
–1.153 CHARACTERS. TOWARDS A QUEERFEMINIST INFRASTRUCTURAL CRITIQUE OF WIKIPEDIA

ABSTRACT — This contribution explores the concealed biases, power dynamics, and inequalities within Wikipedia’s infrastructural framework. Building upon the works of queerfeminist scholars such as Susan Leigh Star, Leslie Kern, and Eve Sedgwick, it uncovers how Wikipedia’s infrastructural opacities perpetuate systemic biases. Star’s research on infrastructure is employed to dissect the hidden labor and dependencies sustaining Wikipedia’s knowledge production. This article culminates in a discussion of the epistemological possibilities that arise with a feminist infrastructural critique of Wikipedia, highlighting the potential of reparative media practices to reshape not only the encyclopedia itself but also broader epistemological narratives and perspectives. It specifically draws on the artistic practices of the queerfeminist collective Feel Tank Chicago, which created an assembly of unfinished definitions, a polyphonic Tool Kit that defies the epistemological boundaries of conventional encyclopedic projects.

— On September 17, 2019, two friends and I organized a feminist writing workshop in a Kreuzberg (Berlin) project space. We set ourselves the goal of authoring Wikipedia articles together in order to create articles we found would contribute to diversifying the online encyclopedia. Without extensive prior knowledge, we invited others to join the process and learn to edit together with us. The workshop went on for four hours, in the period of which we researched, wrote, exchanged trivia about the content of our articles, and ate cookies together. In the end, we published our articles, feeling a sense of satisfaction. As we finished our workshop, our increased zest for action was suddenly slowed down: The article about the “Feel Tank Chicago,” a queerfeminist group of theorists, artists, and activists, had already been marked for “quality assurance.” This means that the article is provided with the reference that it does not correspond to the self-established standards of Wikipedia and requires a critical revision. Three minutes after we published the article, user Schnabeltassentier deleted the asterisk (*) that we had used for gender-neutral designations and instead changed them to generic masculine. The user also added a reason for their changes¹⁾: “Wikify” (Wikipedia “Feel Tank Chicago”). We promised each other to update the article the next day, so that this marking would be removed as soon as possible. But when we opened the article again, it was

1)

In the “settings” section on German Wikipedia you can only specify whether you want to be addressed with male or female pronouns. Although there is a third option to be addressed as “gender-neutrally” as possible, in the case of the generically masculine language on Wikipedia this means that you are addressed as a male user. Due to these limitations, I will generally use the pronouns “they/them.”

already removed from quality assurance. Instead, it was proposed for deletion.

— This contestation can be made visible on the article page by an inserted module, but the discussions happen on the “talk pages” and within the special pages of quality or deletion discussions, which we as a group didn’t know existed. Although easily accessible if you are familiar with them, these pages are rarely visited by readers. As such, they form the concealed, yet visible protocols of an article’s development. Conversations on the talk pages, e.g., about an article’s relevance, its writing style, references, content, or the possible deletion of an article, are structurally hidden from view. And all too often, and especially with articles that deal with gender identity, these discussions become antagonistic power struggles between higher-ranking users and newcomers. Though, as Melissa Adler writes, “[f]or the most part, however, these kinds of conversations are unnoticed and hidden beneath the entries that appear to have achieved consensus. The erased minority points of view are hidden in layers of a palimpsest” (Adler 2016: 39). Although these debates seem to be concealed and taking place in a kind of back room that usually only higher-ranking, active editors access, the debates fundamentally influence the content and fashion of the visible articles themselves. Daniela Agostinho, Katrine Dirckinck-Holmfeld, Nanna Bonde Thylstrup, and Kristin Veel have highlighted how Wikipedia’s “performative openness produces new opacities [that] conceal patterns of abuse and discrimination” (Agostinho et al. 2023: 5).

— As Heather Ford and Judy Wajcman have shown, “the systemic bias of the encyclopedia is important because Wikipedia has become one of the most powerful global media of our time” (2017: 2). This may certainly be one of the reasons why Wikipedia also has “become a crucial site of feminist and decolonial interventions, where scholars and practitioners engage with the opensource infrastructures to counter its male, white, Western bias through edit-a-thons that seek to amplify the presence of women, people of colour and the narratives and perspectives from the Global South” (Agostinho et al. 2023: 5). With regards to positions of queerfeminist and decolonial criticism of infrastructure, I will explore the relationship between epistemic injustices, the infrastructures that Wikipedia is built upon, and the social category of gender. I will further investigate editing as an act of reparative queerfeminist media practice. To this effect, I understand the online encyclopedia as a socio-technical discursive infrastructure that only works due to multimodal dependencies and constant maintenance work. Referring to epistemological questions towards digital information infrastructures in regard to access,

selection, omissions, and classifications, my contribution will deal with the “Infrapolitics” (Agostinho et al. 2023) of Wikipedia.

— In the following sections, I will analyze Wikipedia as an infrastructural platform with a reading of Susan Leigh Star’s notions on infrastructure. Following this, I will propose potential reparative queerfeminist media practices along with artistic practices established by associates of the Feel Tank Chicago. The closing chapter will examine and think with forms of queerfeminist infrastructural critique within the Wikipedia ecosystem.

TOOLKIT: DOUBLE VISION AND HIDDEN LAYERS — Infrastructure has gained highly scholarly traction in the last few years. Contemporary queerfeminist infrastructural critiques emphasize the invisibilized but yet essential maintaining and reproductive labor that enables the functioning of infrastructures. This perspective offers the possibility to re-read and analyze material-discursive and space-encompassing technologies that are inscribed with racist, sexist, ableist, and classist inequalities (Kern 2021; Boehmer / Davies 2018; Bee 2021). Susan Leigh Star’s pioneering research in Infrastructure Studies provides a valuable toolkit to frame the infrastructural characteristics and dissect the hidden complexities of Wikipedia. The properties that she defined for infrastructures can be accurately applied to the encyclopedic platform: Wikipedia is “sunk into and inside of other structures” like the networked servers it runs on, the MediaWiki open-source software that powers it, and its privileged ranking in online search results. Wikipedia is relatively “transparent to use” for people with basic digital literacy, editing “is learned as part of membership,” and its content “shapes and is shaped by the conventions of a community of practice.” Furthermore, the guidelines for editing are an “embodiment of standards” and the encyclopedia “is built on an installed base” (Star 1999: 381–382) that I will simplistically call “internet infrastructure.”

— Star, a feminist sociological scholar who studied the importance of information and standardization in society, often emphasized the unobtrusive labor, dependencies, and maintenance efforts required to sustain the functioning of infrastructures. In addition, she dedicated her research to the perspective of the marginalized as a starting point for her analyses. Star saw marginality as a position of being an outsider and an insider at the same time (Star 2015 [1994]: 155–156). She explains this as “[o]ne of the great lessons of feminism,” starting from the “double vision” with which the various aspects of standardization and classification can be viewed (Star 2015 [1990]: 283). By applying this double vision to Wikipedia, the

platform appears on the one hand as open and collaborative. Its knowledge production process thrives on the collective efforts of its editors, administrators, and contributors, and is marked by a constant interplay between individuals who are both users and producers of information. On the other hand, this seemingly democratic and accessible knowledge creation model conceals layers of complexity that require examination. Articles can be created, edited, and updated by anyone with internet and computer access. While this should allow for a diverse range of voices and perspectives to contribute to the encyclopedia, it also exposes hierarchies, biases, exclusions, and misinformation.

Star's concept of "double vision" offers a squinting view on the encyclopedic infrastructure. One that takes into account the seemingly paradoxical nature of its accessible and open editing process, as well as its exclusionary mechanisms. Wikipedia's editing process often remains unnoticed by the readers, who may interact with the platform primarily through the instantly visible content. However, it is within the infrastructure, the behind-the-scenes labor, and the maintenance work that substantial power dynamics and systemic biases are at play. These hidden layers of Wikipedia are what enable it to function as a vast repository of information while simultaneously obscuring the inequalities embedded within. Precisely this intangible labor of maintaining Wikipedia's infrastructure extends beyond the act of writing new articles. It encompasses tasks such as monitoring and examining changes, engaging in or resolving disputes, ensuring verifiability through citations, organizing and maintaining portals and support groups, constantly updating content, as well as revising articles that have been proposed for deletion. This behind-the-scenes labor and the discussion pages on which it takes place are at the same time where Wikipedia's exclusionary mechanisms become the most graspable.

MAPS OF FEAR To access Star's metaphor of the hidden mundane requires questioning for whom these infrastructural settings are invisible and for whom they are not. This is accompanied by the question of the infrastructural barriers that restrain participation and camouflage the exclusionary mechanisms at play. In order to get closer to an answer, I consulted perspectives from queerfeminist infrastructural critique. Above all is feminist geographer Leslie Kern's *Feminist City* (2021), which offers valuable insights into built-in inequalities of urban environments, as well as personal maps of fear that have seeped into their structure. Although Kern explores urban spaces and their gendered dimensions in eastern

Canada, her analysis is a useful illustration of the infrastructural deterrents for Wiki editors. Concentrating on performative aspects, Kern uses the imaginaries of “dark alleys” and “stranger danger” to show that the “female fear” of cities, night-time, going out alone, and sexual violence “isn’t even necessarily related to fear of men or physical harm,” but often an imaginary that is “dissolved in the bloodstream” (ibid.: 119) and that produces habitually performed acts of safety and precaution in line with gendered socialization. And just as urban spaces are populated by “our personal mental maps of safety and fear” (ibid.: 149), so are fear, caution, and restraint inscribed in the way marginalized editors behave and interact on Wikipedia. There have been numerous studies from Information Sciences that documented “the need [of women editors] to consider safety risks involved before editing certain topics or entering contentious spaces” (Tripodi 2021: 1688) on Wikipedia (Menking / Erickson, 2015; Menking et al. 2019). Francesca Tripodi has investigated that in order to manage their personal and emotional safety, female editors often withdraw to the “quiet corners of Wikipedia, avoiding topics or areas prone to harassment” (Tripodi 2023: 1689). The question I am asking and approaching with Kern’s insights in mind is: Why is that and how is it connected to infrastructural settings?

— Though there are 323 active Wikipedias for different languages; the extents of its gender bias form a more or less common ground of the online encyclopedia. Several studies have suggested that the demographics of its contributors directly affect its topical coverage, resulting among other things, in topical and linguistic biases. Put simply, it means that the overall coverage of topics is predetermined due to the gendered interests of its editors and the reportedly different language used when speaking about different genders (Wagner et al. 2016; Tripodi 2021). The WikiProject “Countering Systematic Bias” highlighted this influence of its contributors’ interests on its topical coverage (Wikipedia 2004). One of its findings, despite indeed oversimplifying gender as binary and essentialist, was that “traditionally male-linked subjects” received much more coverage than “traditionally female-linked” interests. This topical bias is, in addition to a more-than-binary understanding of gender, exacerbated when social categories like sexuality, race, religion, and socioeconomic status are taken into account. Xiang Zheng et al., for example, have recently investigated that user demographics correspond not only with topical, but also with its citation biases, demonstrating that Wikipedia “reflect[s] the Anglo cultures more than other cultures” (2022: 221).

—— Topical biases are not a “women’s problem.” Despite the lack of studies concerning LGBTQIA+ participation on the German Wikipedia, transantagonism and homophobia are reported issues on online social platforms. The discussion page of the German Wikipedia article on transphobia bears witness to this (Wikipedia, “Diskussion: Transphobie”). Online queer- and transphobia as well as heterosexism are not only expressed through ridicule, insults, and threats, but all too often result in online doxing and calls for organized stalking actions (Wörz 2022; Keighley 2022; Giese 2018). This hostile atmosphere inscribed into the scaffolding of online social media platforms restricts and decides who gets to learn “as part of membership” (Star / Ruhleder 1996: 113) and who prefers to stay away. This wall of fear and restraint seems to predominantly affect FLINTA*, queers, and racialized subjects (in unequal proportions) and thus prevents the specific perspectives and multiple interests they bring along. My friend, who wrote and uploaded the Wiki article on Feel Tank Chicago onto Wikipedia, told me that for her “it was an experience that confirmed clichés I knew before: that Wikipedia is a hostile environment. And especially hostile towards bringing in a body of knowledge that is situated within the political realm of queerfeminism. That gets singled out and attacked particularly quickly” (voice message sent to the author, September 30, 2023). In the case of the online encyclopedia, the phenomenon of the masculinized “Edit War” as well as cases of gendered and racist online harassment tag its discussion and talk pages as “places to avoid” for people affected by this violence. While Wikipedia is an anonymous platform that advertises itself as participatory, collaborative, and open to all, the encyclopedia is inscribed with a barrier nurtured by “personal experiences of danger and harassment but also media, rumours, urban myths” (Kern 2021: 149).

—— Far from being formed only by personal experiences, these maps of fear are built on top of an epistemic hierarchy that informs the infrastructure of Wikipedia’s reference system. What can be written and how is narrowed down due to the specific standards that the platform operates upon. In the following section, I will explore these standards building upon the thesis that just as urban environments can either empower or marginalize individuals based on their gender, sexuality, race, ableness, or socio-economic status, platforms like Wikipedia can either reinforce or challenge existing hierarchies of knowledge.

BUILT ON A HAUNTED BASE —— The fact that biographical articles, one of the largest categories within Wikipedia, predominately cover

white cis-males is not only due to the demographic of the editorial community, but is also infrastructurally induced. The relevance criteria for articles, i.e., criteria that decide whether a person, group, or topic is suitable for an entry, are based on an epistemological paradigm that reproduces and is itself embedded into a hetero-patriarchal and colonial matrix.²⁾ “Gendered and colonial infrastructures also contribute to an unequal distribution of representation in Wikipedia – which remains largely white, and gendered in favor of masculinity – and continue to inform the framing of articles, for instance, by drawing on romantic or nationalist accounts of colonial pasts rather than critical voices” (Agostinho et al. 2023: 2). I understand this topical unevenness not only as a mirror of contemporary patriarchal colonialist fantasies, but also as a product of the historical contingencies embedded in the encyclopedic project itself.

——— Following Ina Ulrike Paul’s account (2005: 11), the European Enlightenment was the historical period in which encyclopedic lexicons flourished. The emergence of this storage medium was made possible by advanced technologies of printing and typography, particularly the invention of printing with movable type and the resulting increase in published knowledge. Although there had been lexical traditions and dictionaries long before the seventeenth century in non-European countries, the role of encyclopedias in the European Enlightenment demonstrated a specific imperial and universal endeavor to collect *all* knowledge and therefore establish “a monopoly of the locus of enunciation of ‘objective,’ scientific knowledge about the modern world” (Lander 2000: 527). These efforts were embedded in a colonial matrix that organized differences by categories such as ‘races’ or ‘cultures’ in which the White West was seen as the highest stage of human development (Bruner 2020, 46f; Mignolo 2009; Quijano 2007). As Adler observes, “[i]n American- and European-designed systems patriarchy, heterosexuality, whiteness are universalized, as are Western ideals about knowledge, research, education, and truth” (2016: 38). These historical origins continue to shape and influence the encyclopedic platform of Wikipedia, for example, through the requirement of verifiability, which places significant constraints and guidelines on what qualifies as legitimate knowledge. Information verified by what are considered legitimate sources takes precedence, effectively marginalizing forms of knowledge that are not deemed qualified to contribute. The German Wikipedia, for instance, establishes criteria for the relevance of authors, which stipulate that authors must have published a minimum of two monographs, received recognition through a prestigious literary award, or produced a

2)

With this statement I am referring to the rich tradition of feminist critique of science as well as feminist science and technology studies. Feminist critiques of science – like the works of Sandra Harding and Donna Haraway – have since the 1970s analyzed the dominant principles of science, like universality, and neutrality as tools that uphold patriarchal power. Feminist science and technology studies have dissected that technologies both shape and are shaped by existing gender and power dynamics. In other words, gender relations are embedded in technologies, and technologies also contribute to the production of gender-related discourses. Hanna Steinert has elaborated on these feminist criticisms of Wikipedia in her article “Feministische Kritik an und in der Wikipedia,” *kritische berichte*. Vol. 51, issue 1 (2023), DOI: <https://doi.org/10.11588/kb.2023.1.92830>.

work recognized as a standard reference in reputable external sources (Wikipedia, “Relevanzkriterien”). On the one hand, these criteria are “built on an installed base” (Star / Ruhleder 1996: 113) of the modern encyclopedic project which, in turn, are oriented towards existing structures such as the publishing industry with its specific barriers and exclusions. This makes it difficult to produce articles about people or topics that have not found their way into Western standard reference works due to a lack of documentation and “epistemic privilege” (Mignolo 2009: 166).

— On the other hand, these relevance criteria are formulated so openly that their interpretation becomes a point of contention. The level of strictness with which these are applied often depends on the topic itself. While anything that can be verified can be written, it can only be verified with sources that are already an exclusion criterion due to their media form. Matthew A. Vetter and Keon Mandell Pettway stated that with “its adherence to Western print culture (itself also an accompanying feature of Western Enlightenment), Wikipedia also marginalizes the knowledge-making practices of cultures with limited access to print sources” (2017). While there have been a few instances where this adherence was criticized and effectively overturned, these “interventions emphasize that Wikipedia is haunted by many of the structural inequalities, colonial and patriarchal focal points that also skew most other encyclopedias in terms of topics, profiles, and framings” (Agostinho et al. 2023: 6). The challenges and debates within Wikipedia’s editorial ecosystem illustrate how relevance criteria and quotable sources pose a systemic barrier that is often modulated in order to prevent or control content and users. For example, blogposts, fanzines, or oral histories can indeed be understood as reputable sources of information, but are often revised because they are not seen as authoritative as the *Encyclopedia Britannica*.

ANOTHER TOOLKIT: REPARATIVE QUEERFEMINIST MEDIA PRACTICES

— One strategy to deal with the inhospitable infrastructure on Wikipedia is the creation of supportive wiki pages as well as off-wiki safe spaces like mailing lists and digital or physical support groups. We also resorted to this strategy when, after the deletion request of the article “Feel Tank Chicago,” we agreed to edit and adjust it according to the criticism so that it would remain. User Count Count justified the deletion request with: “Encyclopedic relevance not demonstrated. In my opinion, ‘Feel Tank’ is not an established term” (Wikipedia, Löschkandidaten/17. September 2019 [my translation]). We tried to show, with the help of reports and newspaper

articles, that the queerfeminist group fulfills the relevance criteria and has already been widely received. What surprised us, however, was the unexpected support of user Pinin, who immediately joined the deletion discussion with an informed and lengthy post about the reception of Feel Tanks, Affect, and Queer Theory after Eve Sedgwick. Sedgwick's seminal work in Queer Theory, particularly the essay "Paranoid and Reparative Reading" (1997), introduces the concept of reparative reading as a transformative practice within literary and cultural analysis. Reparative reading stands in contrast to paranoid reading, which focuses on uncovering and exposing supposedly hidden motives and agendas. Reparative reading emphasizes a more affirmative approach to texts and narratives. As Mary Shnayien has precisely shown, Sedgwick's point is not to attribute greater validity to a reparative stance over a paranoid one, but rather to draw attention to the different outcomes that can arise from varying positions and situations. "Choosing a form of knowledge production that is reparative rather than paranoid draws different circles, designs different narratives, and so also changes the perceived possibilities for critique and thus for one's own action" (2022: 62 [my translation]). Applied to editing Wikipedia, the practice of "reparative critical practices [...] as changing and heterogeneous relational stances" (Sedgwick 1997: 8) could involve a shift from a purely exposing and anticipatory stance to one that seeks surprises and unforeseen alliances. In light of the above-sketched challenges, I will explore the potential for reparative queerfeminist media practices, understood as interventions by users dedicated to fostering a sense of care and collaboration. These interventions exemplify how queerfeminist engagement can challenge systemic biases and contribute to a more equitable representation of knowledge.

— A powerful starting point for thinking about reparative practices is by consulting artistic practices and artistic interventions towards archival encounters with missing knowledge, encyclopedic universalism, and alternative epistemological narratives. One vivid example can be found within the work of Feel Tank Chicago, whose Wikipedia article we tried so hard to save after our initial workshop. The Feel Tank Tool Kit serves to document important concepts and theorems that are formative for the work of the group. It is a thought-provoking approach to how general reference works, such as encyclopedias, could function differently. The unconventional pool of lemmata offers a compelling alternative model for encyclopedic knowledge collection, one that prioritizes the gathering of situated and particular understandings of terms and the pooling of diverse perspectives (Feel Tank, n.d.).

— Traditionally, encyclopedias have often been seen as repositories of objective and universally valid knowledge, striving for a neutral and rational stance on various topics. However, this conventional approach can inadvertently reinforce existing knowledge hierarchies and uphold dominant narratives. The Feel Tank Tool Kit challenges this paradigm by embracing partialness, polyphony, emotion, and situated context as integral components of knowledge. The experimental alphabet includes “terms with decidedly political connotations, such as struggle, revolution, protest, but also such as emotionality, empathy, desire, etc.” (Königshofer 2018: 14 [my translation]) and reframes how we conceptualize, standardize, and organize information. Instead of seeking a single definition for a term, this approach encourages the collection of multiple interpretations, experiences, and perspectives. It recognizes that terms and concepts as well as their meaning are inherently personal and contextual, shaped by individual experiences, cultural backgrounds, and socialization.

— This alternative model suggests that encyclopedic entries could incorporate a multiplicity of voices, emotions, and viewpoints. Rather than privileging a single authoritative perspective, such entries could serve as hubs for diverse narratives, anecdotes, and insights. This approach challenges the notion of a monolithic, one-size-fits-all definition. The “Feel Tank Wiki” offers an opportunity to reflect on the existing knowledge hierarchies within platforms like Wikipedia that often strive for a perceived neutrality. By embracing alternative models that acknowledge partiality and context, a vision of encyclopedias as dynamic sources that actively engage with the multiplicity of understanding rather than attempting to impose a single, normative perspective can be nourished.

— Daniela Agostinho, Katrine Dirckinck-Holmfeld, Nanna Bonde Thylstrup, and Kristin Veel have deployed Sedgwick’s notion of “reparative reading” for a concept of “reparative critical practice.” Rather than constituting a conclusive or final action, repair is characterized by the authors as “a process of ongoingness that emphasizes the need to continue to tend to” (2023: 12). This implies that repair, rather than simply restoring something to its previous state, “is tied to a poetic dimension” (ibid.: 12). With reference to Sedgwick, repair is situated as a dynamic, transformative, and everyday micro-labor in reshaping the past into something new. The authors propose that reparative practice involves acquiring the skills to cultivate “worlds of sustenance from infrastructures [...] in order to cultivate and live out a different future” (ibid.: 12).

Existing reparative queerfeminist media practices within Wikipedia are not limited to editing articles but encompass building supportive communities, engaging in discussions, and amplifying marginalized voices. Wiki support groups, for example, serve as a political move to counteract the exclusion and hostility that marginalized editors may encounter within the Wikipedia community. By fostering a sense of belonging and solidarity, these groups provide emotional support and mentorship. Cooperatives like *Art+Feminism*, *Noircir Wikipédia, les sans pagEs*, and *Who writes his_tory?* organize edit-a-thons and collaborative editing events focused on filling participatory and content gaps related to gender, race, and other marginalized identities. They bring together editors to collectively improve and create articles that center on women, Black, Indigenous, and People of Color, LGBTQIA+, and other underrepresented groups. From these support groups, queerfeminist reparative practices are organized to collectively intervene within the encyclopedic platform, thus undermining the infrastructural barriers of Wikipedia and tagging personal maps of fear with collaborative action.

Another strategic move in reparative queerfeminist media practices is the effort to bring backgrounded discussions to the forefront. Wikipedia's talk pages, where editors engage in discussions about article content and disputes, are often overlooked by the general readership. These discussions can be sites of contestation and negotiation, but they are not always visible to those outside the editing community. As a feminist political agenda, Matthew Vetter and Keon Mandell Pettitway have advocated for the inclusion of summaries or chapters on disputes and controversies directly on the main page of Wikipedia articles (2017). This approach aims to make the editorial process more transparent and accessible to the wider public, shedding light on the struggles and debates that shape the content. By elevating these discussions, the illusion of Wikipedia articles as neutral products of consensus is contested and its dynamic and processual nature is highlighted instead.

SHAPING A QUEERFEMINIST INFRASTRUCTURAL CRITIQUE When we successfully intervened in the deletion discussion with Pinin's support and the article's deletion request was finally withdrawn, we were relieved. User Count Count provided the discussion with the closing words: "Reception is now sufficiently presented. Deletion request withdrawn. It would be nice if the reception could be incorporated into the specialist literature" (Wikipedia, Löschkandidaten/17. September 2019 [my translation]). Nevertheless, this initial experience of the deletion discussion and criticism of the

Feel Tank Chicago article had consequences for our behavior on the platform. When editing articles now, we make sure that we include a chapter on “reception” that shows how much coverage the person or topic has received, and signals that this is a relevant addition to the encyclopedia. Telling this from our shared and my own experiences means telling it from a pretty privileged perspective. Framing this text with the relatively innocuous initial experience I had on Wikipedia is itself an expression of this privilege, as I did not encounter trolling, insults, or aggressive behavior targeting my body, language, race, as well as educational or social background. Having an extended confirmed Wiki user account and a user page that signals that I am a white cis-woman in academia, I know that in most cases I can engage in online discussions without fearing the risk of being personally attacked or harassed. This privilege does not negate gendered exclusions, but it informs my experience as well as my own topical biases.

— I have tried to show how Wikipedia's infrastructural barriers are built into its policies, standards, and guidelines that determine what or who can be represented in the encyclopedia. In addition to these structures built on an unevenly installed and biased basis, aspects of fear and epistemic hierarchies that permeate the social component of Wikipedia were also addressed. This resonates with the examination of digital infrastructures, highlighting the significance of questioning and reshaping the structures that underpin our information systems.

— One key lesson from Kern's *Feminist City* is the notion that feminist transformation often involves reimagining and redesigning the very infrastructure that shapes our lives. This resonates with the potential for change within Wikipedia's architecture. While Wikipedia operates within a volunteer-driven framework with limited editorial oversight, it is not immune to structural adjustments or workarounds that can facilitate queerfeminist interventions. Transforming entrenched structures, whether physical or digital, is a complex and often contentious process. Wikipedia's fundamental principles, editing norms, systemic biases, and resistance to change are challenges that queerfeminist editors must navigate. To the question of how to deal with this inhospitable architecture, I would like to respond with precisely those queerfeminist media practices that are dedicated to a reparative and infrastructural critique: On the one hand, the analysis and reflection of those transparently made barriers and exclusions. On the other hand, the establishment and nourishment of infrastructures of solidarity, as they already exist in the form of mailing lists, writing or support groups. My

friend and editor of the article, with whose words I would like to end here, told me that this shared experience has left in her “a certain defiance. In the sense that I was in a solidary writing context where it was possible to push the article through together.” (Voice message sent to the author, September 30, 2023).

// References

- Adler, Melissa (2016): Wikipedia and the Myth of Universality. In: *Nordisk Tidsskrift for Informationsvidenskab og Kulturformidling*. Vol. 5, issue 1, pp. 37–41.
- Agostinho, Daniela / Dirckinck-Holmfeld, Katrine / Thylstrup, Nanna Bonde / Veel, Kristin (2023): Infrapolitics, archival infrastructures and digital reparative practices. In: Schreibman, Susan / Rhody, Lisa (eds.), *Feminist Digital Humanities*. Champaign; IL: University of Illinois Press, pp. 1–12.
- Art+Feminism: About. <https://artandfeminism.org/about/> (May 8, 2024).
- Bee, Julia (2021): Lob des Fahrradfeminismus. In: *Zeitschrift für Medienwissenschaft, ZfM Online, GAAAP_ The Blog*, November 18, 2021. <https://zfmedienwissenschaft.de/online/lob-des-fahrrad-feminismus> (May 8, 2024).
- Boehmer, Elleke / Davies, Dominic (eds.) (2018): *Planned violence: Post/colonial urban infrastructure, literature and culture*. London, Palgrave Macmillan.
- Brunner, Claudia (2020): *Epistemische Gewalt: Wissen und Herrschaft in der kolonialen Moderne*. Bielefeld, transcript.
- Feel Tank (n.d.): FeelKit. In: Waybackmachine Internet Archive (saved December 6, 2010). <https://web.archive.org/web/20100612005129/https://coral.uchicago.edu/display/utopianfutures/FeelKit> (last visited September 30, 2023).
- Ford, Heather / Wajcman, Judy (2017): ‘Anyone can edit’, not everyone does: Wikipedia’s infrastructure and the gender gap. In: *Social studies of science*. Vol. 47, issue 4, pp. 511–527.
- Giese, Linus (2018): Transfeindlichkeit im Netz: Der Hass der Anderen, *Tagesspiegel* February 12, <https://www.tagesspiegel.de/gesellschaft/queerspiegel/der-hass-der-anderen-5277814.html> (May 8, 2024).
- Kern, Leslie (2021): *Feminist city: Claiming space in a man-made world*. London / New York, Verso Books.
- Königshofen, Eva (2018): Sometimes definitions are a desire – Feel Tank, ToolKits & feministische Wissenschaftskritik, unpublished term paper. Goethe-Universität Frankfurt am Main.
- Kosofsky Sedgwick, Eve (1997): Paranoid Reading and Reparative Reading; or, You’re So Paranoid, You Probably Think This Introduction is About You. In: Barale, Michele Aina / Goldberg, Johnathan / Moon, Micheal (eds.), *Touching Feeling: Affect, Pedagogy, Performativity*. Durham, NC, Duke University Press. pp. 123–152.
- Lander, Edgardo (2000): Eurocentrism and Colonialism in Latin American Social Thought. In: *Nepantla: Views from South*. Vol. 1, issue 3, pp. 519–532.
- Les sans pagEs (n.d.): <https://sanspages.org/> (May 8, 2024).
- Menking, Amanda / Erickson, Ingrid (2015): The heart work of Wikipedia: Gendered, emotional labor in the world’s largest online encyclopedia. In: *Proceedings of the 33rd annual ACM conference on human factors in computing systems*, pp. 207–210.
- Menking, Amanda / Erickson, Ingrid / Pratt, Wanda (2019): People who can take it: How women Wikipedians negotiate and navigate safety. In: *Proceedings of the 2019 CHI conference on human factors in computing systems*, pp. 1–14.
- Mignolo, Walter D. (2009): Epistemic Disobedience, Independent Thought and Decolonial Freedom. In: *Theory, Culture & Society*. Vol. 26, issues 7–8, pp. 159–181.
- Noicir Wikipedia (n.d.): <https://noicirwikipedia.org/fr/projets-pedagogiques/> (May 8, 2024).
- Paul, Ina Ulrike (2020): *Weltwissen. Das Eigene und das Andere in enzyklopädischen Lexika des langen 18. Jahrhunderts*. Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz.
- Quijano, Anibal (2007): Coloniality and Modernity/Rationality. In: *Cultural Studies*. Vol. 21, issues 2–3, pp. 168–178.
- Shnayien, Mary (2022): Sichere Räume, reparative Kritik. Überlegungen zum Arbeiten mit verletzendem Material. In: *Zeitschrift für Medienwissenschaft*. Vol. 14, issue 1, pp. 54–65.
- Star, Susan Leigh / Ruhleder, Karen (1996): Steps Toward an Ecology of Infrastructure: Design and Access for Large Information Spaces. In: *Information Systems Research*. Vol. 7, issue 1, pp. 111–134.
- Star, Susan Leigh (1990). Power, technology and the phenomenology of conventions: on being allergic to onions. In: *The Sociological Review*. Vol. 38, issue 1, pp. 26–56.
- Tripodi, Francesca (2023): Ms. Categorized: Gender, notability, and inequality on Wikipedia. In: *New Media & Society*. Vol. 25, issue 7, pp. 1687–1707.
- Vetter, Matthew A. / Pettway, Keon (2017): Hacking hetero/normative logics: Queer feminist media

praxis in Wikipedia. In: Technoculture. Vol. 7, <https://tcjournal.org/Vol7/hacking-hetero-normative-logics/> (May 8, 2024).
Voice message sent to the author, September 30, 2023.
Wagner, Claudia, et al. (2016): Women through the glass ceiling: gender asymmetries in Wikipedia. In: EPJ Data Science. Vol. 5, pp. 1–24.
Who writes His_tory? (n.d.): Wir. <https://whowriteshistory.me/index.php/info/> (May 8, 2024).
Wikipedia (n.d.): Feel Tank Chicago. https://de.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Feel_Tank_Chicago&action=history (May 8, 2024).
Wikipedia (n.d.): Gender-Data-Gap. <https://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Gender-Data-Gap> (May 8, 2024).
Wikipedia (n.d.): Geschlechterverteilung in der Wikipedia. https://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Geschlechterverteilung_in_der_Wikipedia (May 8, 2024).
Wikipedia (n.d.): Löschkandidaten/14. März 2023. [https://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wikipedia:L%C3%B6schkandidaten/14._M%C3%A4rz_2023#Gender-Data-Gap_\(bleibt\)](https://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wikipedia:L%C3%B6schkandidaten/14._M%C3%A4rz_2023#Gender-Data-Gap_(bleibt)) (May 8, 2024).
Wikipedia (n.d.): Löschkandidaten/17. September 2019. [https://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wikipedia:L%C3%B6schkandidaten/17._September_2019#Feel_Tank_Chicago_\(LAZ\)](https://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wikipedia:L%C3%B6schkandidaten/17._September_2019#Feel_Tank_Chicago_(LAZ)) (May 8, 2024).
Wikipedia (n.d.): Neutraler Standpunkt. https://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wikipedia:Neutraler_Standpunkt (May 8, 2024).
Wikipedia (n.d.): Relevanzkriterien/Autoren. <https://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wikipedia:Relevanzkriterien#Autoren> (May 8, 2024).
Wikipedia (n.d.): WikiProject Countering systemic bias. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wikipedia:WikiProject_Countering_systemic_bias (May 8, 2024).
Wörz, Aaron (2022): Transfeindlichkeit im Netz: Die Hetze ausschalten. taz online, September 11, <https://taz.de/Transfeindlichkeit-im-Netz!/5880999/> (May 8, 2024).
Zheng, Xiang / Chen, Jiajing / Yan, Erjia / Ni, Chaoqun (2022): Gender and country biases in Wikipedia citations to scholarly publications. In: Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology. Vol. 74, issue 2, pp. 219–233.

// About the Author

Hannah Schmedes is a Ph.D. candidate at the research group “The Documentary” at Ruhr University Bochum, completing a dissertation on feminist infrastructural critique. She is part of the feminist collective Wiki Riot Squad running writing workshops dealing with Wikipedia’s publishing and interface policies. Recent publications: “Am Saum des Sichtbaren. Eine Annäherung an Feministische Servers” in *Konstanzer Hefte zur Medienwissenschaft* 85, 2022 and “The im:permeable Sieve. Following Gendered Imaginaries of Containers and Leaks” in *Liquidity, Flows, Circulation. The Cultural Logic of Environmentalization*, Denecke, Mathias, Kuhn, Holger and Stürmer, Milan (eds.), Zurich and Berlin: Diaphanes, 2022.

// FKW is supported by the Mariann Steegmann Institute and Cultural Critique / Cultural Analysis in the Arts ZHdK

Sigrid Adorf / Kerstin Brandes / Edith Futscher / Kathrin Heinz / Marietta Kesting / Julia Noah Munier / Franziska Rauh / Mona Schieren / Rosanna Umbach / Kea Wienand / Anja Zimmermann
// www.fkw-journal.de

// License

This work is licensed under the CC-BY-NC-ND License 4.0. To view a copy of this license, visit: <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/legalcode>

