

Special Issue on Feminism and Capitalism

WHY IS FEMINISM SO GOOD AT UNDERSTANDING CAPITALISM? Because gender, like capital, is never separate or pure in its expressions. Feminism has theorized gender as an intersecting system that configures and distributes power not just between female-identified and male-identified persons and within households, but also between classes and between producers and reproducers. It does so within and across these boundaries, and it questions the boundaries themselves. Always relational, feminism is adept at thinking about gender and capital as constitutive and in relation to difference—of sexuality and sex, race and caste, disability and debility, public and private, rural and urban, human and nonhuman animal, and Global North and Global South. Feminism is a critique of knowledge formations. This includes critiques of “classical” Marxism and how capitalism is approached by the disciplines of history, economics, anthropology, geography, science, and by ethnic studies and area studies. Whether decolonial or postcolonial, anti-capitalist feminism challenges the telos of modernity by asking where women’s liberation under capitalism dead-ends rather than progresses, and by questioning the Western-centrism of feminist knowledge production that does not scrutinize its own provenance. In its commitment to alternative worlds, feminism embraces humans, especially those gendered female, as embodied producers of situated knowledge, connected to kin and community, not the disembodied individual rationalists nor the “free” wage laborers capitalism depends on. Feminism is transdisciplinary in its choice of methodologies to apprehend capitalism. At times it is transnational, and at others, location-specific in tracing out the gendered workings of capital at multiple scales. Feminism is always auto-interrogatory, which makes it agile in its response to capitalism in its always restless and mutating forms.

Feminist activists and scholars theorize capitalism as a political and economic conjuncture, a hydra-headed monster configuring and distributing power unevenly across difference to produce multiple inter-related crises. Months prior to the COVID pandemic, when we issued the call for this special issue on feminism and capitalism, we indexed our contemporary conjuncture as one in which inequality is at an unconscionably high level. Hundreds of millions of people are poor, hungry, and in a perpetual search for bad jobs and precarious work. Sexual and domestic violence, and violence based on the hardening of gender, racial, caste, religious and ethnic differences is increasing. Migration and displacement within and across national boundaries are at record levels. An environmental apocalypse appears to be unfolding. The pandemic has exacerbated these crises and underscores the urgency of feminist interrogations of capitalism. Several works in this special issue focus on this very task, including Leslie Salzinger's discussion of how capitalism is foundationally and structurally dependent on social reproduction, and Rebecca Herzig and Banu Subramaniam's examination of "housekeeping," the "invisibilized, undercompensated, and utterly indispensable labor" of social reproduction in US universities, both of which have been intensified by the pandemic whose burdens have fallen in disproportionately gendered and racialized ways. Ana Hernández's reflection on contemporary socialist feminist activism in Venezuela similarly points to how COVID has worsened longstanding capitalist, imperialist, and patriarchal processes, including increasing domestic violence and further restricting poor and working-class women's access to food, medicine, and reproductive health. Sushmita Chatterjee and Kiran Asher's essay extends our focus from humanist conceptions of labor and history in their examination of "COVID capitalism," drawing our attention to the deep dependencies of human-animal relationships in the production of value.

While examining the intersection of capitalism and the pandemic is one way of traversing this issue, there are other paths to take. We invite you to find your own, and in what follows, we suggest a few possibilities.

Feminist activists and scholars, long dissatisfied with abstract generalizations about value-making in the realm of production and market exchange in capitalism, have sought to show its constitutive dependence on what it casts as outside: the gender-differentiated creation of life and labor. This, the realm of social reproduction, has witnessed a

resurgence in feminist scholarship and movements in recent years. A cluster of essays provides a genealogy of feminist engagements with social reproduction. They approach social reproduction both as a spatial formation, which distributes gendered care work across urban and rural spaces, as well as a temporal formation, which banks on the forgetting of past squeezing of reproduction in the interests of ongoing capitalist development. The informal economy is also cast as outside to capitalism but, as many feminist analyses — including those by Leslie Salzinger, Rebecca Herzig and Banu Subramaniam, Jiwoon Yulee, Priti Ramamurthy and Vinay Gidwani, and Elaine McCrate in this issue — demonstrate, far from disappearing, it is what continues to subtend capitalism today. Jiwoon Yulee's analysis points to how the idea of labor precarity being a new feature brought about by neoliberalism masks the very processes of social reproduction of gender and class relations in South Korea. Priti Ramamurthy and Vinay Gidwani's theorizing of violence as a "punctuating" vector in the lives of working-class women straddling the urban and rural in contemporary India shows how gendered violence controls the ideological and material means of reproduction and knits together economies of care. Elaine McCrate's essay focuses on the mutually reinforcing process whereby the normative expectation that women be ever-available to offer caregiving time effectively prevents their labor market participation, especially where work schedules are unpredictable.

Keeping with the theme of temporality, a cluster of essays, including those of Mercer Gary, Shana Ye, and Nina Medvedeva, addresses neoliberalism as the latest incarnation of capitalism. For example, at least since the 1990s, state withdrawal from social service provisioning, privatization, and financialization has not only made social reproduction much more difficult, but has shifted the burdens of care, education, health onto households, especially to women and female-identified persons. The monetization of kinship relations and the financialization of debt to bind the working class and poor in relations of perpetual dependence are some of the themes these essays explore. Mercer Gary's review essay examines how differing approaches to structural forces such as transnational capitalism and neocolonial invasions undergird debates about disability and debility that crosscut recent works in disability studies. Nina Medvedeva's essay examines what she calls "emotional governance" where companies manage and manipulate their customers'

dissatisfied emotions while simultaneously perpetuating the structures of racial capitalism.

As a spatial formation, capitalism morphs and mutates in its relentless search of greater surpluses. Feminist scholars are acutely attuned to the relationship between capitalism and on-the-ground specificities that selectively enable its taking root and reproduction, or its disarticulation and flight. These specificities are historical, connected to longer and larger processes of exploitation and oppression (including Indigenous genocide, chattel slavery, and imperial colonialism) and to different trajectories of state-formation whether these be blatantly pro-capitalist, less blatantly capitalist, or socialist. Capitalism relies on and produces subjectivities that play out in intimate and sensorial realms, ones in which subjects are also agentic, strategic, and creative. Articles by Sushmita Chatterjee and Kiran Asher, Nina Medvedeva, Elaine McCrate, Rebecca Herzig and Banu Subramaniam, and Leifa Mayers, focus on capitalism in its US manifestations, including in meat-packing plants and home-stays, as well as a site that many of us are privileged and complicit to be housed in, universities. Leifa Mayers's essay examines how the pervasiveness of student loan debt in the United States is "financializing" student life and turning students into entrepreneurs of risk in ways that are fundamentally predicated on, and reinscribe, gendered, racialized, and classed differences. This issue also showcases feminist analyses by Shana Ye, Ka-ming Wu, Jiwoon Yulee, Priti Ramamurthy and Vinay Gidwani, and Ana Hernández, attuned to the historical and sociocultural specificities of contemporary China, South Korea, India, and Venezuela that reveal unexpected crossings and contradictions of capitalism and feminisms. Shana Ye's article examines how a dominant strain of Chinese feminism is predicated on complicity with neoliberalism, which is credited with creative and empowering agency for activists. Ka-ming Wu's essay foregrounds how the development of urban infrastructure, as part of a larger materialist network, is facilitating the creation of new sites of feminist organizing and new modes of citizen practice in China.

Lest we get overwhelmed by the generalizing and universalizing forms of capitalism today, we would like to point to the radical rethinking a cluster of essays calls for, most notably the essay by Kathi Weeks that calls for more robust US Marxist feminist theorizing through an "archive" of theoretical texts that enables us to imagine theoretical commonality and political solidarity of time rather than a "tradition" that

carries with it a potentially “debilitating sense of indebtedness.” There is hope, too, in the many feminist movements that several essays document across the world, including the work of Jiwoon Yulee, Shana Ye, Ka-ming Wu, Leslie Salzinger, and Ana Hernández, all of which underscore feminist activists’ insistence that states address debt, evictions, income inequality, rising corporate profits, persistent agrarian crises, planetary urbanization, labor precarity and informality, and climate change.

We acknowledge the recent resurgence of feminist engagements with capitalism in scholarship and activism that this special issue indexes. We hope you will find the pathways we suggest to explore these essays generative, and invite you to chart pathways of your own.

Leslie Salzinger’s review essay “Seeing with the Pandemic: Social Reproduction in the Spotlight” argues that the COVID pandemic laid bare the usually invisible foundational and structural dependence of capitalism on the domain of social reproduction, the realm within and beyond the family, where people are produced through “unpaid, underpaid, and formally unrecognized work.” In theorizing social reproduction as the primary arena of primitive accumulation, Salzinger traces its long genealogy from Marx to Rosa Luxemburg, to the Wages for Housework movement of the 1970s and 1980s, to the most recent resurgence of feminist scholarship of social reproduction. The production of labor, which is the precursor and host of capitalist exploitation, is in serious trouble. The un-free-ness of this work due to its constitutively gendered and racialized form was impossible to escape during the pandemic as its burdens fell unequally on women, of all races, at home, and left “essential workers,” disproportionately working-class women of color, with no option to stay at home. This unfreedom, inherent to motherhood and being a wife, and to the racialization of carework when it is paid, is embedded in the very logic of capitalism, which must be challenged for survival.

In “Housekeeping: Labor in the Pandemic University,” Rebecca Herzig and Banu Subramaniam highlight the indispensability of analyzing affective and domestic labor when grappling with institutional responses to the COVID-19 pandemic. Herzig and Subramaniam examine non-profit universities in the United States through the lens of “housekeeping,” a term they use to refer to the “invisibilized, undercompensated, and utterly indispensable labor” of social reproduction that includes both cognitive work and the inescapably manual work at the university, which has all intensified with the pandemic. Herzig and Subramaniam

note that well before the global outbreak of COVID-19, feminized faculty of color had been disproportionately tasked with non-research and non-teaching institutional caretaking in a context of government divestment from public higher education and the expansion of contingent and disposable teaching labor. But in the pandemic university, they argue, care has assumed a new status. Even debates over “remote” teaching and research, they argue, serve to highlight the inescapable, if often invisible, physicality of academic labor. University communications offices have pivoted deftly toward rebranding carework as essential. Caring, in the pandemic university, as in so many other sites of neoliberal restructuring, is positioned as the flexible, presumably inexhaustible resource that is supposed to hold the institution together. Yet, they argue, “the symbolic elevation of care as a virtue is not necessarily matched by meaningful transformations in working conditions or material compensation.” Rather, more labor is demanded via the sentimental imperatives of love and commitment. Herzig and Subramaniam conclude that the “ingenious maneuvers of the pandemic university mean that our sleep, our kitchen tables, even our leftover testing specimens have been included in its grasp, all in the name of love.”

Ana Hernández’s essay “Socialist Feminism in Venezuela: Revolution on Three Fronts” reflects on feminist activism in Venezuela today, the multiple forces it is battling, and the schisms within feminist groups. The patriarchal social order, Hernández argues, predates the Bolivarian Revolution, but is heightened by President Maduro’s blatant patriarchy. COVID, as socialist feminist activists in Venezuela have pointed out, has exacerbated poor and working-class women’s access to food, medicines, and reproductive health and has increased domestic violence. They have demanded that the Maduro administration take a gendered response. Even as socialist feminists recognize the “anti-imperialist, anti-capitalist, and anti-patriarchal” promise of the Bolivarian revolution, they continue to critique “the people, policies, and structures” that make up the state, which has fallen far short of its promises. Ministries devoted to women’s health and rights have not confronted the larger social order that subordinates women, and a new anti-hate law has been used against “people demanding better living conditions and sharing information about worsening conditions due to the pandemic” by labeling them terrorists. In addition to the patriarchal social order and working both with and against the state, socialist feminists in Venezuela are confronting

the sanctions levied by the United States and its allies that have crippled the country. To counter “rising rates of femicide, maternal mortality, trafficking, sexual violence, and survival sex work, as well as patterns of precarization of living conditions, neglect of women’s health, and displacement,” socialist feminists in Venezuela are fighting on all three fronts.

Débora de Fina Gonzalez offers a contextualization of *Las Tesis*’s performance of “A Rapist in Your Path,” an example, also mentioned by Hernández, of South American feminist activism against neoliberal economic policies. Gonzalez reflects on the intensification of Chilean feminist street activism over the past few years and explores its performance-driven dimensions. *Las Tesis*’s anthem, which was performed in protests around the globe, comes into clearer focus as part of a vibrant feminist uprising in Chile.

In “Animal Sightings and Citings under COVID Capitalism: Beyond Liberal Sentimentalism,” Sushmita Chatterjee and Kiran Asher juxtapose representations of the multiple sightings of animals welcomed in locked-down cities and in virtual meetings at the height of the COVID pandemic with the equally preponderant, but unseemly, citings of animals as “as food, threat, pests, and resources” to analyze the workings of capitalism at this historical moment, or conjuncture. They coin the term “COVID capitalism” to refer to the pandemic as an outcome of capitalist political economy and to the inextricably linked relationship between the pandemic and capitalism. By centering and making visible the animal in “living nature-culture,” they draw attention to the politics of class and the geopolitics of race that are reproduced in designations of difference between “exotic” wild animals (in urban areas and “wet” markets in China), pets, and invading pests by asking who can consume animals at leisure, through their windows, and screens, and who is blamed for virus, vermin, or insect attacks. Then they focus on the labor of humans, which render some animals killable and consumable as meat, and expose people — mostly working-class immigrants and people of color in the rural United States — to dangerous and inhuman conditions in meat-packing plants during COVID. To dismantle liberal sensibilities toward cute pets, which are, of course, lovable but also thoroughly enmeshed in commodity circuits and to recognize the deep dependencies of human-animal relationships in the production of value, Chatterjee and Asher suggest embracing a “critical relationality . . . to co-labor

and be-labor continually to disrupt humanist conceptions of labor and history.”

Jiwoon Yulee’s article “A Feminist Critique of Labor Precarity and Neoliberal Forgetting: Life Stories of Feminized Laboring Subjects in South Korea,” sets out the central contribution of this essay in her opening query: “What if the history of global capitalism were written by those who have never been granted full security, identity, entitlement, citizenship, or rights through formal labor?” Yulee proceeds to demonstrate exactly how the history of global capitalism would look if examined from the perspective of the casual, informal labor of feminized workers whose precarity long preceded the most recent era of neoliberal capitalism, the era known for making labor precarity into a supposedly new accumulation strategy. Analyzing three oral life histories of middle-age female janitors in South Korea and tracing the history of South Korea from the developmental state (1960s–1980s) to the neoliberal reform era (1997–present), Yulee argues that the process of “social reproduction of feminized labor [is] a condition of possibility for the developmental state’s neoliberalization.” Thus, she asserts that the idea that labor precarity emerged with neoliberalism masks the very processes of social reproduction of gender and class relations in South Korea that is the enduring condition of “disposable” feminized labor. Moreover, informal economies in both the Global South and North, not formal labor, are the location of the new terrain of resource extraction and social reproduction struggles. Yet, discourses of neoliberal labor precarity as new forgets histories of feminized labor. Yulee’s aim in this essay is thus to teach us how to unlearn the discourse of neoliberal precarity, not in order to deny precarity but to show its location and gender.

In “The Gender of Value: Punctuated Violence and the Labor of Care,” Priti Ramamurthy and Vinay Gidwani theorize how violence shapes the everyday lives of working-class women in contemporary India who straddle the urban and rural in translocal households. The essay conceptualizes the relationship between violence, carework, and aspirations for the future, theorizing violence as a punctuating vector. Drawing on the life history of one woman, Usha, the authors illustrate how violence “punctuates” by both marking inflection points in narrating life stories and by causing upheavals. As someone who moves between urban and rural environments, Usha is emblematic of those who are “perched” between older and newer discourses of individuation and between “the

fatigue of reproduction and the desire to be more.” The article shows how gendered “banal and sometimes brutish violence” controls both the ideological and material means of reproduction and “knits a moral economy of care” in lives such as Usha’s.

Elaine McCrate’s essay “Contemporary American Capitalism, Gender, and Work Schedule Instability” focuses on the normative social expectation that women, and mothers in particular, be ever-available to offer caregiving time, and the effect that this expectation of ever-availability has on the labor market and on how work schedules are organized. McCrate draws on federal governmental data to make observations about the demographic patterns in work schedules. One of the important arguments McCrate makes is that a fair number of women, especially white women, refuse unpredictable schedules in order to fulfill domestic roles, which in turn reinforces gender expectations and roles. The most marginalized women are often those who are subject to the most unstable schedules. It also makes important observations about the unstable work schedules of Hispanic and Black fathers.

In “Disability and Debility under Neoliberal Globalization,” Mercer Gary reviews work by Nirmala Erevelles, Jasbir Puar, and Robert McRuer, highlighting how a transnational scope of analysis poses foundational questions for the field of disability studies. According to Gary, Erevelles resists celebrations of the transformative possibilities of disability, arguing that such celebrations depend on the whiteness and affluence of the disabled subject and under-recognize the structural forces—such as transnational capitalism and neocolonial invasions—that produce most disabilities. Extending Erevelles’s critique, Puar argues that the exclusion of marginalized populations is built into the very concept of disability, which is defined in relation to a normative neoliberal subject and routinely fails to recognize less readily discernible forms of impairment such as chronic pain and depression. Gary explains the distinction between disability and debility is crucial: “if disability is the contingent impairment of body or mind that causes societal exclusion and discrimination,” for Puar, debility “addresses injury and bodily exclusion that are endemic rather than epidemic or exceptional, and reflects a need for rethinking the overarching structure of working, schooling, and living rather than relying on rights frames to provide accommodationist solutions.” Gary then puts McRuer into conversation with Puar, pushing back against McRuer’s claim that Puar ultimately rejects disability as

an analytic category. Rather, Gary argues, Puar seeks to resituate disability in ways that actually resonate with McRuer's work on crip politics; both theorists seek to challenge normalizing conceptions of disability. Gary concludes her review by exploring how Erevelles, Puar, and McRuer identify key conceptual issues for future transnational disability studies work.

Nina Medvedeva's essay, "Belong Anywhere? Airbnb's Corporate Narratives as Emotional Governance," illustrates how the company, which makes reservations for travelers' short-term stays at private homes rather than hotels, resolves problems caused by the potential hosts' homophobia and racism — not by fighting these prejudices but by providing a simulation of concern and repair. Medvedeva sees such ameliorative responses as fitting a broader corporate strategy that she calls "emotional governance," the affective alignment of feelings of discontent with visions of the future that redress the harms of racial capitalism while leaving its socio-economic roots intact." The essay cites examples from Airbnb's public relations and marketing efforts that describe how the company manipulates its customers' dissatisfied emotions to keep the users invested in racial capitalism and believing that its problems can be solved in the future without immediate structural changes.

One of the most pernicious aspects of neoliberal finance capitalism is the salience of risk, unequally shared, and its corollary burden, debt. The issue of student debt in particular has become a widespread topic of political discourse as students find themselves in an increasingly financialized system of higher education, even as the option of bankruptcy proceedings are denied to them. Thus, as Leifa Mayers argues in her article "Gendered 'Risk' and Racialized Inheritance: Toward a Feminist Analysis of Debt in US Higher Education," the pervasiveness of student loan debt is "financializing" student life and turning students into entrepreneurs of risk. Using empirical data from focus groups, Mayers examines this risk, debt, and inheritance through the experiences of first-generation college students. The financial aid system in the United States has expanded significantly over the past several decades, owing to increasing costs of higher education as well as greater socio-economic need for a college degree. Moreover, this takes place in a context in which, across different forms of risk, financialization structures the inheritance of whiteness. Mayers contextualizes student borrowing and debt within political discourses of risk and the ability of those who

inherit proximity to whiteness to benefit from the investment in their education, while “at-risk” others “have limited potential to capitalize on debt” and may even internalize these problems. Mayers thus demonstrates the ways in which gendered operations of finance capitalism buttress institutionalized whiteness and racialized indebtedness. She argues that the gendered financialization of student loan debt reproduces race-, gender-, and class-based inequalities while cloaking itself in neoliberal, colorblind rhetoric of self-investment and personal responsibility.

In “The Drama of Chinese Feminism: Neoliberal Agency, Post-Socialist Coloniality, and Post-Cold War Transnational Feminist Praxis,” Shana Ye offers a provocation about transnational feminism in the post-Cold War, neocolonial, neoliberal era. Addressing feminist activism in contemporary China, Ye argues that the complexity of Chinese feminist politics is often reduced in the transnational arena to a binary dramatization of a repressive communist state versus heroic victim-resisters. Ye focuses on the transnational outcry over what became known as “The Feminist Five,” five feminist activists arrested by the government in 2015 for planning street activities, to highlight women’s ongoing inequality in China, in particular sexual harassment. The debate that ensued about how to address these arrests pitted feminists in favor of vast international publicity to pressure the Chinese government versus feminists concerned that such international attention would escalate tensions with the state. The former prevailed, indexing a dominant strand of Chinese feminism that depicts the Chinese state as their ultimate patriarchal oppressor, seeking redress largely through what Ye calls “the neoliberal regime of visibility,” or media capitalism. Ye asks “why in postsocialist China cooperating with the state as an activist strategy is more often perceived as despicable while complicity with neoliberalism is credited with creative and empowering agency?” The answer, Ye finds, lies in the way Chinese feminists’ desires for transnational affinity through media consumerism enact a repetition of colonial doubling, that is, being acclaimed on a global, that is, “Western” stage paradoxically refracts a longstanding postcolonial anxiety of “missing out.” Ye concludes that a closer examination of how China sits at the crossroads of franchise, settler, and Cold War colonialisms would add critical knowledge, from the perspective of postsocialism, to existing feminist South-South decolonial praxis.

Ka-ming Wu's article "The Pink Flaneur: Feminist Public Citizenship and Urban Infrastructure in China," brings to the fore what is usually left literally in the background of discussions about feminist activism in China and activism more broadly: the urban infrastructure feminists use to broadcast their political messages. Wu's analysis is timely, as China has emerged as the biggest investor and builder of infrastructural projects in the world. Focusing largely on the 2017 feminist campaigns of "I am a billboard walking against sexual harassment" and the adaptation by these feminists of flaneur practices instead of demonstrations, which are forbidden in China, to purvey their message, Wu argues that urban infrastructure is not mere physical space in which feminist action takes place. Joining other theorists of infrastructure and emphasizing a materialist feminism of the more-than-human, Wu argues that urban space belongs to a larger materialist network that excites people's imagination and, in its techno-bureaucratic role, redefines the political. Wu's argument is that this dynamic "assemblage of mediation" facilitates the creation of new sites of feminist organizing and new modes of citizen practices in China. Wu further emphasizes that these feminist activist/citizen practices display a gendered citizenship that does not "conform to the values of wealth and power the hegemonic party state imagines in these infrastructural wonders but instead "generate values of equality, participation, and autonomy." Based on in-depth interviews with major activists, the collection of visual and textual campaign materials, and re-walking some of the protest routes, Wu challenges the binary opposition of authoritarian state versus hapless activists. She concludes that Chinese feminist activism contributes to an understanding of an expanding public, materialist and participatory form of citizenship within an authoritarian state structure, subverting any easy conclusion about an all-encompassing state.

Kathi Weeks makes a persuasive call for the revival and reinvention of a more robust US Marxist feminist theory in "Scaling-Up: A Marxist Feminist Archive." She points to several factors in the decline of what she calls this "anti-capitalist brand of feminism," including the renaturalization of capitalism under neoliberalism as well as certain reductive tendencies in feminist theory. In response, Weeks proposes to enlarge the archive of Marxist feminist texts by including three well-known works that, paradoxically, are not usually considered works of Marxist feminist theory: Shulamith Firestone's iconic manifesto from 1970, *The Dialectic*

of *Sex: The Case for Feminist Revolution*, Donna Haraway's 1985 "Manifesto for Cyborgs," and the Laboria Cuboniks collective's 2015 manifesto, "Xenofeminism: A Politics for Alienation." Weeks uses the concept of "archive" to challenge the notion of a "tradition" of theoretical texts that carries with it a potentially "debilitating sense of indebtedness." Archive, for Weeks, enables us to imagine theoretical commonality and political solidarity over time not homogenized through the modality of tradition, or for that matter, canon or kinship. Through a close reading of these three texts, Weeks emphasizes two main insights gained from the texts: a methodological one of scaling-up feminist theory to prioritize institutions over subjects and futures over narrow presents; and a concrete political one, in which this scaled-up theory enables effective Marxist feminist projects of antiwork politics and family abolitionism. Weeks concludes that expansions of the Marxist feminist archive such as the ones she suggests might make this theoretical archive that centers the relations among capitalist political economies, diverse modes of laboring practices, and regimes of gender, race, sexual, and national hierarchy more sustainable over time.

This issue also features art by Kirin Joya Makker and Lily Cox-Richard, both of whom are committed to collaboration and historical research as engines of their work. Makker describes her project, "Womb Chair Speaks," as an invitation to interrogate and reclaim an icon of modernist design, Eero Saarinen's Womb Chair. "Fieldwork" records a conversation between Cox-Richard and art historian Susan Richmond. Seemingly free-ranging but actually quite deliberate, the discussion surveys Cox-Richard's approaches to activism, racial justice, community, and the anti-monumental.

Priti Ramamurthy, Attiya Ahmad,
with Judith Gardiner, Bibiana Obler, Lisa Rofel,
Megan Sweeney, and Ashwini Tambe,
for the *Feminist Studies* collective