an exercise in critical engagement.³⁸ We shift the concept of ‘historical literacy’ from the educational to the protest sphere in order to gauge the degree of historical literacy of key actors in the Women’s March organisation and those commenting on the marches, including the media.

The 2017 Women’s March on Washington and Historical Precedents

The Women’s March grew out of a traumatic moment for feminists across the US—the election to president of a man infamous for his misogyny. While arising out of trauma, feminist responses to this event and their

initial attempts at creating a feminist memory culture produced further trauma, this time among the diverse communities of feminists in the US. It was apparent that, in the movement's early communications, the organisers had not adopted an inclusive approach to citing historical precedents. This proved key to ensuring that the planned event would remain a highly emotional one. While never its stated intention, the new movement repeated past wrongs through its initial omission of people of colour and their histories and legacies.

In *The Cut*, a New York-based website devoted to women's issues, Rebecca Traister wrote that the Women's March had an 'impulsive', emotional beginning. It was sparked when 'a horrified and furious Hawaii woman named Teresa Shook invited 40 of her friends to march on Washington' on the day after the Trump's inauguration.³⁹ Brooklyn fashion designer Bob Bland also called on angry women via Facebook, and both mobilisations became aligned.⁴⁰ The apparently spontaneous movement was hampered by a constellation of problems including a lack of formal organising experience and logistical difficulties (resulting, for example, in delayed permits and prohibitive travel costs for some potential participants).⁴¹

The name given to the planned rally by the initial organisers sparked the first historical controversy. The organisers no doubt made the decision to name the upcoming march the Million Woman March to envision and engender a sense of powerful togetherness. This drew criticism, however, on the grounds that, at that stage, an all-White team of organisers had used the name of earlier, Black-led marches. This was 'especially galling', Traister wrote, because the March 'organizers were white and 53 percent of white women [who voted] had just voted for Donald Trump'.⁴² This was in contrast to an estimated 4 percent of Black women voters who voted for Trump.⁴³ In response to expressions of outrage, organisers were 'swift to self-correct' in terms of terminology and committee representation.⁴⁴ They changed the name to the Women's March on Washington and invited three women of colour, Linda Sarsour, Tamika Mallory and Carmen Perez, to be National Co-Chairs.⁴⁵ The messaging accompanying the protest also changed. As stated, organisers initially declared that the Women's March would 'send a bold message to our new administration on their first day in office, and to the world, that women's rights are human rights'.⁴⁶ By January 2017 the agenda had broadened to include immigration reform, health care reform, voting rights, reproductive rights, the environment, LGBTQ+ rights, racial equality, freedom of religion, workers' rights

and gun control. The aim, as championed by Sarsour, was to create an inclusive, wide-ranging movement that would ‘push feminism toward a transformational step’.⁴⁷

In response to criticism, organisers reflected on and changed their approach to the complex layers of gendered and racialised history that they were building on. While acknowledging these acts of self-correction and expansion, however, some feminists could not overcome the initial insensitivities. In January 2017, cultural critic and writer Jamilah Lemieux declared that she refused to put her body on the line and ‘feign solidarity’ with White women who had not had her back in the presidential elections just months before.⁴⁸ She had felt ‘a familiar sense of annoyance’ when she first heard the name given to the women’s protest (Million Woman March). ‘Once again’, Lemieux wrote, ‘the labors of Black folks (in this case, the 1995 Million Man March and the 1997 Million Woman March organized by Minister Louis Farrakhan and the Nation of Islam) were being co-opted and erased by clueless White ones’.⁴⁹ Here, perhaps, her selection of historical events was less in tune with her feminism given that, at the time, many Black feminists had denounced Farrakhan’s March ‘as an expression of the persistence of patriarchy in the Black community’, one reason for the founding of the 1997 Million Women March.⁵⁰

In the apparent absence of historical awareness on the part of the early organisers of the 2017 event, feminists of colour were compelled to critically engage with the past—to demonstrate their historical literacy—and to use this literacy to make crucial decisions about whether or not to join in with demonstrations against a public figure that the majority of them had actively opposed. Taylor Aldridge, co-founding Editor of *Arts.Black*, a journal of ‘art criticism from Black perspectives’, discussed the sense of unease that women of colour felt in relation to the Women’s March, invoking a racist and racialised history, that of the US suffrage movement:

I consider this [shared unease] reflective of a longer tension between Black civil rights movements and feminist movements primarily led by mostly White women. Members from the Suffrage movement in particular were explicit in prioritizing the rights of White women rather that [sic] for the greater human kind—and they were especially not interested in compromising their rights to protest for Black Americans...With this history, it’s challenging to be optimistic about this proposed intersection now.⁵¹

Certainly, Black suffragists in the past had condemned White women's racism. Frances Watkins Harper (1825–1911), for example, made her position clear in 1866 when she spoke of White women of America as a 'class of people who need to be lifted out of their airy nothings and selfishness'. She reiterated these claims at the 1869 meeting of the American Equal Rights Association, led by White suffragists Elizabeth Cady Stanton and Susan B. Anthony, in response to White suffragist Paulina Davis' (1813–1876) sexual stereotyping of African-American men as desiring to pursue helpless White women and White women as natural protectors of less fortunate Black women.⁵²

Notwithstanding disquiet about racism and the history of the US women's suffrage movement among women of colour, those marching in 2017 did make direct reference to the early twentieth century suffrage campaign. As the National Museum of American History (NMAH) shows, some protestors wore sashes bearing the words 'Still Marching/1848–1917', thereby linking the officially recognised beginning of the US women's rights movement with the current Women's March.⁵³ One of the signs that the museum has preserved depicts Inez Milholland (1886–1916), a lawyer and suffrage speaker who rode as the herald in a 1913 suffrage parade.⁵⁴ On its 2017 Women's March webpage, the NMAH declares: 'History Repeats Itself...In 1913, the day before Woodrow Wilson's [1856–1924] inauguration, suffragists had held a parade that clogged the streets of the capital. Marchers returned in 2018 and 2019.'⁵⁵ Had campaigners and curators been historically literate, in an environment that was already embroiled in discussions about racialised inclusions and exclusions, they may have been more sensitive in their selection of historical precedents to celebrate. Whereas the 1913 parade was evoked by some to demonstrate continuity between past and present women's rights protests, it was held up by others as evidence of White feminists' insensitivity to racialised positioning or of their outright bias. The controversy concerned claims that Black women had been forced to march at the back of the 1913 parade to appease the racist demands of White women from the South. The actual history of Black women's participation in 1913 is complex given that some women of colour, like Ida B. Wells-Barnett (1862–1931), ignored directives and marched with their state delegation.⁵⁶

In her explanation about why she refused to participate in the Women's March, Lemieux stated that she was tired of 'Black and Brown women routinely being tasked with fixing White folks' messes'.

Nevertheless, she followed this up by proffering a solution to some of the historical and racialised ‘messes’ that had arisen out of the recent women’s mobilisation:

I’d like to see a million White women march to the grave of Harriet Tubman [1820–1913], Sojourner Truth [1782–1883] or Audre Lorde [1934–1992], or perhaps to the campus of Spelman College to offer a formal apology to Black women. It’s time for White women to come together and tell the world how their crimes against Black women, Black men and Black children have been no less devastating than the ones committed by their male counterparts.⁵⁷

An accumulation of decisions, including the initial omission of women of colour from the organising committee, the use of a name previously used by Black activists, and evocations of historical movements and events deemed racist, compelled some feminists of colour to practise historical literacy and use this knowledge and skill to make decisions, such as whether or not to exclude themselves from mainstream feminist movements or to offer solutions that might help fix ‘White folks’ messes’ and lead to some form of historical restitution.

Reporting on the Historical Precedents and Controversies

The mainstream press and more conservative social and political papers in the US, it appears, did not want to engage with how feminists were feeding into or resisting the movement’s evolving memory culture. They tended to buy into and sensationalise controversies arising from the movement without exercising anything akin to historical literacy. Traister wrote that mainstream media reporting on the 2017 March was ‘so fretful that you’d be forgiven for thinking that this grass-roots demonstration of hundreds of thousands on behalf of women’s rights is an example of feminism in crisis and disarray’.⁵⁸ While not surprising for a conservative tabloid, the *New York Post* actively and unequivocally rejected any notion of taking history seriously or practising historical literacy on the issue of gender activism, while indulging in the idea of feminism in crisis. An editorial on 5 January 2017 deliberately demeaned the historical contentions that rose out of the movement, asserting that the ‘Women’s March on Washington is becoming a joke’: ‘It’s almost as if no one’s treating this thing seriously.’⁵⁹ The tabloid claimed that even the new name had ‘prompted grumbles

that it “appropriates” from the Dr. Martin Luther King Jr.-led (1955–1968) 1963 March on Washington’. Its advice? ‘Organizers’ dodge: Claim the whole thing is a tribute to King’⁶⁰ To avoid ‘grumbles’, the newspaper suggested inaccurately attributing the event to a historical moment and movement. It did so while exhibiting no sense of what the ramifications might be for those affected, including feminists of colour who had already articulated feelings of trauma over historical occlusions and misrepresentations.

Some press coverage presented a narrative of historical progress gone too far. The *New York Times* shone a spotlight on women for whom the Women’s March meant nothing. The lead image of a grandmother and granddaughter contained the caption: “‘Personally, I’d love to see our country go back to one parent working, like the good old days...I want to be able to quit my job.’”⁶¹ Entitled ‘In a Rust Belt Town, the Women’s March Draws Shrugs and Cheers from Afar’, the article documented more ‘shrugs’ than ‘cheers’.⁶² Other articles reduced the concerns of feminists like Jamilah Lemieux and Taylor Aldridge about repeated historical omissions and historical traumas as being about something other than history. In early January 2017, in ‘Why the Women’s March on Washington has Already Failed’ in the political journal *The Week*, self-professed ‘progressive libertarian’ Shikha Dalmia argued that ‘angry’ feminists had appropriated the initial outrage spurred by Trump’s election for their own ends, thereby ‘prematurely elevating the faux concerns of a hyper-active feminist lobby’.⁶³ She reduced the controversies to mere ‘bickering over semantics’.⁶⁴ A few weeks later, citing Dalmia, conservative *New York Times* columnist David Brooks said ‘identity politics’ were to blame: ‘Identity-based political movements always seem to descend into internal rivalries about who is most oppressed and who should get pride of place’, he wrote. ‘Sure enough, the controversy before and after the march was over the various roles of white feminists, women of color, anti-abortion feminists and various other out-groups.’⁶⁵

Like Lemieux, Brooks proffered a solution for all the unrest: ‘Counter Trump’s nationalism by offering a better nationalism’. He then declared that the March did not do this whereas Lin-Manuel Miranda’s popular musical ‘Hamilton’, which used actors of colour to tell the story of White ‘founding father’ Alexander Hamilton (1755 or 1757–1804), did.⁶⁶ It is interesting that Brooks would recommend that women should use the story of a national patriarch as a model for their movement, and that he should cite a theatrical performance rather than primary historical research.⁶⁷ Perhaps this is further indication of the lack

of significance he attached to the historical controversies arising from the Women's March. Lemieux's suggestion that White women pay homage to Black women's historic struggles and achievements through rallying around the graves of Tubman or Truth or Lorde at once appears a much more historically sensitive solution to the worries plaguing the US in 2017 than Brooks' championing of fiction or fantasy.

While the mainstream press belittled or ignored historical controversies, an array of online magazines showed more sensitivity to historical context. US-based digital media website *Refinery29*, like *Teen Vogue*, represents what we might describe in shorthand as 'feminism and fashion', 'celebrity and consumerism'.⁶⁸ It addresses young women in education and the workplace and combines interests in fashion, interior design and consumer items with reporting on feminism, gender equity, sexuality and intersectionality. In an article entitled 'Feminism's 1970s Flagship Faded from View—But In 2017 It's Back with a Vengeance', the author argued that, alongside the explosive Women's March movement, another 'subtler revolution' was taking place. In the wake of the Women's March, the National Organization for Women (NOW), a liberal feminist organisation founded in the 1960s, was now experiencing a boom in membership.⁶⁹ The article then turned to an historical precedent to the 2017 women's rally, a 1970 demonstration 'Women Strike for Peace and Equality' which took place in New York and other US cities, and which was spearheaded by NOW. *Refinery29* introduced its young readership to the 1970 March which had been held on the fiftieth anniversary of the granting of female suffrage in the US. Marchers had called for access to abortion, free childcare and equal opportunity in education and employment. This was before Title IX in 1972, which legislated for equality in education, before *Roe v. Wade* in 1973, which gave women greater access to abortion, and before the Equal Opportunity Commission recognised sexual harassment in 1980. There has been little progress on access to childcare since then, and the precedent of the *Roe v. Wade* decision is now under threat (as discussed below).⁷⁰

In contrast to the beginnings of the Women's March, the 1970 march has been noted for its inclusivity, but in the language of the time:

Limping octogenarians, braless teenagers, Black Panther women, telephone operators, waitresses, Westchester matrons, fashion models, Puerto Rican factory workers, nurses in uniform, young mothers carrying babies on their backs.⁷¹

NOW founder Betty Freidan (1921–2006) and US House Member Bella Abzug (1920–1998) were joined by a diverse range of speakers, including a speaker from the revolutionary socialist Third Women’s Alliance. The marchers included former suffragist, artist and author Kate Millett (1934–2017), and Gloria Steinem, who has also been a prominent figure in the twenty-first century marches. There were also smaller marches in around 40 other cities.⁷²

It was reported in a 2015 article that, in the 1970 rally, one woman had stopped marching and stood outside a peep show in Times Square with a placard demanding that a statue of Susan B. Anthony be erected on that spot at the corner of Broadway and 46th Streets.⁷³ A contemporaneous article, however, reported that:

A dozen women showed up for a ceremony to ‘consecrate’ a site at Duffy Square on Broadway from 46th to 47th Street, for a statue of Susan B. Anthony, the ‘mother of the movement.’

The ceremony was presided over by Ms. Mary Orovan, dressed in cassock and surplice as a ‘symbolic priest.’ As she made the sign of the cross, she intoned: ‘In the name of the Mother, the Daughter and the Holy Granddaughter. Ah-wo men. Ah-women.’⁷⁴

It was not until fifty years later that a statue of Susan B. Anthony, Elizabeth Cady Stanton and Sojourner Truth (1797–1883) was erected in Central Park.⁷⁵ The different versions of this incident highlight the need for historical literacy, the need to go back to primary sources rather than simply referring to the most recent media reporting.

In reporting on earlier women’s marches and the long history of activism by such organisations as the National Organisation for Women, *Refinery29* noted the intersecting layers of history and activism. It acknowledged that the Women’s March built on past gender rights rallies and drew attention to the ways in which the current movement had helped to revive interest and promote participation in some co-existing but more longstanding women’s organisations.

As the *Refinery29* article demonstrated, current women's activism builds on past activism, but the degree to which this is known and acknowledged is uneven. Ann Snitow informs us that, '[h]istory may tell us that women have been present as key players in any number of movements. Documents exist; first-hand accounts list their names. But collective memory of these movements is quite a different matter.'⁷⁶ Her explanation for this omission is that women are 'rarely in charge of the story or in a position to insist on their centrality to the remembered significance of events. They have stories of course, but these are not often enough rehearsed, not inscribed on stones.'⁷⁷ A historically literate approach to the intersectional debates that broke out over the Women's March movement might have acknowledged recurring debates about the relationship between different feminisms. The debates prompted by the Women's Marches echoed discussions which had been carried out for decades. Well before the coining of the term intersectionality, African-American women, Latinas, Native American women, and other women of colour had challenged what they saw as a White-dominated feminist movement. They produced such classic texts as the Cohambee River Collective Statement of April 1977, *This Bridge Called My Back: Writings by Women of Color* in 1981, and *All the Women are White, All the Blacks are Men, but Some of Us are Brave* in 1982.⁷⁸

As Angela McRobbie has argued, there has long been a problem with ensuring the intergenerational transmission of feminist knowledge; transferring testimonies, texts and material culture to successive generations.⁷⁹ Publicly, histories of women's struggles and feminist achievements have long been 'caricatured and trivialised, if not forgotten'.⁸⁰ Funding to preserve women's histories and interested and appropriate repositories have been lacking.⁸¹ Despite past activists' labours to collect, collate and preserve records of their movements and write their histories, these materials have not always been readily available to inspire future generations of feminists.⁸² Without an easy transfer of knowledge about past feminisms, each generation of activists seems doomed to revisit the debates of earlier generations, as we have seen in the intersectional controversies in 2017. This is why it is important to put these political struggles and debates on the record, and find avenues for making them readily available, for the reference of future generations.⁸³

The Women's March on Washington was barely over before the activists and archivists started the process of documenting the event through oral histories, online archives, books and repositories of material

culture.⁸⁴ They created physical holdings, new digital archives (born-digital resources) and digitised analog items (such as photographing marching memorabilia).⁸⁵ The rapid and increasing digitisation of cultural heritage globally has played a key role in ensuring the preservation and accessibility of knowledge about Women's March history in the US as elsewhere.⁸⁶ In the lead up to the 2017 March members of the Society of American Archivists' Women Archivists' Section issued a statement declaring that they intended to immediately start to preserve the history of the event through establishing an aggregate digital platform.⁸⁷ Women's March organisers and marchers worked with other institutions and organisations to create digital and physical repositories to record the history of the 2017 event, including documentary film-makers and the Smithsonian's National Museum of American History.⁸⁸ Online magazines, including *Teen Vogue* and *Refinery29*, made textual and visual records of events.⁸⁹ In January 2018, just before the first anniversary, a book of oral histories and photographs was released.⁹⁰ If comprehensive and detailed histories of the contributions of diverse groups of feminists were not readily available to women marchers to draw on in 2017, then the plan was that such resources would be preserved to provide impetus for future inclusive and historically literate political campaigns.

While helping to ensure the intergenerational transmission of layers of feminist histories—those of current activism building on past protests—the emergence of new digital platforms has meant that the collective identity of Women's March activists has continually and readily been honed. Group members are linked by an evolving memory culture. Social movement organisers now mobilise support and circulate protest materials, including selected memories of past campaigns, with speed and relative ease through new media ecologies or technological environments which allow for the formation of political and social relations and meaning.⁹¹ One way that the Women's March has ensured this is through continual communications. Once the planning for the first March commenced it was possible to sign up for regular e-mail bulletins. The e-mails soon diversified and arrived in in-boxes on a daily basis. With the expansion and diversification of the movement, it now accommodated two separate bodies: Women's March Foundation which focused on 'social justice and civic engagement on a national level', and Women's March Action which championed 'nonpartisan education, civic engagement and advocacy on important issues affecting women'.⁹² E-mails regularly solicited donations for Women's March activities and for the campaigns of progressive political candidates, as well as circulating petitions on specific issues. Members were mobilised

using a style of language which mirrored that used in youth-oriented publications like *Refinery29* and *Teen Vogue*. Subject headings announced the urgency of participating in the expanding and diversifying the movement with phrases like: ‘This is it’, ‘Our training is in less than one week’, ‘Yes! Yes! Yes!’, ‘Bumping to the top of your inbox’, ‘Women are watching’, ‘We’re crushing on this feminist gear’. Women’s March is also active on Twitter, Facebook, Youtube, Instagram and TikTok. The organisation has also used its social media site to advertise its evolving history and branding, such as using the movement’s fifth anniversary to display a brief commemorative video of its historical highlights and reveal its new logo.⁹³

Creating New Historical Traditions

The Women’s March movement has continued to build on complex layers of the history of women’s diverse activism. It now draws on the expanding history of its *own* movement, created and archived year after year. At the same time, it creates new traditions that are enacted in subsequent rallies, thereby constructing an ever-growing archive of protest practices and histories. These are available for future generations to reference and enact.

Take, for example, the ‘pussy hats’. The physical and embodied manifestations of the protest remain through the yearly performance of marching, but also through recurring motifs such as the pink handknitted ‘pussy hats’. Photographs of the 2017 March show a ‘sea of pink’ as masses of protestors marched wearing pussy hats. Jayna Zweiman and Krista Suh have been credited with leading the pussy hat project and the pussy hat pattern was created by Kat Coyle.⁹⁴ They protested the crude and potentially trauma-inducing sexism of their new president who said that he liked to grab women by the ‘pussy’, referring to women’s genitalia. The association of the word was recalibrated by the pink handknitted hats, which had a feeling of cuteness rather than the vulgarity of Trump’s use of the term. Handknitting the pussy hats was an embodied practice which forged a sense of solidarity among the supporters of the March, thereby fulfilling organisers’ affective aims. Wearing the pussy hats forged solidarity among the marchers, in the same way as wearing t-shirts with political slogans, carrying placards, marching together and singing or chanting slogans. Wearing

the hats in subsequent marches has served to re-create the affective bonds forged in the original rally; to demonstrate ongoing solidarity and unity of values. In line with curatorial and archiving practices initiated at the onset of the movement, the hats themselves have become a historical artifact, included in the collections of the Victoria and Albert and other museums, and their image preserved online via digitised collections.⁹⁵ Whether on display on marchers' bodies or in online and onsite memory institutions, the pussy hats exemplify a new historical tradition created and ritualised by women marching.

As stated, each march subsequent to the original 2017 event acts as a commemoration of that event. Yet, as organisers know, history marches on. Environments and priorities change. People face different or new challenges and are presented with new opportunities. To maintain their relevance, each year's March since 2017 has been afforded a distinctive theme. In 2019, it was 'Women's March, Women's Agenda'. In 2020, it was 'Women Rising' and a 'Week of Action'.⁹⁶ In the second March in January 2018, the theme was 'Power to the Polls'. Many of the marchers wore pussy hats, and one placard played on the reference to Trump's vulgarity, proclaiming 'GRAB 'EM BY THE MIDTERMS', referring to the 2018 mid-term elections. The focus of Marching On in 2018 was to encourage voter registration and support for feminist candidates and other progressive candidates in those mid-term elections. Organisers announced a goal of getting one million people to vote.⁹⁷ In support, unsuccessful 2016 presidential candidate Hillary Clinton tweeted:

In 2017, the Women's March was a beacon of hope and defiance. In 2018, it is a testament to the power and resilience of women everywhere. Let's show that same power in the voting booth this year
#PowerToThePolls

House Speaker Nancy Pelosi and Democratic Senator Kirsten Gillibrand addressed the Washington Women's March that year. 'If you are about winning back the House, flipping the Senate, then I urge you to support Democratic candidates across the country', said Gillibrand. Co-Chair of the Women's March, Linda Sarsour, told the *Guardian*: 'We started 2017 with perpetual outrage and now we are at a moment when we have perpetual outrage plus a plan for 2018'.⁹⁸

An ongoing history of collective outrage, this time with a plan, worked as a record number of female candidates was elected in 2018. Women candidates broke records for the number of candidates for governor, US House of Representatives and US Senate. Landmarks included the first Muslim woman and the first two Native American women elected to Congress.⁹⁹ When the new female members attended Trump's State of the Union Address in January 2019, they made a visual statement by wearing white clothes, in contrast to the sombre suits of their male colleagues. The white clothes invoked the history of the use of white clothes by the suffragists, and the wearing of white suits at strategic moments by Shirley Chisholm (1924–2005), the first African-American woman elected to the US Congress and the first African American woman to run for nomination as a Presidential candidate, Geraldine Ferraro (1935–2011), who ran for Vice-President alongside Walter Mondale, and Hillary Clinton, who wore a white suit to accept the Democratic Party's nomination as Presidential candidate.¹⁰⁰ As *Teen Vogue* stated: 'Historically, color in dress is draped in serious meaning, and this is especially true when it's used by marginalized groups.'¹⁰¹ Acknowledging that past feminists had donned white worked to demonstrate historical literacy, an understanding that fashion and colour historically played a part in feminist activism and achievement.

In 2022, the Women's Marches were overshadowed by the ongoing pandemic and the anniversary of the 6 January Capitol Uprising which had seemed to strike at the very heart of democracy in the US.¹⁰² As we discuss below, 2021 and 2022 were taken up with the fight to retain reproductive rights.¹⁰³ These campaigns necessarily referenced history as it was the historic *Roe v. Wade* decision of half a century before which was under threat.

'We will not go back': Rallying for Reproductive Rights

All of this is not to say that the Women's March movement approaches history as a progressive and linear matter. It has worked to improve access to women's history through making its archives accessible and visible. Still, in 2021, along with other feminist bodies, it was compelled to confront and address the continued onslaught on historic feminist gains. The freedom to access abortion is key. While activists built

on past campaigns for reproductive rights, by the beginning of the 2020s, they found themselves mobilising to defend against the erosion of those rights.

In 2017, when *Refinery29* was remembering the 1970 ‘Women Strike for Peace and Equality’ and celebrating the infusion of energy into the National Organization for Women (NOW), it commented that that strike had taken place half a century ago:

We no longer live in the same world that Friedan was fighting... We have *Roe v. Wade*, which guarantees women the right to have an abortion (though with many caveats). Our culture has changed from a place where feminists are reviled to one where public figures who don’t personally identify with the word are considered regressive—it just means women are equal to men, after all.¹⁰⁴

In 2021 and 2022, though, the Women’s March had to campaign against challenges to the the *Roe v. Wade* decision, first in Texas and then in Mississippi, Florida and several other states.¹⁰⁵

In 1973, the US Supreme Court brought down a decision in the case of *Roe v. Wade*. This decision ruled that the Constitution of the United States protects a pregnant woman’s liberty to choose to have an abortion without excessive government restriction. The majority decision in *Roe v. Wade* was carried by seven to two judges. This led to the repeal of many federal and state abortion laws—the situation is thus made more complex by the US federal system of government. Since 1973, the right to abortion has been a contentious issue in US politics, often used as a litmus test when candidates are enjoined to state their support for the so-called ‘pro-choice’ or ‘pro-life’ positions, and also used in evaluating candidates for the Supreme Court and lower courts.¹⁰⁶ The right that guarantees access to abortion is also unstable. There have been regular challenges to the *Roe v. Wade* decision, notably in the years 1988 to 1991, and now more recently in in 2021 and 2022. Recent challenges to *Roe v. Wade* have involved placing ever tighter time restrictions on access to abortion.¹⁰⁷

In October 2021, in response to the challenges to women’s reproductive control, Women’s March activists staged demonstrations in 650 locations, in cities and in rural areas, in all 50 US states. In February 2022, the organisation named its fundraising campaign, the ‘1973’ campaign, after the year in which the

initial *Roe v. Wade* judgment had been handed down in Texas. It asked supporters to donate \$19.73, or whatever they could afford.¹⁰⁸ This was captured in a Women's March e-mail:

[O]n January 22, 1973, the right to an abortion became the law of the land under landmark Supreme Court decision *Roe v. Wade*.

So much has changed since the year 1973—and women have fought and won so much progress. Now, in the face of the most dire threats to our reproductive freedom in decades, we must say louder and clearer than ever: We won't go back.

Right now, *Roe v. Wade* is under direct attack from all sides. Donald Trump's stolen Supreme Court threatens our reproductive rights on the federal level, while anti-woman GOP [Republican] state legislators pass law after law rolling back our rights to safe, legal, and accessible abortions—despite the fact that a majority of Americans believe that abortion should remain legal. **That is why today, Women's March is launching our 1973 Fund to fund our work to defend abortion rights across the nation.** [Bolt font in original.]

Will you donate \$19.73, or anything you can, to Women's March's urgent 1973 Fund to defend abortion? ...

In May 2022, a draft opinion from a Supreme Court judge in the case of *Thomas E. Dobbs, State Health Officer of the Mississippi Department of Health et al. Petitioners v. Jackson Women's Health Organization et al.* was leaked to the press. This suggested that the court—now with a majority of conservative members—was about to strike down the *Roe v. Wade* judgment.¹⁰⁹ This led to national mobilisation on the part of Women's March Inc. and other progressive organisations. On 14 May 2022, marches in support of reproductive freedom were held across the US. There were more than 380 protest events, including those in major cities like Washington DC, New York City, Los Angeles and Chicago. Marchers held placards bearing slogans like 'Bans off our bodies' or 'We will not go back' and chanted the classic slogan 'My body, my choice'. Speakers at the rallies told their experiences of illegal abortions in the days before *Roe v. Wade*, half a century before.¹¹⁰ Many commentators fear that if *Roe v. Wade* is overturned, this could lead to

other threats to personal freedom.¹¹¹ Women's March Inc. declared this to be the beginning of a campaign called 'The Summer of Rage', leading up to a Women's Convention planned for Houston in August 2022.¹¹² A *Vanity Fair* article emphasised the affective dimension of the 'the summer of rage' in its headline 'At "Bans off our Bodies Rallies, Abortion Rights Supporters Express Anger, Defiance and Unity'.¹¹³ At the time that this article went to press in June 2022, the Supreme Court had just announced its decision in the case of *Dobbs v. Jackson Women's Health Organization*. As feared, this removed the protection previously afforded to women who chose to undergo an abortion, and meant that individual states could legislate on abortion. Women immediately mobilised, with demonstrations taking place throughout the country.¹¹⁴

In the *Refinery29* article discussed above, a liberal feminist progressive view of history was presented. The *Roe v. Wade* decision was framed as somehow assured. In *Marching On* communications, however, the tone was much less celebratory. There had already been multiple attacks on the right to abortion, and this recent series of challenges represented 'the most dire threats to our reproductive freedom in decades'. The organisation demonstrated a sensitivity to the ability of history to be rewritten by those in power and for historic moments to be erased or reversed by regressive political decision-making in the present. Emotions were clearly present. In 2018, Co-Chair of the Women's March, Linda Sarsour, told the press that the movement had begun in 2017 with 'perpetual outrage', adding that one year later this had evolved to 'perpetual outrage plus a plan'.¹¹⁵ In 2022, outrage with a plan had become a program of rage. Demonstrating indignantly against what was envisioned as an anti-feminist future under Trump had morphed into mass coordinated anger as past gains seemed set to be overturned or reset. Over the current lifetime of the Women's March, the potential for hostile futures and lost pasts has produced a developing memory culture. Contemporary campaigns reference an ever-changing blend of historical narratives, historical controversies and emotional milieux.

Concluding Thoughts

In this article, we have analysed the complex relationship between history, memory and activism in the Women's Marches. In the five years since 2017, the Women's March organisation and movement have

adopted a reflexive approach to the past. The intersectional controversies which erupted at the outset of the campaign impelled organisers and activists, as well as some commentators, to consider the importance of the role of history in activism. Organisers responded to calls to reassess their historical literacy and demonstrated their historical awareness in each successive campaign conducted under their auspices. A growing body of multi-disciplinary scholars believe that the right emotional mix, cultivated by organisers and activists, can motivate or sustain political movements, whereas the wrong one can bring about their demise. Some also state that evoking certain historical moments can help bring about some of those desired activist emotions.

Many memory theorists assert that, within memory cultures, representations of the past are more about what these pasts might mean for the groups cultivating them in the present than about presenting an accurate account of historical events, movements or organisations. While we do not dispute the point about the ways that groups cultivate the meanings which are important to them in the present, we argue that the exercise of historical literacy means that this can be compatible with historical accuracy and fidelity. Our research into the five-year history of the Women's March has confirmed for us that the selection of historical moments and movements and organisers' interpretations or articulated understandings of these can be crucial when attempting to construct a workable group identity. Recalling histories of suffrage struggles and successes helped to instil pride and solidarity among women in the movement. This is borne out by the historical references on signs and placards in the marches, especially the 2017 March. However, citing a past movement which had been criticised for its racialised character also helped to induce feelings of anger, thus threatening to fracture the movement from its inception. Deploying historical literacy when constructing a group's memory culture, therefore, is one way of developing an emotional milieu aimed at facilitating a movement's success.

The Women's March grew out of a traumatic moment for feminists across the US. Organisers' initial attempts to create a collective memory produced further trauma, this time among the diverse communities of feminisms. The movement revised their approach to the complexities of history but not all sections of society were equally keen to embrace or develop historical literacy. Whereas some media commentators celebrated recent marches' connections with historic forms of activism like women's liberation or

suffragism, others represented these debates as squabbles over mixed-up terminology or identity politics. Non-mainstream media also played a significant role in enabling feminists who felt excluded to voice their objections and demonstrate their historical literacy. It was these angry and often frustrated protests which compelled the Women's March to confront its approach to building group dynamics, including emotion and memory.

At the same time that the movement *referenced* history, it also *made* history, and *recorded* and *archived* that history. Indeed, continually affirming for members that they were making history was an important strategy for building pride and solidarity. The Women's March was a living, evolving movement that was creating change. They cited their own evolving history while referencing distant pasts. Their growing archive, communicated and made readily accessible via digital platforms, has been instrumental in addressing a fragile tradition of trying to transmit knowledge of women's activism through successive generations.¹¹⁶ It should be remembered, however, that while the movement does try to ensure that women's history is recorded and made available, often it is a corrected version of feminist history, one which has erased signs of contention from its website (as seen via its revised 'Mission', for example). Still, with attention to other sources such as published observations about and responses to dissent, this growing archive helps to ensure that activists and others can be historically literate about feminist politics in a way that might not have been possible for their predecessors.

¹ Suzanne Moore, 'Why did women vote for Trump? Because misogyny is not a male-only attribute', *The Guardian*, November 17, 2016, <https://www.theguardian.com/lifeandstyle/commentisfree/2016/nov/16/why-did-women-vote-for-trump-because-misogyny-is-not-a-male-only-attribute> (accessed May 13, 2022).

² Mark Setzler and Alixandra B. Yanus, 'Why did women vote for Donald Trump?', *PS: Political Science & Politics* 51, no. 3 (2018): 523–527, 523.

³ Clare Foran, 'Women Aren't Responsible for Hillary Clinton's Defeat', *Atlantic*, November 13, 2016, <https://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2016/11/hillary-clinton-white-women-vote/507422/> (accessed April 15, 2017). Exit polls also indicate that 63% of White men who voted supported Trump and that, overall, Trump received 8% of the Black vote and 29% of the Latino vote. Cited in Jon Henley, 'White and

wealthy voters gave victory to Donald Trump, exit polls show’, *The Guardian*, November 10, 2016, <https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2016/nov/09/white-voters-victory-donald-trump-exit-polls> (accessed May 15, 2022). It needs to be remembered that voting is not compulsory in the USA, so these percentages refer to those who actually voted.

⁴ Setzler and Yanus, ‘Why did women vote for Donald Trump?’, 526.

⁵ Moore, ‘Why did women vote for Trump?’

⁶ Sophie Tatum, ‘Women’s March on Washington: What you Need to Know’, *CNN*, January 16, 2017, <http://edition.cnn.com/2017/01/16/politics/womens-march-on-washington-need-to-know/index.html> (accessed October 28, 2017). The slogan ‘Women’s Rights are Human Rights’ was used by feminists in the 1980s and 1990s, particularly in the lead-up to the United Nations World Conference on Human Rights, held in Vienna in 1993. The phrase was used by (then ‘First Lady’ of the United States) Hillary Clinton in a speech at the Fourth World Conference on Women in Beijing in 1995. The slogan became a feature of Clinton’s 2016 Presidential campaign, which sold T-shirts and other merchandise bearing the words ‘women’s rights are human rights’. (Links to shop.hillaryclinton.com are no longer active.) For the history of the phrase ‘Women’s Rights are Human Rights’, see Sharon Crozier-De Rosa and Vera Mackie, ‘Who was Jane Walker? Remembering Women’s Activism’, *VIDA*, June 2019, <http://www.auswhn.org.au/blog/jane-walker/#:~:text=But%20who%20is%20Jane%20Walker,Month%20in%20the%20United%20States> (accessed February 8, 2022).

⁷ Carolyn Kitch, ‘“A living archive of modern protest”: Memory-making in the Women’s March’, *Popular Communication*, 16, no. 2 (2018): 119–127, 119.

⁸ Dana Milbank, ‘My Favorite Signs at the Women’s March on Washington’, *The Washington Post*, January 21, 2017, https://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/post-partisan/wp/2017/01/21/my-favorite-signs-at-the-womens-march-on-washington/?utm_term=.dcac1933e80f (accessed April 15, 2017).

⁹ See, for example, the photograph of activist Kristina Graves holding a protest sign at the Women’s March on Washington which quoted Elizabeth Cady Stanton. ‘Kristina Graves holding Elizabeth Cady Stanton quote protest sign, Women’s March on Washington, 2017-01-21’, W148_GravesK_052, Women’s March on Washington Collection, Archives for Research on Women and Gender, Special Collections and Archives, Georgia State University, <https://digitalcollections.library.gsu.edu/digital/collection/marches/id/304> (accessed May 13, 2022).

¹⁰ Representatives of the Susan B Anthony Birthplace Museum in Adams, Massachusetts, decided not to participate in the march because of what they saw as co-option of suffragists’ for causes they would not have supported like abortion: ‘History, particularly American history, is not always conveniently in sync with today’s popular views and culture. Neither should the suffragist movement be co-opted into joining a cause that they universally condemned.’ See Carol Crossed and Eric Anthony, ‘Susan B. Anthony would never have joined the Women’s March on Washington’, *The Washington Post*, January 18, 2018, <https://www.washingtonpost.com/posteverything/wp/2017/01/18/susan-b-anthony-would-never-have-joined-the-womens-march-on-washington/> (accessed May 13, 2022). Anthony’s perceived views about abortion are contested. The anti-abortion advocacy group, the Susan B. Anthony List (established in 1992), asserts that it is named ‘after the influential suffragette who also fiercely opposed abortion’. ‘About Susan B. Anthony List’, Susan B. Anthony List, <https://www.sba-list.org/about-susan-b-anthony-list> (accessed January 10, 2022). Journalist Lynn Sherr and Rutgers University professor emerita Ann D. Gordon have denied Anthony’s association with the pro-life movement, contending that she did not take a stand on the issue at all. Lynn Sherr and Ann D. Gordon, ‘No, Susan B. Anthony and Elizabeth Cady Stanton Were Not Antiabortionists’, *Time*, November 10, 2015.

¹¹ See, for example, Jamilah Lemieux, ‘Why I’m Skipping the Women’s March on Washington’, *Colorlines*, January 17, 2017, <https://www.colorlines.com/articles/why-im-skipping-womens-march-washington-op-ed> (accessed August 24, 2021).

¹² Women’s March Inc Annual Report 2017, Return of Organization Exempt From Income Tax Form 990, and Women’s March Inc Annual Report 2019, Return of Organization Exempt From Income Tax Form 990, <https://www.womensmarch.com/annual-report> (accessed March 10, 2022). The term ‘intersectionality’ here refers to a term coined by Kimberlé Crenshaw to denote that women’s identities are positioned in the intersections of different categories—including racialised positioning, ethnicity, class, sexual identity, descent from colonisers or colonised, indigeneity, migrancy—and these intersectional dynamics may change according to situation and across time. See Kimberlé Crenshaw, ‘Demarginalizing the Intersection of Race

and Sex: A Black Feminist Critique of Antidiscrimination Doctrine, Feminist Theory and Antiracist Politics', *The University of Chicago Legal Forum*, 140 (1989): 139–167.

¹³ Women's March, <https://www.womensmarch.com/> (accessed February 25, 2022).

¹⁴ 'Our History', Women's March, <https://www.womensmarch.com/> (accessed March 10, 2022).

¹⁵ Jessica Gantt-Shafer, Cara Wallis and Caitlin Miles, 'Intersectionality, (Dis)unity, and Processes of Becoming at the 2017 Women's March', *Women's Studies in Communication* 42, no. 2 (2019): 221–240, 221.

¹⁶ Sierra Brewer and Lauren Dundes, 'Concerned, meet terrified: Intersectional feminism and the Women's March', *Women's Studies International Forum* 69 (2018): 49–55.

¹⁷ Kirsten M. Weber, Tisha Dejmancee, and Flemming Rhode, 'The 2017 Women's March on Washington: An Analysis of Protest-Sign Messages', *International Journal of Communication* 12 (2018): 2289–2313.

¹⁸ Chiara De Cesari and Ann Rigney, 'Introduction', in *Transnational Memory: Circulation, Articulation, Scales*, ed. Chiara De Cesari and Ann Rigney (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2014), 1–25, 8–9.

¹⁹ Guy Beiner, *Forgetful Remembrance: Social Forgetting and Vernacular Historiography of a Rebellion in Ulster* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018), 23.

²⁰ De Cesari and Rigney, 'Introduction', 8. For a more detailed discussion of mediation and remediation see Astrid Erll and Ann Rigney, 'Introduction: Cultural Memory and its Dynamics' in *Mediation, Remediation, and the Dynamics of Cultural Memory*, ed. Astrid Erll and Ann Rigney (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2009), 1–14.

²¹ De Cesari and Rigney, 'Introduction', 9. Astrid Erll explains that this continual process of regeneration is possible because memory is always 'travelling'. She means this to involve movements across territorial and social boundaries but, on a more fundamental level, she also means 'the ongoing exchange of information between individuals and minds and media'. See Astrid Erll, 'Travelling Memory', *Parallax* 17, no.4 (2011): 4–18, 12.

²² Ann Snitow, 'Refugees from Utopia: Remembering, Forgetting and the Making of The Feminist Memoir Project', in *Memory and the Future Transnational Politics, Ethics and Society*, ed. Yifat Gutman, Adam D. Brown and Amy Sodaro (Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010), 141–157, 145.

²³ Emily Keightley, 'Remembering Research: Memory and methodology in the social sciences', *International Journal of Social Research Methodology* 13, no. 1 (2010): 55–70; and, Red Chidgey, *Feminist Afterlives: Assemblage Memory in Activist Times* (Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 2018), 47.

²⁴ Sarah Ferber, *Bioethics in Historical Perspective* (Houndmills Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013), 7.

²⁵ Ferber, *Bioethics in Historical Perspective*, 7.

²⁶ De Cesari and Rigney, 'Introduction', 8–9.

²⁷ Yifat Gutman, Amy Sodaro and Adam D. Brown, 'Introduction: Memory and the Future: Why a Change of Focus is Necessary', in *Memory and the Future: Transnational Politics, Ethics and Society*, ed. Yifat Gutman Adam D. Brown and Amy Sodaro (Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010), 1–11.

²⁸ Chidgey, *Feminist Afterlives*, 52.

²⁹ Deborah Gould, 'Concluding Thoughts', *Contemporary European History* 23, no. 4 (2014): 639–44, 643. See also James Jasper, *The Emotions of Protest* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2018); and, Helena Flam and Debra King, 'Introduction', in *Emotions and Social Movements*, ed. Helena Flam and Debra King (London: Routledge, 2005), 1–18.

³⁰ Deborah Gould, 'Life During Wartime: Emotions and The Development of Act Up', *Mobilization: An International Quarterly* 7, no. 2 (2002): 177–200, 177. For examples of recent histories of emotions in politics, see Sharon Crozier-De Rosa, 'Emotions of Protest', in *Sources for the History of Emotions: A Guide*, ed. Katie Barclay, Sharon Crozier-De Rosa and Peter N. Stearns (London: Routledge, 2020), 198–211.

³¹ Sharon Crozier-De Rosa, 'Anger, Resentment and the Limits of Historical Narratives in Protest Politics: The Case of Early Twentieth Century Irish Women's Intersectional Movements', *Emotions: History, Cultural, Society* 5 (2021): 68–86. Ana Stevenson, 'From Suffragist to Congresswoman: Celebrating political action, women's history, and feminist intellectuals in *Ms. Magazine*, 1972–1984', in *Suffrage at 100: Women in American Politics since 1920*, ed. Stacie Taranto and Leandra Zarnow (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2020), 201–218.

³² Taylor and Young discuss the origins and changing meaning of the term ‘historical literacy’ in Tony Taylor and Carmel Young, *Making History: A Guide for the Teaching and Learning of History in Australian Schools* (Canberra: Department of Education, Science and Training, 2003), 31–32.

³³ In the US in the 1990s, controversy erupted over a planned exhibition at the Smithsonian Institution in Washington DC which invited visitors to question the morality of the US’s decision to drop the atomic bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki in 1945. Such a positioning drew the ire of many, including military veterans, and sparked nationwide debate. In Australia, the ‘history wars’ were similarly sparked by histories of violence, this time centred on massacres of indigenous people on the frontiers of settlement in the early nineteenth century. Meanwhile, much of East Asia was rent by debates over the interpretation of the actions of the Japanese Imperial Army and Navy in the Asia-Pacific War. Stuart Macintyre, ‘The History Wars’, *The Sydney Papers* (2003): 77–83, <http://www.kooriweb.org/foley/resources/pdfs/198.pdf>; Ann Curthoys and John Docker, *Is History Fiction?* (Kensington: UNSW Press, 2006), 220–237; and Vera Mackie, ‘In Search of Innocence: Feminists Debate the Legacy of Wartime Japan’, *Australian Feminist Studies* 20, no. 47 (2005): 207–217.

³⁴ Anna Clark, ‘The challenge of teaching Australian history’ in *Australia Under Construction. Nation-building – past, present and future*, ed. John Butcher (Canberra: ANU Press, 2008), 33–48, 34. In 2006, amid Australia’s ‘history wars’, then Australian prime minister, John Howard, elaborated that not teaching history was to miss out on a vital step in the preparation of young people ‘to be informed and active citizens’. See John Howard, ‘Prime Minister John Howard’s address to the National Press Club on 25 January, 2006’, <http://theage.com.au/news/national/pms-speech/2006/01/25/1138066849045.html?page=fullpage#contentSwap1> (accessed February 24, 2021).

³⁵ Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: The Origins and Spread of Nationalism* (London: Verso, 1986).

³⁶ Clark, ‘The challenge of teaching Australian history’, 35.

³⁷ Charlotte Lydia Riley, ‘Don’t worry about “rewriting history”: It’s literally what we historians do’, *The Guardian*, June 11, 2020, <https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2020/jun/10/rewriting-history-historians-statue-past> (accessed February 18, 2022).

³⁸ For examples of how the mainstream press approached the History Wars, see Macintyre, ‘The History Wars’, 77–83.

³⁹ Rebecca Traister, ‘The Complicated, Controversial, Historic, Inspiring Women’s March’, *The Cut*, January 20, 2017, <https://www.thecut.com/2017/01/the-complicated-controversial-inspiring-womens-march.html> (accessed September 27, 2021).

⁴⁰ Malika Michaud, ‘Black Women Conflicted Over Women’s March’, *Jet*, January 20, 2017, <https://www.jetmag.com/news/womens-march-black-women/> (accessed September 27, 2021).

⁴¹ Jia Tolentino, ‘The Somehow Controversial Women’s March on Washington’, *The New Yorker*, January 18, 2017, <https://www.newyorker.com/culture/jia-tolentino/the-somehow-controversial-womens-march-on-washington> (accessed August 24, 2021).

⁴² Traister, ‘The Complicated, Controversial, Historic, Inspiring Women’s March’.

⁴³ Election 2016 Exit Polls, US Politics, CNN, <https://edition.cnn.com/election/2016/results/exit-polls> (accessed January 4, 2022).

⁴⁴ Traister, ‘The Complicated, Controversial, Historic, Inspiring Women’s March’.

⁴⁵ Mallory worked closely with the Obama Administration as an advocate for, among other things, civil rights issues and served as a national organiser for the 50th Anniversary of the March on Washington. Perez is a respected expert in the fields of juvenile and criminal justice and dedicated the past twenty years to advocating for civil rights issues including gender equality, violence prevention, racial healing and community policing. Sarsour is described as an award-winning, Brooklyn-born Palestinian-American-Muslim racial justice and civil rights activist, community organizer, social media maverick, and mother of three. Women’s March on Washington, ‘National Co-Chairs’, <https://www.womensmarch.com/team/> (accessed April 15, 2017).

⁴⁶ Tatum, ‘Women’s March on Washington: What you Need to Know’.

⁴⁷ Quoted and cited in Traister, ‘The Complicated, Controversial, Historic, Inspiring Women’s March’.

⁴⁸ Jamilah Lemieux, ‘Why I’m Skipping the Women’s March on Washington’, *Colorlines*, January 17, 2017, <https://www.colorlines.com/articles/why-im-skipping-womens-march-washington-op-ed> (accessed August 24, 2021).

⁴⁹ Lemieux, ‘Why I’m Skipping the Women’s March on Washington’.

-
- ⁵⁰ Charles Green and Basil Wilson, 'Marches on Washington and the Black Protest Movement', *Journal of Ethnic & Cultural Diversity in Social Work* 16, no. 3-4 (2007): 199–212, 200.
- ⁵¹ Quoted in Michaud, 'Black Women Conflicted Over Women's March'.
- ⁵² Frances Watkins Harper, 'We Are All Bound Up Together', quoted in C. C. O'Brien, "'The White Women All Go for Sex'": Frances Harper on Suffrage, Citizenship, and the Reconstruction South', *African American Review* 43, no. 4 (2009): 605–606.
- ⁵³ 'Women's March sash, 2017', National Museum of American History, https://americanhistory.si.edu/collections/search/object/nmah_1943486 (accessed January 4, 2022). The year 1848 refers to the Seneca Falls Convention where the issue of women's suffrage was raised in its 'Declaration of Sentiments'.
- ⁵⁴ 'Women's March on Washington poster, 2017', National Museum of American History, https://americanhistory.si.edu/collections/search/object/nmah_1893609 (accessed January 4, 2022).
- ⁵⁵ 'The Women's March, 2017', National Museum of American History, <https://americanhistory.si.edu/creating-icons/women%E2%80%99s-march-2017> (accessed March 4, 2021).
- ⁵⁶ The history around this issue is contested. Whereas, later in her life, Alice Paul (1885–1977) remembered that Mary Church Terrell (1863–1954) wanted to bring a group from the National Association of Colored Women to the procession and that it caused a lot of angst leading to a compromise being reached whereby African American women would march at the back, *Crisis, the journal of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People*, recorded a different experience. In April 1913, *Crisis* reported that after a deluge of telegrams and protests, 'eventually the colored women marched according to their State and occupation without let or hindrance'. Ida B. Wells-Barnett (1862–1931), for example, walked with the Illinois delegation. See 'Marching for the Vote: Remembering the Woman Suffrage Parade of 1913', Research Guides, *American Women: Topical Essays*, Library of Congress, https://guides.loc.gov/american-women-essays/marching-for-the-vote#note_38 (accessed September 27, 2021) (For the sources cited, see the Records of the National Woman's Party (Group I, boxes 1–3) for correspondence on the role of African American women in the parade (MSS). See also *Crisis*, 5, no. 6 (April 1913), 267; reprint ed. (New York: Negro Universities Press, 1969). For Wells Barnett, see the *Chicago Tribune*, March 4, 1913, 2.
- ⁵⁷ Lemieux, 'Why I'm Skipping The Women's March on Washington'. Spelman College in Atlanta is a historically Black liberal arts college for women, <https://www.spelman.edu/about-us> (accessed February 7, 2022).
- ⁵⁸ Traister, 'The Complicated, Controversial, Historic, Inspiring Women's March'.
- ⁵⁹ Editorial Board, 'The Women's March on Washington is becoming a joke', *New York Post*, January 5, 2017, <https://nypost.com/2017/01/05/the-womens-march-on-washington-is-becoming-a-joke/> (accessed March 6, 2022).
- ⁶⁰ Editorial Board, 'The Women's March on Washington is becoming a joke'.
- ⁶¹ Julie Bosman, 'In a Rust Belt Town, the Women's March Draws Shrugs and Cheers from Afar', *New York Times*, 21 January 2017, <https://www.nytimes.com/2017/01/21/us/niles-michigan-trump-no-women-march.html> (accessed January 4, 2022).
- ⁶² Bosman, 'In a Rust Belt Town, the Women's March Draws Shrugs and Cheers From Afar'.
- ⁶³ Shikha Dalmia, 'Why the Women's March on Washington has already failed', *The Week*, January 3, 2017, <https://theweek.com/articles/667163/why-womens-march-washington-already-failed> (accessed August 24, 2021).
- ⁶⁴ Dalmia, 'Why the Women's March on Washington has already failed'.
- ⁶⁵ David Brooks, 'After the Women's March', *New York Times*, January 24, 2017, <https://www.nytimes.com/2017/01/24/opinion/after-the-womens-march.html> (accessed January 4, 2022).
- ⁶⁶ Brooks, 'After the Women's March'. See Brooks' own ambivalent position on abortion in David Brooks, 'Abortion: The Voice of the Ambivalent Majority', *New York Times*, December 2, 2021, <https://www.nytimes.com/2021/12/02/opinion/abortion-ambivalent-majority.html> (accessed March 6, 2022). Hamilton (1755 or 1757–1804) held such positions as Secretary of the Treasury and Senior Officer of the United States Army in the new nation.
- ⁶⁷ The play has been lauded by many for its revolutionary approach to 'race' (the founders are without exception played by Black and Latino men), but it has also been deemed 'historically inappropriate' for both its actual erasure of 'real' historical Black bodies (for example, Black slaves) and its depiction of ahistorical Black social mobility which detracts from the fact that people of colour continue to face structural inequalities which block such upward movement today. See Lyra D. Monteiro, 'Review: Race-Conscious

Casting and the Erasure of the Black Past in Lin-Manuel Miranda's *Hamilton*', *The Public Historian* 38, no. 1 (2016): 89–98, 91, 96.

⁶⁸ *Teen Vogue* is a renewed version of a former print magazine, originally founded in 2003 as an offshoot of *Vogue* magazine, but now available online. It ceased publishing regular print editions in December 2017. The final print edition was guest-edited by former Presidential candidate Hillary Clinton. See Natalie Coulter and Kristine Moruzi, 'Woke Girls: From the Girl's Realm to Teen Vogue', *Feminist Media Studies*, DOI: 10.1080/14680777.2020.1736119; Jessalyn Keller, 'A Politics of Snap: *Teen Vogue*'s Public Feminism', *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 5, no. 4 (2020): 817–841.

⁶⁹ Elizabeth Kiefer, 'Feminism's 1970s flagship faded from view – but in 2017 it's back', *Refinery29*, August 26, 2017, <https://www.refinery29.com/en-us/2017/08/169213/womens-equality-day-feminism-2017> (accessed February 20, 2022).

⁷⁰ Sascha Cohen, 'The Day Women Went on Strike', *Time*, August 26, 2015; Maggie Doherty, 'Feminist Factions United and Filled the Streets for this Historic March', *New York Times*, August 26, 2020.

⁷¹ 'Women on the March, Page 4', *New York Times*, August 30, 1970, <https://www.nytimes.com/1970/08/30/archives/it-was-a-great-day-for-women-on-the-march.html> (accessed May 18, 2022); and, Linda Charlton, 'Women March Down Fifth in Equality Drive', *New York Times*, August 17, 1970, <https://www.nytimes.com/1970/08/27/archives/women-march-down-fifth-in-equality-drive-women-march-down-fifth.html> (accessed February 7, 2022).

⁷² Kate Millett published her book *Sexual Politics* in 1970, based on her doctoral dissertation completed at Columbia University. Kate Millett, *Sexual Politics* (New York: Doubleday, 1970).

⁷³ Cohen, 'The Day Women Went on Strike'.

⁷⁴ Charlton, 'Women March Down Fifth in Equality Drive'.

⁷⁵ Women's Rights Pioneers Monument, Central Park Conservancy, <https://www.centralparknyc.org/locations/womens-rights-pioneers-monument> (accessed March 12, 2022).

⁷⁶ Snitow, 'Refugees from Utopia', 144–145.

⁷⁷ Snitow, 'Refugees from Utopia', 145.

⁷⁸ Cohambee River Collective Statement, April 1977, <http://circuitous.org/scraps/combahee.html> (accessed December 16, 2017); Cherrie Moraga and Gloria Anzaldúa, eds., *This Bridge Called my Back: Writings by Radical Women of Color* (Watertown: Persephone Press, 1981); and, Gloria T. Hull, Barbara Smith and Patricia Bell Scott, eds., *All the Women are White, All the Blacks are Men, but some of Us are Brave* (New York: The Feminist Press, 1982).

⁷⁹ Angela McRobbie, *The Aftermath of Feminism: Gender, Culture, and Social Change* (London: Sage, 2009), 26.

⁸⁰ McRobbie, *The Aftermath of Feminism*, 49.

⁸¹ The financial struggles experienced by the Fawcett and later Women's Library in London is one example of this. See Sharon Crozier-De Rosa and Vera Mackie, *Remembering Women's Activism* (Routledge: Abingdon, Oxon), 22–24.

⁸² The Suffragette Fellowship and the Fawcett later Women's Library in the UK sought to protect the history of militant and constitutional suffragism respectively. See Crozier-De Rosa and Mackie, *Remembering Women's Activism*, 19–78. As early as 1928, Ray Strachey wrote a history of the women's suffrage movement in the United Kingdom. Ray Strachey, *The Cause: A Short History of the Women's Movement in Great Britain*, (London: G. Bell and Sons, 1928). In the US, Elizabeth Cady Stanton, Susan B. Anthony and others produced a six-volume history of their movement. Elizabeth Cady Stanton, Susan B. Anthony, Matilda Joslyn Gage, and Ida Harper, *History of Woman Suffrage*, six volumes (Rochester, New York: Susan B. Anthony and Charles Mann Press, 1881–1922).

⁸³ Crozier-De Rosa and Mackie, *Remembering Women's Activism*, 208.

⁸⁴ See Chidgley, *Feminist Afterlives*, 27–28; and, Crozier-De Rosa and Mackie, *Remembering Women's Activism*, 210.

⁸⁵ Sarah Cascone 'Signs of the Times: Museums Are Collecting Protest Posters From the 2018 Women's March', *Artnet*, January 22, 2018, <https://news.artnet.com/art-world/museums-already-enshrining-2018-womens-march-us-history-1204031> (accessed January 24, 2022).

⁸⁶ Even before the Women's March, Kate Eichhorn noted that there were both benefits and disadvantages to the digitisation of feminist materials and born-digital resources. See Kate Eichhorn, 'Beyond digitisation: a case study of three contemporary feminist collections', *Archives and Manuscripts* 42, no. 3 (2014): 227–237.

⁸⁷ One example is the ‘Women’s March’ digital repository at Georgia State University Library, <https://exhibits.library.gsu.edu/current/exhibits/show/bridging-communities--50-years/protests-for-change-in-atlanta/women-s-march> (accessed January 5, 2022).

⁸⁸ ‘The Women’s March, 2017’, Smithsonian’s National Museum of American History, <https://americanhistory.si.edu/creating-icons/women%E2%80%99s-march-2017> (accessed March 12, 2022); ‘Women’s March on Washington’, Independence Television, https://archive.org/details/Women_s_March_on_Washington (accessed March 12, 2022); and, ‘Women’s March. A Documentary Film about Democracy and Human Rights’, TrimTab Media, <http://womensmarchfilm.com/> (accessed March 12, 2022).

⁸⁹ See Chidgley, *Feminist Afterlives*, 27–28; and Crozier-De Rosa and Mackie, *Remembering Women’s Activism*, 210.

⁹⁰ Women’s March Organizers, *Together we Rise: Behind the Scenes at the Protest Heard around the World* (New York: Conde Nast, 2018). An Australian author issued a children’s book called *The Pink Hat* for the anniversary. Andrew Joyner, *The Pink Hat* (Sydney: Random House Australia, 2017).

⁹¹ Chidgey, *Feminist Afterlives*, 52; and, Gianpiero Gamaleri, ‘Media Ecology, Neil Postman’s Legacy’, *Church, Communication and Culture* 4, no. 2 (2019): 238–244.

⁹² E-mail from Women’s March Foundation, January 21, 2022 (received January 21 Australian time, probably sent January 20 US time).

⁹³ Its original logo showed three women’s faces in profile, coloured red, dark blue and cream, signifying diversity and standing for solidarity. On the fifth anniversary in 2022, it announced a ‘rebrand’ designed by Grey Area Collective. The new logo is in two colours: bright blue and white, with other versions in pale pink and white or ochre and white. According to designer Nicole LaRue the logo ‘conveys diversity and women standing together and speaking out in a united voice - a voice that calls for solidarity, demands equality and confronts injustice’, quoted in Women’s March Sketch Resource, <https://www.sketchappsources.com/free-source/2421-womens-march-logo-sketch-freebie-resource.html> (accessed February 8, 2022). See ‘Women’s March celebrates five years’, Women’s March, <https://www.womensmarch.com/newsroom/womens-march-celebrates-five-years-with-refreshed-brand-and-renewed-purpose> (accessed February 19, 2022). For a critique of such branding of political movements, see Chiara J., ‘Branding of the “Women’s March”: ‘Can authenticity be maintained when a movement is branded?’’, *Medium*, April 29, 2019, <https://medium.com/@chiara.jutz/branding-of-the-womens-march-can-authenticity-be-maintained-when-a-movement-is-branded-1142044f2994> (accessed February 20, 2022). For the anniversary video, see <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=R5tEtocOZ4g> (accessed March 14, 2022). The Women’s International Democratic Federation also used an illustration of three women in profile – black, white and yellow. See the cover of Women’s International Democratic Federation, *World Congress of Women, Moscow 1963* (Berlin: Women’s International Democratic Federation, undated).

⁹⁴ Katie Rogers, ‘Fashioning Protest for the Women’s March on Washington’, *New York Times*, January 18, 2017, <https://www.nytimes.com/2017/01/18/fashion/womens-march-washington-fashion-protest.html> (accessed February 18, 2022); and, *Pussyhat Project*, <https://www.pussyhatproject.com/our-story> (accessed February 19, 2022).

⁹⁵ Katherine Brooks, ‘How Pussy Hats are Making their Way into Museums around the World’, *Huffpost*, March 15, 2017, https://www.huffpost.com/entry/how-pussy-hats-are-making-their-way-into-museums-around-the-world_n_58c6dd50e4b081a56dee37f3 (accessed March 9, 2022).

⁹⁶ Women’s March, womensmarch.com (accessed February 25, 2022).

⁹⁷ “‘Elect a clown, expect a circus’: Anti-Trump Women’s Marches held across US”, *SBS News*, January 22, 2018, <https://www.sbs.com.au/news/elect-a-clown-expect-a-circus-anti-trump-women-s-marches-held-across-us/b76abbe0-4ec9-44e9-821d-dae2324ccaf7> (accessed February 17, 2022); Lena Felton, ‘Women’s marchers look to the midterms’, *The Atlantic*, January 21, 2018, <https://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2018/01/this-is-now-really-a-womens-march/551069/> (accessed February 18, 2022); and, Poulomi Das, ‘A New Doc on the Midterm Elections Captures the Struggle of Women Candidates’, *Hyperallergic*, February 12, 2019, <https://hyperallergic.com/483614/a-new-doc-on-the-midterm-elections-captures-the-struggle-of-women-candidates/> (accessed February 17, 2022).

⁹⁸ Lauren Gambino, Adam Gabbatt and Carla Green, ‘One year later, thousands return for Women’s March with spirits undaunted’, *The Guardian*, January 21, 2018, <https://www.theguardian.com/us->

[news/2018/jan/20/womens-march-trump-inauguration-anniversary-protest?utm_source=esp&utm_medium=Email&utm_campaign=E2%80%A6](https://www.nytimes.com/2018/jan/20/womens-march-trump-inauguration-anniversary-protest?utm_source=esp&utm_medium=Email&utm_campaign=E2%80%A6) (accessed February 19, 2022).

⁹⁹ Samantha Cooney, 'Here are some of the women who made history in the midterm elections', *Time*, November 19, 2018, <https://time.com/5323592/2018-elections-women-history-records/> (accessed February 20, 2022); and, Jennifer Mothers, 'Women candidates break records in the 2018 US midterm elections', *The Conversation*, November 8, 2018, <https://theconversation.com/women-candidates-break-records-in-the-2018-us-midterm-elections-105829> (accessed February 20, 2022).

¹⁰⁰ Sophie Shaw, 'The history of women wearing suffragette white', *CR*, February 11, 2019, <https://www.crfashionbook.com/fashion/a26261899/the-history-of-women-wearing-suffragette-white/> (accessed February 18, 2022); Sarah Radin, 'How color in fashion has been used throughout history to display political solidarity', *Teen Vogue*, May 14, 2019, https://www.teenvogue.com/story/color-fashion-history-political-solidarity?mbid=nl_051419_daily&CNDID=49961231&utm_source=nl&utm_medium=email%E2%80%A6 (accessed February 18, 2022); and, Crozier-De Rosa and Mackie, 'Who was Jane Walker?'

¹⁰¹ Sarah Radin, 'How color in fashion has been used throughout history to display political solidarity'.

¹⁰² On January 6, 2021, extreme right activists had stormed the Capitol Building in Washington DC, echoing Trump's view that the election of Joe Biden, one which Trump had lost, had been 'stolen'. The almost simultaneous anniversaries of the Capitol Building uprising and the Women's March implied a contrast between one which was predicated on masculinised entitlement and violence and another which modelled peaceful but assertive protest. On January 6, 2022 the Women's March sent an e-mail with the header 'January 6 2021', commenting that 'this secessionist coup pulled back the curtain to reveal to the nation how **white supremacy and systemic racism permeate every American institution**. The foundation of this country was built on systemic racism and the free labor of enslaved Black people – we must move forward to take on the necessary and hard work ahead of us to address our history as a nation'. [Bold type in original.]

E-mail from Women's March Foundation, January 6, 2022 (received January 7 Australian time, probably sent January 6 US time).

¹⁰³ While the discussion in 2021 and 2022 generally focused on the right to abortion, the issue of reproductive control refers to broader issues of reproductive freedom, including not only the right to contraception and abortion, but also the right to give birth under circumstances of one's own choosing. For some working-class women, enslaved women and Native American women, this had historically included issues like forced abortion, sterilisation or gynecological experimentation without consent. BBC, 'New York: James Marion Sims Statue Removed from Central Park', *BBC News*, April 17, 2018, <https://www.bbc.com/news/world-us-canada-43804725> (accessed May 15, 2022)

¹⁰⁴ Kiefer, 'Feminism's 1970s flagship faded from view'.

¹⁰⁵ The issue of reproductive control also draws its own forms of rallying from different places on the political spectrum. While 'pro-choice' activists regularly carry out marches in favour of reproductive autonomy, every year on the anniversary of the *Roe v. Wade* decision, opponents of abortion march to the Supreme Court Building in Washington DC in the 'March for Life'.

¹⁰⁶ Rebecca Hersher, 'Norma McCorvey of *Roe v. Wade* Embodied The Complexity of American Abortion Debate', *NPR*, February 18, 2017, <https://www.npr.org/2017/02/18/516001566/norma-mccorvey-of-roe-v-wade-embodied-the-complexity-of-american-abortion-debate> (accessed March 15, 2022); Emily Langer, 'Norma McCorvey, Jane Roe of *Roe v. Wade* Decision Legalizing Abortion Nationwide, Dies at 69', *Washington Post*, February 18, 2017; Robert McFadden, 'Norma McCorvey, Roe in *Roe v. Wade*, Is Dead at 69', *New York Times*, February 18, 2017; and, Joshua Prager, 'The Accidental Activist', *Vanity Fair*, January 18, 2013, <https://www.vanityfair.com/news/politics/2013/02/norma-mccorvey-roe-v-wade-abortion> (accessed February 20, 2022); Joshua Prager, 'Tracing the Life of Norma McCorvey, "Jane Roe" of *Roe v. Wade*, and Why She'd Favor an Abortion Ban', *Vanity Fair*, January 30, 2015, <https://www.vanityfair.com/news/politics/2013/02/norma-mccorvey-roe-v-wade-abortion> (accessed March 15, 2022); Linda Napikoski, 'Biography of Norma McCorvey, "Roe: in the *Roe v. Wade* Case', *ThoughtCo.*, August 14, 2019, <https://www.thoughtco.com/norma-mccorvey-abortion-3528239> (accessed March 15, 2022); and, Jacquelyne Anton, 'The Life and Legacy of Norma McCorvey', *History in the Making* 11, Article 11 (2018), <https://scholarworks.lib.csusb.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1006&context=history-in-the-making> (accessed March 15, 2022).

¹⁰⁷ Patricia Mazzei and Alerxandra Glorioso ‘Florida Lawmakers Vote to Ban Abortions After 15 Weeks’, *New York Times*, March 3, 2022, https://www.nytimes.com/2022/03/03/us/florida-abortion-ban.html?campaign_id=60&emc=edit_na_20220303&instance_id=0&nl=breaking-news&ref=cta®i_id=28135109&segment_id=84580&user_id=4f638ea9239b8c9234c06903e47a44ee (accessed March 15, 2022).

¹⁰⁸ E-mail from Women’s March Foundation February 14, 2022 (received February 15, 2022 Australian time, probably sent February 14 US time).

¹⁰⁹ Nina Totenberg, ‘Leaked Document Suggest the Supreme Court Intends to Strike Down Roe v. Wade’, *NPR*, May 3, 2022, <https://www.npr.org/2022/05/03/1096075487/leaked-document-suggests-the-supreme-court-intends-to-strike-down-roe-v-wade> (accessed May 15, 2022). See the leaked memo on *Politico.Com*, <https://www.politico.com/f/?id=00000180-874f-dd36-a38c-c74f98520000> (accessed May 19, 2022).

¹¹⁰ ‘We will not go back’: Thousands rally for abortion rights across the US’, *The Guardian*, May 15, 2022, <https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2022/may/14/abortion-rights-protests-us-roe-v-wade> (accessed May 19, 2022).

¹¹¹ Abigail Abrams, ‘How Overturning Roe v. Wade could Affect every American’, *Time*, May 12, 2022, https://time.com/6176180/overturn-roe-transform-america/?utm_medium=email&utm_source=sfmc&utm_campaign=newsletter+inside-time-saturday+default+%E2%80%A6 (accessed May 19, 2022).

¹¹² E-mail from Women’s March Foundation May 14, 2022 (received May 15, 2022 Australian time, probably sent May 14, 2022 US time).

¹¹³ Terry Mosely, ‘At “Bans Off Our Bodies” Rallies, Abortion-Rights Supporters Express Anger, Defiance, and Unity’, *Vanity Fair*, May 14, 2022, <https://www.vanityfair.com/news/2022/05/bans-off-our-bodies-rallies-abortion-rights-supporters-express-anger-defiance-and-unity> (accessed May 19, 2022).

¹¹⁴ Jia Tolentino, ‘We are not going back to the time before Roe We are going somewhere worse’, *The New Yorker*, 24 June 2022, https://www.newyorker.com/magazine/2022/07/04/we-are-not-going-back-to-the-time-before-roe-we-are-going-somewhere-worse?utm_social-type=owned&utm_brand=tny&utm_source=twitter&utm_medium=social&mbid=social_twitter (accessed 25 June 2022).

¹¹⁵ Lauren Gambino, Adam Gabbatt and Carla Green, ‘One year later, thousands return for Women’s March with spirits undaunted’, *The Guardian*, January 21, 2018, https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2018/jan/20/womens-march-trump-inauguration-anniversary-protest?utm_source=esp&utm_medium=Email&utm_campa%E2%80%A6 (accessed February 19, 2022).

¹¹⁶ McRobbie, *The Aftermath of Feminism*, 26.