



# **Purling Politics: Crafting Resistance with the Knitting Nannas Against Gas**

**Melina Ey**

The University of Newcastle  
melina.ey@newcastle.edu.au

---

---

## **Abstract**

In recent years, growing dissatisfaction with predominant forms of political resistance has underpinned pursuits of ‘alternative’ forms of activism. One example of this is the way in which growing interest in creative and craft-based acts of resistance has led to the coining of the term ‘craftivism’ (or craft activism). Often posited as a gentler, more inclusive form of political engagement by its advocates, practices framed as ‘craftivist’ are gaining increasing popularity and visibility. However, emergent work conceptualising craftivism has thus far tended to focus on (and to critique) a somewhat limited representation of the bodies and practices that use craft in/as resistance. In response, this paper aims to deepen current conceptions of the use of craft in/as resistance, using insights from feminist geography to foreground the already existing multiplicity of actors and practices that craft resistance in varied ways. Drawing on research with the Knitting Nannas Against Gas, this paper deepens and expands current considerations of who crafts resistance, and what is (and can yet be) crafted as resistance.

## **Keywords**

Knitting Nannas Against Gas; craftivism; resistance; activism

---

---

## **Introduction**

Who resists, and how?

More than simply being a matter of curiosity, this question continues to be deeply political.

Predominant representations of political resistance which “champion and romanticise antagonistic, vocal and demonstrative forms of protest” (Pottinger 2017, 215), and which also construct



“binaries between activists and their other” (Chatterton and Pickerill 2010, 487) have historically erased a host of other diverse bodies, concerns and practices when determining what resistance is, and can be. Whilst the public demonstrations and acts of protest that are evoked in predominant representations of resistance are of profound consequence, it is critical that we also continue to push beyond these to consider what else resistance might be, and do (Martin et al 2007).

It is these political possibilities (and possibilities for politics) that a feminist imaginary of possibility invites us to attend to. For Gibson-Graham, the “ontological contours” of such a feminist imaginary can lead us “to see the whole world” as terrain through which myriad possibilities can be performed, and are *also* “already being enacted” (Gibson-Graham 2014, 82). Whilst deployed by Gibson-Graham primarily within the context of community economies, these ontological contours have been increasingly taken up elsewhere, “opening up space for...different political imaginations” (Gibson-Graham 2014, 82) in multiple places and ways (Dombroski 2016). If resistance itself is, among other things, “an act that invokes and produces new possibilities, new worlds” (Wright 2014, 705), our approach in thinking about resistance must be pivoted not just towards the possibility of the not-yet, but also towards widening recognition of the ways in which politics and resistance is *already* being enacted otherwise.

Whilst geography has certainly seen a widening of framings of resistance, particularly through acknowledgement of ‘quiet’ and everyday resistance (Chatterton 2006, Martin et al 2007, Horton and Kraftl 2009, Askins 2015, Pottinger 2017), Boothroyd and colleagues (2017, 718) recently reiterated the importance of continuing to widen the definitional bounds placed around activism and resistance, calling for the ongoing recognition of the “multiplicity of different kinds of spaces that can generate possibilities” within resistance. One such space in which these multiplicities are increasingly being explored is through practices described as ‘craftivist’.

First attributed to Betsy Greer in the early 2000s, the term ‘craftivism’ emerged from Greer’s struggle to describe the “intrinsic connection” she observed between “*craft* and *activism*”, and to emphasise the role of craft and ‘making’ as avenues for resistance (2011, 178). In combining the terms ‘craft’ and ‘activism’, Greer hoped to encourage “people to use imagery and creativity as their activism” (2011, 178) in ways that didn’t involve “yelling or placard waving” or other more abrasive public expressions of resistance (2011, 183). In other words, Greer’s notion of craftivism sought to describe and encourage creativity as a way of literally ‘making’ resistance and offering an alternative to more recognisable acts of public resistance (such as marches and protests).

Resistance activities situated as ‘craftivist’ are steadily gaining public recognition, with commonly acknowledged examples including the work of The Craftivist Collective (No Date), and movements such as The Pussyhat Project (No Date). This growing prominence is also beginning to be reflected within the academy, with increasing consideration of the practices of craftivism gathering momentum (Black 2017, Clarke 2016, Greer 2014, 2011, Newmeyer 2008, Roberston 2011). However, within this emerging body of work, the overall tendency to focus on (and to critique) a series of somewhat narrow representations of craftivists as white, middle class, heteronormative “thirty-something...politico-hipsters” (Newmeyer 2008, 440) and to predominantly limit analysis of crafting practice to the making of fibre crafts and objects, runs the risk of obscuring a much wider array of crafters engaging in resistance in myriad ways.

Not unlike resistance itself, craftivism is also comprised of multiple and diverse practices, with innumerable possibilities for its practice and its potentiality. Whilst critique remains vital in the work of displacing resistance practices and logics that marginalise and erase, this must also be accompanied by attention to the already existing ways in which diverse subjects are performing resistance otherwise. Neglecting this not only inadvertently reinforces predominant framings of crafting subjects and

practices, but it also sustains the continued invisibility of already present multiplicity and difference in spaces of resistance.

In addition to the important work of critiquing enactments of craftivism that erase and marginalise diverse bodies and practices, the contribution this paper makes is to attend to some of the diverse ways in which craft and resistance is also already being enacted. To do this, I begin by framing these practices in terms of a wider notion of ‘crafted resistance’<sup>1</sup>, to describe actors and interventions that may not necessarily identify themselves as ‘craftivist’ or ‘activist’<sup>2</sup>, but which enact crafted forms of resistance. Using a feminist imaginary of possibility, I draw attention to the work of the Knitting Nannas Against Gas<sup>3</sup>, who perform crafted resistance in ways that unsettle predominant conceptions of who crafts resistance, and what can be (and is) crafted as resistance.

This paper begins by situating crafted resistance within a broader landscape of resistance thinking and practice. It then explores some of the criticisms currently levelled at crafted resistance within the academy, as well as some of the limitations of current framings of craftivism. The paper then introduces a feminist imaginary of possibility, and the Knitting Nannas, to highlight just one example of the already existing multiplicity of bodies and practices that subvert predominant crafted resistance conceptualisations. This paper also draws on the work of the Knitting Nannas to trouble the predominant framing of ‘craft’ itself, opening up the notion of craft beyond the crafting of fibres and materials, towards the crafting of subjectivities, encounters and the past/not-yet here.

### **Romanticising Resistance: The ‘Great Man of History’**

Over a decade ago, Sparke (2008, 423) lamented that the notion or “category” of resistance was “too often left uncomplicated”. Whilst Sparke’s own reflections are situated in a more macro-scaled conceptualisation of responses to neoliberalism and globalization, his reflections on the ‘romanticism’ permeating representations of resistance remain pertinent. This romanticism, underpinned by particular “assumptions about autonomous action”, has routinely construed resistance in “existential and ageographical terms” – collapsing a diverse array of politics, bodies and actions into a singular, heroic meta-narrative of a “universalized human spirit” (Sparke 2008, 423). This is reiterated by Chatterton and Pickerill (2010) who have also argued that:

The twentieth century has been preoccupied with the ‘great man of history’, the militant figure who is dedicated to revolutionary change and detached from the mundanity of everyday reality. Here, resistance evokes visible acts fighting an objective oppressor...This revolutionary agent of history...seeks truth and revenge against oppression. For the militant, resistance always comes after oppression. There is always oppression to fight and a state of grace, now lost, to be regained.

Indeed, much research on political and social action has continued to retain a “bias towards adversarial social movement mobilization and highly visible social conflict” (Yates 2015, 237), reflecting a very particular and exclusionary framing of politics and its possibilities. In grappling with the exclusionary nature of this prevailing representation of resistance, Sparke (2008, 434) also reflected

---

<sup>1</sup> Unless specifically referring to practices and actors who identify as ‘craftivist’.

<sup>2</sup> See Bobel (2007) for an exploration of some of the challenges associated with activist identities.

<sup>3</sup> Hereafter also referred to as the Knitting Nannas, or the Nannas.

that “breaking the frame of what counts as ‘political’ might even be argued to be one of the major theoretical lessons of studying resistance without romance”. Askins (2009, 8) has similarly cautioned against ‘reifying’ one specific practice of resistance as “*the way to enact/enable social change*”. For Askins (2009, 8), such an approach produces knowledges about resistance that “lose sight of”, and often erases entirely, “the ways in which indirect, *less obviously political* ways of doing...also affect change”.

### **Troubling Resistance**

Feminist geography has long troubled, indeed, long resisted, the academy’s historically constrained characterisation of both resistance itself, and of those who can, and do, resist. Feminist geographers have insisted on the importance of acknowledging the ways in which “particular voices and bodies are persistently left out” and are rendered invisible by hegemonic knowledges of politics and its potentialities (Mott and Cockayne 2017, 955). Feminist geography has also sought to “reclaim and analyse sites, voices and ways of knowing the world epistemologically and methodologically that produce difference and disparities” (Mountz and Hyndman 2006 p. 447). This has involved both a refusal to be “fixated on the global as the ultimate scale of successful activism” and a continued “orientation to the local, daily and bodily” (Gibson-Graham 2005, 131).

For feminist geographers, the body itself continues to be privileged as an “active site of political engagement and resistance” (Mountz 2018, 761). Particular attention is paid not just to the representation and inclusion/exclusion of particular bodies, but also to embodied subjectivities which negotiate and “move[s] through space and time, revealing power relations along the way” (Mountz 2018, 762). Furthermore, the “taken-for-granted, mundane and everyday routines of women’s lives” are repositioned as “central” to knowledge and politics (Dyck 2005, 236), as part of a longstanding interrogation of the “limits of local/global binaries” through drawing both “the global and the intimate into the fold of quotidian life” (Mountz and Hyndman 2006 pp 447-8).

Furthermore, increasing emphasis placed on the emotional and affective nature of social life within geography more broadly has also facilitated increasing acknowledgment of resistance as “emotionally laden, relational, hybrid, corporeal and contingent” (Chatterton 2006, 260). Firstly, this has contributed to shifting predominant understandings of what public acts of resistance (and their possibilities) can be and do. For Routledge (2012, 449), “the subversive power of humour” and the mobilisation of emotions not traditionally associated with public resistance has the capacity to “deregulate conduct and fashion liberatory feeling rules of political action”. Reflecting on time spent with the Clandestine Insurgent Rebel Clown Army during the 2005 G8 meeting at Gleneagles, Scotland, Routledge highlights the way in which emotions and affects can be deployed in resistance in unexpected ways (such as clowning during anti-globalisation actions), fostering “emotional resonance”, affinity and solidarity through laughter and whimsy (2012, 441). In reflecting on a women’s march in Oaxaca, Mexico, Arenas (2015, 1125) also emphasises the ways in which emotions and affects not only motivate and pervade social movements, but are also essential to “articula[ting] people together” and “generating solidarities” and social change. For Arenas, the women involved in the march “transformed their place in society not by claiming rights granted or guaranteed by the state, but by producing an emotionally charged, shared, and visceral sense of togetherness” (2015, 1135) that resonated well beyond the initial ‘moment’ of social action, and garnered new forms of political subjectivity.

### **Everyday/Resistance**

For feminist geographers, and for geographers engaging with the emotive/affective nature of social life, the importance of acknowledging the ways in which “a range of activities” are already

political (Martin et al 2007, 78) remains paramount. Indeed, longstanding distinctions between “everyday life” and “activism” are being rendered “increasingly irrelevant”, particularly in light of the growing acknowledgement that the everyday is “where we make our worlds and where our worlds make us” (Pink 2012, 4-5). Horton and Kraftl (2009, 21) have advocated for the recognition of ‘implicit activism’s; “activisms which are politicised, affirmative and potentially transformative, but which are modest, quotidian, and proceed with little fanfare”. Reflecting on the potential closure of a children’s centre in the UK, Horton and Kraftl (2009, 21) consider the ways in which this prospect elicited and “made visible” already existing “affective/everyday bonds of care” that constituted often overlooked, but politically salient forms of activism. In essence, they argue that “everyday, affective bonds and acts can ultimately constitute political activism and commitment” (2009, 14).

Prefigurative activism, or the enactment of “the forms, relations and ideas that constitute...political goal[s]” through everyday life (Dyson and Jeffrey 2018, 573), further emphasises the liminality of activism/the everyday. For Yates (2015, 238), everyday practices of food provisioning and labour sharing through social centres in Barcelona also demonstrate the simultaneous negotiation and enactment of “values”, “politicised identity” and ultimately “social change”. Véron (2016, 767) also situates the vegan movement in France as both prefigurative and as praxis, or an “act of applying or practicing ideas”. For Véron, the “everyday changes advocated and practiced by vegans” (specifically in negotiating everyday life in ways that exclude forms of animal exploitation) “are not part of a lifestyle movement at the periphery of the larger, political animal rights movement; to vegans, this agenda is the movement itself” (2016, 767). In the practice of monthly vegan street fairs, and in the sharing of vegan food in public space, Véron (2016, 763) also emphasises the way in which these kinds of practices stand as “an enacted way of opposing dominant ideologies, based on everyday practices” and relations of care.

Pottinger (2017, 215) echoes this in her emphasis on “the everyday embodied repetitions and practices of care that make modest, yet purposeful, contributions to progressive social and environmental goals”. Reflecting on time spent with communities of seed savers, Pottinger (2017, 221) argues that practices such as seed saving can be considered a form of quiet activism: as “small, everyday, embodied acts” that can be “implicitly” and/or “explicitly political in nature”. These communities of seed savers framed their work as a form of environmental conservation and means of resisting “the corporate control of food and seed systems” (Pottinger 2017, 215) by reclaiming the skills and practices of seed saving and the means of food cultivation. Importantly, Pottinger (2017, 221) argues that the work of the seed savers in her research demonstrates that “the quiet activism inherent within practices of gardening, crafting and making holds potential to challenge, resist and rework social, environmental and economic relations” in the everyday. It is these practices of making and crafting which have also garnered particular interest in recent years, and which have underpinned the emergence of the umbrella term ‘craftivism’.

### **Making Resistance: Craftivism**

In paying attention to the myriad ways in which resistance is performed, craftivism poses yet another disruption to the romanticised stereotypes that have pervaded predominant representations of resistance. As already acknowledged, the term ‘craftivism’ was first formalised in the work of Betsy Greer in the early 2000s. Greer herself concedes that this is a somewhat complex attribution, reflecting that “its usage came about thanks to a few phenomena occurring simultaneously” and that “from the very beginning, my use of the term *craftivism* was born from discussion” and exchange (2011, 178-9). For Greer, craftivism offers an alternative means to engage in resistance and articulate different visions for politics:

The very essence of craftivism lies in creating something that gets people to ask questions; we invite others to join a conversation about the social and political intent of our creations. Unlike more traditional forms of activism, which can be polarising, there is a back-and-forth in craftivism...we forment dialogue and thus help the world become a better place (2014, 8).

More than simply being an alternative to more established methods of resistance, craftivism draws on unique affective and emotive resonances to capture attention and elicit responses in often unexpected ways (Price 2015). Reflecting on the Pink Tank Project (forming part of protests against the Iraq War), Black and Burisch (2011, 207) suggest that the wrapping of a bright pink knitted blanket around “such a threatening object in public space may seem like a disarmingly absurd gesture, but the dramatic use of the crafted object...creates a rupture in the ways in which the public interacts with the tank” and with the public commemoration of warfare. Such projects strategically harness the “familiarity of knitted material and its ordinariness”, and the surprise produced through its unexpected deployment in public discourse around warfare, to open spaces of dialogue, exchange and response. It is the perceived ordinariness of craft which, for Price, “belies” its “extraordinary potential” as a tool “to interrogate the urban experience” and expectations of politics (2015, 90).

Furthermore, the deployment of craft within public space has also been used to rupture prevailing stereotypes and binaries regarding both the nature of craft itself, and where it takes place. Routinely represented as ‘conservative’, ‘private’, ‘domestic’ and ‘feminine’, craftivist interventions have also sought to trouble the gendered stereotypes affixed to craft, and the devaluing of other activities and practices which (like craft) are often framed as ‘domestic’. Whilst “domestic craft practices have historically been considered unproductive activities”, there have been increasing efforts by craftivists to legitimise the political and social value of craft by “drawing it out of the ‘hidden’ zones and into public space” (Black 2017, 700). Performing practices routinely stereotyped as ‘feminine’ and ‘private’ in public space has also been used to “evoke a gender politics about who or what can occupy or be seen in public, and how” (Black 2017, 701), and to trouble delineations between (and devaluing of) spaces and practices on the basis of gender binaries. Using and making crafts in public space “turns the interiority of the domestic outward” (Bratich and Brush 2011, 237), bringing attention to the “explicitly gendered” nature of negotiating public space by “reweave[ing] discrete boundaries between public and private” (Black 2017, 701).

Craftivist interventions have also been positioned as having “a political and conceptual focus” on “the work involved in making” itself (Black and Burisch 2011, 205). Situated within the wider anti-consumerist DIY movement (McKay 1998, Portwood-Stacer 2012) and DIY punk ethic (Dunn 2016), the skills and practices associated with making (and with craft) have also been deployed as part of a wider effort to “promote autonomy outside of conventional governance models” and capitalist systems of production and consumption (Carr and Gibson 2016, 300). The skills and practices associated with making, in this sense, become profoundly political acts of resistance in moving “away from a reliance on mass manufacture” towards self-sufficiency and “community interdependence” (Turney 2009, 175) in more-than-capitalist worlds.

Disenfranchisement not just with capitalist consumer culture, but also with more “standard forms of protest” (such as “marches, sit-ins, petitions, and chanting”) have arguably also sustained the growing visibility and legitimacy of craft in/as resistance (Newmeyer 2008, 456). Indeed, craftivism has been increasingly posited as an inclusive alternative for those who “want to be activists but are not comfortable with overtly confrontational forms of activism” (Newmeyer 2008, 457). Turney highlights that “the familiarity and accessibility” of crafts such as “knitting offers the potential for large numbers of people to literally make social comment” (2009, 204-5) and to be included in spaces of protest and resistance. An often referenced example of this is the Revolutionary Knitting Circle (Turney 2009,

204) during the 2002 G8 Summit in Calgary, Canada where the “synthesis of craft activity and political protest or commentary” used knitting as “peaceful and accessible rallying points for action, discussion and awareness” amongst a large number of participants (Black and Burisch 2011, 206). The increasing use of craft as a form of public resistance also continues to blur “the political and the personal”, emphasising a host of ways in which resistance can be undertaken through activities that are often framed as ‘mundane’ and ‘ordinary’ (Newmeyer 2008, 452).

### Critiquing Craftivism

Whilst craftivism continues to experience considerable popularity, critiques and considerations of its limitations are also emerging. Importantly, the establishment of the term ‘craftivism’ does not mark the beginning of crafted resistance, indeed alternative acts of crafted resistance have always been taking place (Greer 2011). Such interventions are countless, with examples of craft-based political interventions predating the term ‘craftivism’ including the knitters of the Women’s Peace Camp Antinuclear Protests (Robertson 2011, 185), the AIDS Quilt in Washington DC (Newmeyer 2008, 451), and the longstanding “role of textiles in resistances around the globe and across time” including “hand-weaving in the Indian independence movement” and “remembrance quilts made in post-apartheid South Africa” (Robertson 2011, 186). Whilst proponents of craftivism have acknowledged this to some degree, this has also formed the basis of some of the emerging critiques of craftivist thinking and practice. For Robertson (2011, 186), craftivist histories are ambiguous at best, and form part of “a trail of activism constantly broken, crossed over, and erased”. However, as Clarke reminds us, “intentionally or not” craftivists do draw from particular political and feminist histories (2016, 299). If we acknowledge that no social intervention can function in a temporal vacuum, it is paramount that we then ask which, and whose histories are privileged through particular craftivist responses and acts of resistance.

This concern with the contemporary exclusions and erasures within craftivist interventions forms part of Black’s (2017) critique of the Pussyhat Project during the 2017 Women’s March on Washington. On the one hand, the knitting and wearing of pink ‘Pussyhats’ by participants during these marches has been argued to have made female bodies and subjectivities visible, and to have engaged an “accessible and multi-scalar” form of public resistance that cultivated solidarities and promoted “participation in the spirit of political activism and change” (Black 2017, 702). However, Black (2017, 704) also cautions that “contemporary craft activism, such as the Pussyhat Project, engages a de-historicized, universalizing, *post-feminist* ethos” that “has the capacity to undo feminism” by commodifying and neoliberalizing the radical politics of the feminist movement.

For Butler (2013, 44), a post-feminist logic is “incredibly ambivalent”, as it “simultaneously rejects feminist activism in favor of feminine consumption and celebrates the success of feminism while declaring its irrelevance”. This is particularly apparent through particular expressions of the ‘new domesticity’ ethos (entangled with interventions like the Pussyhat project), in which “women’s (historical) relationship to domesticity” is celebrated and ‘reclaimed’ through the ‘choice’ to engage in activities such as craft (Black 2017, 705). However, growing emphasis on “choice” and “happiness” as key motivations for some craftivists also “represents the influence of a neoliberal discourse” and a “slippage in the use of key feminist concepts”, particularly regarding the primary objectives of feminist interventions (ie ‘happiness’ and ‘choice’, as opposed to gender equality) (Kelly 2013, 138). Turney (2009, 215) similarly reflects on the ways in which the radical use of craft has the capacity to be co-opted and commercialised more broadly, with “the meaning of making” becoming “lost as the fashion for knitting” (and crafted resistance) gains popularity. For Turney (2009, 215), this popularity runs the risk of destroying “the potency of both act and object, commodifying it for a mass market through mass-produced kits, patterns and causes”, in turn erasing “its marginal status”.

Even more concerningly, diverse bodies and subjectivities are also routinely conflated and collapsed through universalising post-feminist logics into a singular “white, middle class, heterosexual, cis-gendered, able bodied subject” in craft-based resistance like the Pussyhat Project (Black 2017, 704). In placing an emphasis on ‘choice’, and the allegedly attained universal freedom to choose to craft resistance, interventions like the Pussyhat Project inadvertently “negate[s]” and flatten “discussions around issues [of] race, class and sexuality” (Black 2017, 706). Consequently, “white, middle-class, able bodied, heterosexual women” are unproblematically rendered “synonymous with the identity of ‘crafter’”, normalizing “the racial and class privilege that is associated with having the time and the economic, cultural and social capital necessary to engage in craft”, or to frame labour as ‘craft’ in the first place (Black 2017, 706).

The post-feminist emphasis on ‘choice’, and the consequent erasure of the privilege that sustains the capacity for particular bodies to ‘choose’ to craft, has arguably facilitated further exclusionary outcomes, particularly within the Pussyhat project. Whilst aspiring to be “symbolic and not representative”, the symbolism deployed through the Pussyhat Project has also reinforced an essentialist “stereotype of women” and women’s bodies (and of the bodies that craft resistance) (Gökarıksel and Smith 2017 p.636, see also Boothroyd et al 2017). This has been particularly evident through both the “unconscious and uninterrogated ‘pinkness’ of the pussy hat” itself, and of the way in which genitalia has been used within the Pussyhat project to “define inclusion in the category ‘woman’” (Gökarıksel and Smith 2017 p.636) – reinforcing the conflation and erasure of a multiplicity of crafting bodies within the Pussyhat Project.

### **Making Space for Difference**

Kelly (2014, 143) argues whilst knitting (and other forms of crafting) can be used in radical ways, crafting in and of itself is not necessarily a practice of resistance. Rather, the radical potential of craft is entirely dependent on its context and the way in which it is deployed. In light of this, if craft is “to be used as a tool of substantive social change, it must be engaged with in such a way that it does not become a mask for, and/or an active agent in, processes of injustice, exclusion and privilege” (Black 2017, 707). Black also highlights that “feminist craft-activist practices”, just like any other form of resistance, must “be understood as existing along a continuum” (2017, 707), and that in “holding these two sides together – the critical and the creative – perhaps new strategies for using craft towards substantive, collaborative justice...will become more tangible” (Black 2017, 707-8).

Whilst critiquing oppressive logics and practices play an integral role in their displacement, making “visible the hidden and alternative” resistance practices that “*everywhere* abound”, and positioning these as “prevalent and viable”, also opens up possibilities for displacement of a different kind (Gibson-Graham 2006, xxiv). Understanding research as performative, as an action that “produces worlds”, means that framing and articulating worlds in particular ways “validates some realities whilst silencing and disappearing others” (Wright 2014, 723). In primarily directing our efforts to critiquing a limited range of examples of crafted resistance, we can also inadvertently close down and conceal already present difference. However, in also attending to, and making space for, a multiplicity of resistance practices that already exist, we can also continue to displace the prominence of hegemonic representations of crafted resistance.

In essence, our critiques of resistance practices and logics that erase and marginalise must also be accompanied by attention to already existing multiplicity. In cultivating and posturing ourselves as “ready to encounter” the many “unmapped possibilities” and acts of resistance that are already present “in every situation” (Gibson-Graham 2006, xxxvii), we can begin to engage an imaginary (and a politics) of possibility. Such a “differentiating imagination” makes space for acknowledging other

potential and already existing resistance practices, thereby “calling into question the marginalisation” and dismissal “of the nondominant” (Gibson-Graham 2006, xxxi-xxxii).

Importantly, this “politics of possibility...cannot simply be put “out there” in the world with the hope that it will flourish”, but rather, must be “sustained by the continual work of making and remaking a space for it to exist” (Gibson Graham 2006, xxvii). In addition to the critique of exclusionary crafted resistance framings and actions, this paper contributes to making space for the already present multiplicity of bodies and subjectivities which craft resistance otherwise. There are innumerable ways and places to engage this work; however, I begin in two places specifically:

### 1. Making Space for Other Crafters

In paying attention to, and gesturing towards, other bodies and subjectivities that craft resistance, we can begin to actively displace the hegemony of the increasingly critiqued and exclusionary stereotype of the ‘crafter’. This involves not just intervening in who might yet craft resistance, but in disrupting the erasures of hegemonic representations by highlighting an already present multiplicity of crafters.

### 2. Making Space for Other Crafting

An imaginary of possibility also opens up space not just for other crafters, but for other crafting. Here, craft itself becomes distinctly more than the delineations prescribed in much of the literature on craft and resistance. Whilst craft is enacted through fibres, textiles and objects, craft (and crafted resistance) is also more than this. Turney reminds us that to refer to something as ‘craft’ is, among other things, to describe “something that has a forward trajectory that cuts through obstacles” (2009, 202). Newmeyer too has alluded to the ways in which ‘craftiness’ “not only implies that people are resourceful and creative in their use of material (physical and stylistic) but more importantly, that they use culture in a cunning, elusive and resistant fashion” (2008, 446). Bratich and Brush’s use of the concept ‘fabriculture’ also troubles the distinction between craft and technology, and broader socio-cultural bifurcations, and repositions craft not just as a set of creative practices, but “as power (as the ability or capacity to act)” (2011, 234).

Craft is certainly used to resist, to intervene in the becoming of politics and lives. However, in continuing to widen our perceptions of what it is to *do* the work of craft, we can also begin to pay attention to the ways in which resistance, and politics itself, is also crafted in turn. Here, the crafting of political subjectivities, performances, encounters, resistance histories, even the future itself, all take place alongside the crafting of fibres and materials. In this sense, when we talk of crafted resistance, we can also begin to gesture towards the unexpected and disruptive ways in which resistance itself is crafted.

As part of the work of making room for a multiplicity of crafting actors and practices, I now turn to the crafted resistance work of the Knitting Nannas Against Gas.

## **The Knitting Nannas Against Gas (KNAG)**

The Knitting Nannas Against Gas (KNAG) are a resistance movement which facilitates and harnesses the creative resistance of older women who are concerned about the consequences of natural resource extraction for Australia’s land, water and people. Starting in Lismore, New South Wales, with just two solitary knitters outside a Coal Seam Gas (CSG) exploration site in 2012, the Knitting Nannas have spread nationwide, with groups now also beginning to form internationally in the UK and the USA. In addition to their iconic yellow and black paraphernalia, the Knitting Nannas are also known for a very distinct approach to public resistance, namely they sit, and knit. Near extraction sites, outside extractive corporation’s head offices, and outside the offices of Members of Parliament (MPs) on an

often weekly basis, Knitting Nannas can be found knitting and purling away at ‘knit-ins’<sup>4</sup> in a host of unexpected and surprising places.

The Knitting Nannas use interventions like knit-ins to bring public attention to the destructive nature of natural resource extraction. In doing this, the Nannas work to inform both individuals and communities about the harm caused by extractive practices, and to encourage individuals and communities to also challenge the institutional frameworks and actors that enable these practices. For the Nannas, this is also accompanied by a commitment to bear witness to the destruction of land and communities through natural resource extraction (Knitting Nannas Against Gas, No Date A). Bearing witness is a distinctly “political act that resists” the “erasure” of stories, suffering and lives, and challenges constructions of whose experiences, knowledges and lives “matter” by those in positions of power (Gillespie 2016, 576-577). Strictly refraining from political party affiliation (Nannas “annoy all politicians equally”), the Knitting Nannas also non-violently challenge claims made by decision makers and industry leaders about extractive practices, using creative expression to publicly trouble their statements and claims (Knitting Nannas Against Gas, No Date A).

Furthermore, the Knitting Nannas also subvert and challenge prevailing stereotypes of activists and support the participation of those who have traditionally struggled to engage in resistance (particularly older women) in asserting “their right to protest” (Knitting Nannas Against Gas, No Date A). This subversion is central to their interventions, challenging not just the harmful nature of extractive projects, but also challenging prevailing stereotypes of who engages in protest, and how.

As part of research exploring women’s resistance of natural resource extraction, I spent time with two Knitting Nanna loops<sup>5</sup> in the New South Wales (NSW) towns of Lismore and Dubbo, Australia. I also attended the 2017 Knitting Nannas ‘Nannual Conference’ in Narrabri, a rural NSW community experiencing considerable disruption as a result of proposed coal seam gas extraction (Sherval et al 2018). During this time, I conducted 5 recorded, semi-structured interviews with individual Nannas<sup>6</sup> from Lismore and Dubbo, who have all been de-identified using pseudonyms in this paper.

As someone outside the Knitting Nannas, who also occupies the uneven power position of ‘researcher’, my intentions in using semi-structured interviews were to make space for my own perceptions to be interrupted and re-directed by the Nannas who shared their time and reflections with me. After ensuring that Nannas were able to edit and approve transcripts from these exchanges, I also discussed the key themes that shaped this paper with a Nanna from each loop. When reading through transcripts, and reflecting on my own observations, I sought not only to discern key ‘themes’ as such, but also to begin ‘reading for difference’ in these transcripts and personal reflections (Gibson-Graham 2006), particularly when it came to my own somewhat romanticised conceptions of what resistance is and does. For me, this specifically involved not just looking for resistance as the stopping (or preventing) of something (ie an extractive project), but *also* as enacting “alternative way[s] of doing, thinking or being” and generating “new norms, new worlds” (Wright 2014, 707).

---

<sup>4</sup> Knit-ins are events where Nannas meet regularly in public space to knit, raise awareness about natural resource exploitation, and engage with the local community (Knitting Nannas Against Gas, No Date C).

<sup>5</sup> A term used to describe the Knitting Nannas’ local groups.

<sup>6</sup> I use the term ‘Nannas’ to describe participants, as whilst not all participants are grandmothers as such, they are identified as ‘Knitting Nannas’ when becoming part of the Knitting Nannas Against Gas.

In looking towards the generative, and in beginning to displace my own lingering and somewhat limited perceptions of resistance, I was especially struck by the ways in which the Knitting Nannas do more than craft fibres and materials as a form of protest. Yes, the Knitting Nannas certainly craft fibres and materials as acts of resistance. However, I suggest here that their resistance is distinctly more than this, that it also involves (amongst an array of other interventions) the crafting of subjectivities, encounters, histories and the yet to come. It is to these forms of resistance crafting that this paper now turns.

### **Crafting Subjectivities: Making Space for Nannas**

Once upon a time, Grandmas were very important people. [However] for quite some time, anybody over the age of 60 (which was the old retirement age) [has been] held in a sort-of contempt...These older people are now being seen as leeches, as it were, on the national economy, because they cost so much in terms of pension entitlements...I think the thing about the Nannas is that what the older women are saying is 'listen mate, we've got wisdom, we've got knowledge, we've got power, and we count'. The Nannas are bringing older women back into activism...we're not standing behind the blokes anymore, we are out there in front, we are going to make ourselves heard, we are going to make ourselves seen...and we're going to show that we have value, we have strength, we have courage, and you'd better get out of our way. (Julie)

Whilst the Knitting Nannas routinely emphasise that participants "don't have to knit" and "don't have to be a Nanna" (Renee), what is striking is the way in which the Knitting Nannas Against Gas is primarily underpinned by the political interventions of older women. Traditionally, "older women are not typically identified as environmental protesters and generally remain invisible as activists" (Larri and Newlands 2017, 36). Yet as Julie makes clear, the Knitting Nannas push back against the erasure of older women in spaces of resistance; instead situating themselves as visible and powerful political agents. Price (2015, 88) suggests that overall, "geographers have often focused on more masculine cultures of urban subversions and thus have neglected questions of gender and identity that allows certain bodies to feel comfortable to intervene in spaces where others may not". How then, might the Knitting Nannas support the political interventions of older women?

Whilst the Knitting Nannas welcome participation from a diverse range of actors, one of the initial motivations in forming the Knitting Nannas Against Gas was also to craft a place for older women to be able to engage in resistance against natural resource extraction projects. This was made particularly clear by Kath, who reflected that one of the purposes of forming the Knitting Nannas was:

to give a meaningful role to older women in protest. That kind of came about because within the [environmental] movement (as there is in broader society) there's a view that once women are past menopause, all they can do is make tea and bake cakes, and do fundraisers or photocopying, stuff like that.

For Arenas (2015, 1131) pervasive "gendered discrimination" and the erasure of women's participation in social movements has led to the generation of specific spaces and collective identities by women, for women, in spaces of resistance. Here, craft as both a "logic" and a "mechanism" stands as a "powerful political tool" in crafting politics and resistance in more inclusive ways (Bratich and Brush 2011, 248). In these spaces, the crafting work of "community-building", and of "space making" is particularly instrumental in remaking the politics of resistance (and of who resists) and its potentiality (Bratich and Brush 2011, 248). Rather than accepting the commonplace side-lining of older women in spaces of resistance, the Knitting Nannas continue to craft a space which articulates older women as significant political actors.

This can be seen firstly through the crafting of a particular subjective voice through social media, where the voice of “an old dottery Nanna” (Kath) is used to playfully communicate information across the movement. Kath describes this character as follows:

We put out a Facebook page, and with the Facebook page it was kind of like a character who was writing it...a bit like, well did you ever see *Mother and Son*? ...Well a bit like Ruth Cracknell's character in that...so a bit dotty, a bit forgetful, but all of a sudden, bang, really pointed and concise. That was really popular...so then we had women activists from other areas saying ‘can we start a group here?’

Indeed, the distinctive use of a typecast ‘Nanna’s’ voice is more than simply humorous. Whilst deploying stereotype and exaggeration, this particular voice also positions and articulates older women as present in spaces of resistance, and as exercising agency within the resistance landscape. Additionally, the crafting of recognisable signifiers of the Knitting Nannas (particularly through yellow and black clothing) also form part of the ways in which the Nannas are distinguished, and physically made visible, as actors with agency within the broader resistance movement against unwanted natural resource extraction. Julie remarked that “a lot of the older women were great workers as volunteers in all sorts of places; they were the quiet strength behind the blokes”. However, in taking up the yellow and black “uniform”, Julie went on to explain that Nannas “stand out, they’re no longer invisible ladies working behind the scenes, they’re out there”, “obvious” and signifying their distinct presence and contribution to the resistance landscape.

What is also significant about the Knitting Nannas is that many Nannas have never had a prior history of involvement in activist and resistance groups. During participant observation, many Nannas articulated having longstanding concerns about the social and environmental consequences of resource extraction, and the intergenerational ramifications of the activities of the industry. However, for many, encountering the Knitting Nannas offered perhaps the first means through which they felt they could actively engage with their concerns, more so than through other groups resisting natural resource extraction. For Helen, encountering other women within the Knitting Nannas that had also “never protested in their life” formed part of the appeal of becoming a Knitting Nanna. For Helen and others like her, their enacting of their “political sensibilities” is in many ways “enabled by collective practices of struggle that produced conditions through which” they were able to voice, practice and remake “their social and political place” in the resistance landscape (Arenas 2015, 1133).

For the Nannas I spoke with, the non-violence and perceived simplicity of the Knitting Nannas’ expressions of protest distinguished them from other groups within the broader environmental movement, and also made them more accessible and approachable for other potential members. Reflecting on what drew her to the Knitting Nannas in the first place, Renee asserted that “it’s the idea that all you have to do is sit in the street and knit, and to raise awareness about the risk of coal seam gas in a non-violent manner”. For Renee, the Knitting Nannas’ particular emphasis on non-violent resistance also poses “a way of engaging people who are for and against, and on the fence, in a non-threatening way”. Julie stated similarly that “I’m a quiet activist in many ways, which is why I find being on the street with the Knitting Nannas lovely”.

Elizabeth also reflected similarly on the simplicity and accessibility of this form of protest, but also warned against characterising these actions as ‘passive’. For Elizabeth, her desire to join the Knitting Nannas also emerged because:

they were actually doing something. They’re there making their presence felt, they’re there every week and they’re in touch with what’s going on all the time. They’re generally active, not passive. I mean you might say this is passive, but they’re in the street, they’re letting people know what’s going on.

Indeed, Elizabeth went on to say that becoming a Knitting Nanna shifted her perception of the possibilities of resistance altogether:

I guess I knew all about tying yourself to trees and all that sort of thing...and those groups were powerful, but I never really knew that you could do it so peacefully, have fun, and have an effect doing it.

As Julie reminds us in the opening of this section, the repositioning, indeed the crafting, of Nannas (and women more broadly) as important actors within the wider resistance movement against resource extraction forms an important part of the crafting work undertaken by the Knitting Nannas Against Gas.

### **Crafting Performances and Encounters**

More than crafting and re-articulating older women as resistance actors, the Knitting Nannas also craft performances and encounters as a key part of their resistance practices. If craft is more than a series of material activities, if it is also a “logic” (Bratich and Brush 2011, 248) and a use of culture in a “resistant” way (Newmeyer 2008, 446), our conceptions of the crafting that takes place in crafted resistance must be extended beyond the products of fibres and textiles. Crafted resistance also represents an interweaving of “making...community building and performance to raise awareness and convey political messaging on an interpersonal and community scale” (Black 2017, 700). This is certainly the case for the Knitting Nannas, who regularly use performances and particular types of encounters to disrupt prevailing natural resource narratives deployed by government and industry.

The Knitting Nannas are recognised in many ways for their performances, particularly the creative ways in which they continue to trouble and disrupt representations of resource extraction put forward by politicians and extractive corporations. Clarke (2016, 305) reflects that the importance of the crafted resistance demonstrated by the Nannas “lies not in the objects produced so much as the physical presence of a body in a public space”. For the Knitting Nannas, the body itself is an important site of political intervention; its actions and postures are a means of articulating dissent.

Judith Butler reiterates the political articulations made by bodies, troubling the privileging of speech acts as primary methods of communicating dissent:

Although the bodies on the street are vocalising their opposition...they are also...posing their challenge in corporeal terms, which means that when the body “speaks” politically, it is not only in vocal or written language...Both action and gesture signify and speak. (2015, 83)

Furthermore, in describing the non-violent action of the Knitting Nannas more broadly, Kath explained that “a lot of non-violent action is theatre if you like: singing, dressing up, whatever just to try and get attention” in alternative and somewhat unexpected ways. Whilst Stops has offered knitting itself as an articulation of protest and “a language with which to speak” (2014, 26), knitting (and other creative interventions) also serves as a means of disarmament, a crafted bodily act that has significant affective resonance. This speaks to Routledge’s (2012, 430) reflections on the role of creative and performed activism, and that with the increasing presentation of the world through media as “staged spectacle”, “the importance of images, performance and emotions in...politics means that activist performances – particularly cultural forms of activism – become important sites for political intervention”.

Helen, based in the Dubbo region in NSW, described the following response to an offhand comment made by their local MP in support of CSG development:

[The MP] was doing an interview on the radio...and he was asked ‘well, what happens when you come back in 30 years and everything’s destroyed?’ He said ‘oh well I’ll be in Hawaii by then’. So we all got our Hawaiian shirts and Leis, and we all protested out the front of his office!



**Figure 1:** The Lismore Knitting Nannas Cleaning Coal with No Success (Knitting Nannas Against Gas Lismore 2017), Used with Permission.

The above image (Figure 1) also shows Lismore Knitting Nannas responding to Federal Government pushes to develop ‘clean coal’ technologies in early 2017. Here, the Nannas can be seen scrubbing away at lumps of coal, mystified by the way that no matter how hard they scrub, these lumps of coal refuse to come clean.

Craftily, many of the performances of the Nannas (the above being but two of many examples) respond to emergent and “contingent moments of opportunity” (Arenas 2015, 1133). Within this emergent space, the Nannas are also adept at deploying humour to disarm and communicate in equal turn. As Routledge reflects, laughter and humour “resonates through the assembled bodies” transforming the “feeling space” of protest and resistance (Routledge 2012, 428) into spaces of possibility, rather than spaces constituted by barriers. Indeed, the knitting that is so representative of the Knitting Nannas is described by Kath as, amongst other things, “a front”. The spectacle of knitting in public space, and the rupturing of norms associated with what (and who) can be seen in public space,

disarms curious bystanders and positions people to engage with underlying messages and politics in unexpected ways.

As Kath remarked:

People don't see you knit in public at all, and they'll come up and say 'Oh I haven't seen anyone knit since my Nanna, or Grandma!' So they kind of relate to that and it opens them up a bit more...to talking about the gas industry or the coal industry.

Whilst the nostalgia associated with knitting has considerable affective pull, the deliberate stances and posturing taken up by the Nannas in these spaces also demonstrates ways in which particular kinds of encounters are also crafted in spaces of resistance. As Kath recounted to me, "we're always receptive rather than 'out there'" and never "in your face". For Nannas, the importance of subverting prevailing perceptions of 'activists' as angry, obtrusive and aggressive is paramount, with the Nannas intend to demonstrate "just how far from radical the 'extremists' who "oppose" the practices of government and mining companies are (Knitting Nannas Against Gas, No Date A). Consequently, the receptive and unobtrusive stance adopted by the Nannas often facilitates encounters marked by curiosity, nostalgia, and surprise, with many unsure what to make of this quiet spectacle. Indeed, puzzlement and bewilderment characterise many of the encounters recounted by Nannas. Far from the awkward disengagement often demonstrated by those avoiding activist groups in public space, being non-threatening (as Kath remarked):

...kind of puzzles people too, because usually when someone's in the street with brochures, they get in your face and most people end up crossing the road and avoid eye contact. If they make eye contact, we just say 'hello, how's your day going' or something.

Renee too reflects that the non-aggressive stance of the Nannas is also powerful because "you don't get people offside, you engage them in conversation, and by having a conversation you can actually turn people around". This echoes Askins' (2015, 473) reflections that whilst the encounter "can draw upon and reiterate socially constructed difference", encounters also "have the *potential to shift* how we see and how we feel about our others" and about different perspectives. For the Nannas, it's these kinds of unexpected encounters that open up spaces of possibility for very different kinds of exchanges between Nannas and others passing by. These exchanges are also far from accidental, stemming from very particular practices and politics crafted by the Knitting Nannas.

## Crafting Histories and Futures

"[C]raft-work is a material practice that weaves in human form something that precedes and exceeds it" (Bratich and Brush 2011, 252)

Importantly, the Knitting Nannas also craft themselves into a distinct resistance history, and work to craft particular futures through their resistance. This demonstrates the ways in which past and future are also subject to crafting, with the Knitting Nannas demonstrating a keen sense of being located in (and connected to others through) time, as well as place.

### *Crafting Histories*

Whilst some critiques of craftivism have raised concerns about the erasure of history in craftivist narratives, the Knitting Nannas actively situate their interventions within a broader crafted resistance history. Importantly, historical narratives, like all narratives, are far from a given 'realities'; indeed their inclusions, exclusions and meanings are crafted by different actors, for different purposes. Furthermore, "the fallacy of presenting history...as a series of taken-for-granted sequential

steps/events” problematically “serves to objectify and reify” these accounts at the expense of multiple, contingent histories that are always present (Patchett 2016, 403). Nevertheless, the “constantly changing” meanings of crafted resistance histories do not make them irrelevant (Clarke 2016, 304); rather they point to the ongoing making and remaking of meaning that takes place in the historical narratives that are crafted.

The Knitting Nannas regularly reference ‘Les Tricoteuses’ in Revolutionary France as important predecessors in a long history of women who have used knitting as a form of resistance. As Stops recounts (2014, 8), the term Tricoteuses “commonly referred to women who sat knitting at the base of the guillotine in silent protest at their enforced exclusion from political participation during the Reign of Terror during the French Revolution”. Identified as “the original Knitting Nannas” (Knitting Nannas Against Gas, No Date B), Les Tricoteuses are a historical reference point with which the Knitting Nannas “align themselves” (Clarke 2016, 299). In doing this, the Nannas acknowledge the lengthy history of craft within spaces of resistance, and identify resonances between their own practices, and the role of crafts and bodily performance in articulating women’s routinely suppressed right to protest across time.

Importantly, whilst this demonstrates a deliberate anchoring to a historical feminist narrative, it is also important to acknowledge that this is a particular history of feminist crafted resistance, and a distinctly Eurocentric one. Indeed, there is a wider multiplicity of feminist bodies and interventions which also accompany this particular representation of women who have crafted resistance across time. Nevertheless, by deliberately weaving themselves into a particular longstanding and ongoing struggle to address the erasure of gendered bodies from politics, the Nannas also trouble representations of crafted resistance (particularly craftivism) as being something that is somehow ‘new’ and ‘post-feminist’. Rather, the Nannas continue to work to situate themselves as part of a continuation of crafted interventions in politics, and as part of the ongoing labour of widening spaces for political participation for a multiplicity of bodies and subjectivities.

### *Crafting Futures: Shaping the Not-Yet Here*

In resisting the expansion of natural resource extraction, Nannas not only craft connections to resisting women that precede them, but they also craft interventions for those who are younger, and who are yet to come. The distinct awareness of the location of others across time, not just place, is also entangled with a keen sense of responsibility for future generations. This was made clear again and again by the Nannas I spoke with:

What is going to happen to those people that make a living on the land? Will they become economic migrants within Australia? ...the social and economic implications of the destruction of our water are just staring us in the face, and the politicians are not listening”. (Julie)

I think that’s the whole idea of the Knitting Nannas, we’re not just concerned about our children, we’re concerned about the following generation, the grandchildren...What will the future be if I don’t step up now and stop this? (Renee)

They’re all thinking about their children, their grandchildren, and their great grandchildren...the Nannas are not the sort to only think about this generation. (Helen)

We’re getting to a climate emergency level, and a lot of women especially are really, really worried about the future for their children and grandchildren...we want to make sure they have what we have, if not more. (Kath)

At first glance, there is a distinctly maternal motivation for addressing intergenerational justice here. This positioning of motherhood as a motivation for intergenerational concern is not unique to the Knitting Nannas as such, indeed it has been reflected in a wide range of women's resistance practices and movements (Stivens 2018, Jenkins 2015). Clarke (2016, 300) has highlighted that there has historically been a strategic positioning of the maternal body in spaces of activism to "normalize" resistance for "conservative onlookers". However, the "combination of activism with the stereotype of the grandmother", and the "disruptive" entanglements of maternal "care and support" with actions of "protest" in public space, has served as a significant point of disruption by the Knitting Nannas (Clarke 2016, 300) in unsettling the essentialist construct of maternal/non-activist<sup>7</sup>.

Furthermore, whilst some of the intergenerational concern espoused by Nannas is deeply linked to being 'mothers' and 'grandmothers', other Nannas also expressed equal concern about the long term consequences of resource extraction for farmers and communities in ways that did not necessarily draw from the experience of being a mother or grandmother (eg Julie). To simply conflate maternal bodies with motivation is to miss the diverse reasons that Nannas are indeed concerned about the future, and work to craft different possibilities for those yet to come. The maternal body is deployed strategically, yes, but it is not the only body, nor the only motivation for the Nannas' interventions in both the now and the not-yet here. Multiplicity also pervades the myriad motivations that prompt the Nannas to intervene in (and for) the world that "exceeds" the present (Bratich and Brush 2011, 252).

### **Conclusion: Purling Politics**

Resistance is, amongst other things, an intervention in what we all may yet become. For Wright "to talk of resistance is to acknowledge the world's incompleteness, its state of always becoming" and its "unfinishedness" (2014, 705). In this unfinished, perpetually unfolding world, to resist is to "intervene" in our co-becoming, to "make...anew" (Wright 2014, 706), and to make room for other bodies, other practices, other politics. In this sense, the world is both "abundant in its alternatives" and "full of possibilities in the most diverse ways" (Wright 2014, 706).

Importantly, attention to possibility, and to encountering already present multiplicity, doesn't overlook the mess, the incongruence; nor the uneven relations of power that are also present in acts and spaces of resistance. It doesn't disappear struggle, or disappointment. What a focus on possibility *does* do, however, is it "shifts attention from lack to abundance" and "acknowledges the diverse worlds that are, right now, being produced" (Wright 2014, 706). In other words, an imaginary of possibility doesn't do away with the 'here' and 'now', but rather, "gives us a larger world in which to start where we are" (Gibson-Graham 2006, 196).

This larger world is one which I have sought to gesture towards in this paper. For the Knitting Nannas, to resist harmful extractive practices is also to insist on a different world, and to intervene in its becoming. This is also a profoundly crafted undertaking. In crafting the 'Nanna' as a distinct resistance subjectivity, in crafting performances and encounters that trouble both current extractive practices and expectations around public protest, and in crafting linkages to others across time (both past and future), the Knitting Nannas craft resistance, and intervene in the emergence, in the becoming, of the world itself.

Whilst the title for this paper is in many ways a nod to the playful terminology used by the Nannas, it also highlights how the Knitting Nannas can help us to pay attention to the ways in which

---

<sup>7</sup> Interventions made by the 'Grandmothers against Detention of Refugee Children' have similarly engaged in this kind of disruption (Stivens 2018).

resistance, and politics, is already crafted in multiple and diverse ways. Rather than primarily engaging with crafting, knitting and purling as tools in the enactment of politics and resistance, perhaps we might also begin to consider the way in which politics and resistance itself is crafted, is purlled, in a host of extraordinary and diverse ways.

Building on important critiques of the erasure of diverse bodies and actions in prominent craftivist interventions, this paper has drawn attention to the Knitting Nannas Against Gas as just one example of an already existing multiplicity of crafting bodies and crafting practices that are enacting resistance. This is hinged on an understanding of research as being a deeply performative effort, and that making space for and “attending to the generative potential of resistance is itself a generative act” (Wright 2014, 706). In engaging an imaginary of possibility as a way of paying attention to, and making space for, other crafting bodies and practices, we also participate in the “ethical act of enabling” and sustaining “such a politics” (Gibson-Graham 2006, xxvii) of multiplicity and difference.

### Acknowledgements

I remain indebted to the wonderful Knitting Nannas for their deep generosity. Thank you for the privilege of spending time in your company, and for continuing to carefully and craftily bring another world into being. I would also like to thank the two reviewers for their thoughtful insights and for helping me to develop this paper, and Levi Gahman for his editorial guidance. Finally, I would also like to thank Meg Sherval and Paul Hodge for their continued and unfailing support throughout this research.

### References

- Arenas, I. 2015 ‘The Mobile Politics of Emotions and Social Movement in Oaxaca, Mexico’, *Antipode* 47(5) pp. 1121-1140.
- Askins, K. 2015 ‘Being Together: Everyday Geographies and the Quiet Politics of Belonging’, *ACME: An International Journal for Critical Geographies* 14(2) pp. 470-78.
- Askins, K. 2009 ‘*That’s just what I do*’: Placing emotion in academic activism’, *Emotion, Space and Society* 2 pp. 4-13.
- Black, S. 2017 ‘KNIT + RESIST: placing the Pussyhat Project in the context of craft activism’, *Gender, Place and Culture* 24(5) pp. 696-710.
- Black, A. and Burisch, N. 2011 ‘Craft Hard Die Free: Radical Curatorial Strategies for Craftivism’ in M. E. Buszek (ed) *Extra/Ordinary: Craft and Contemporary Art*, Duke University Press, Durham, pp. 204-221.
- Butler, J. 2013 ‘For White Girls Only? Postfeminism and the Politics of Inclusion’, *Feminist Formations* 25(1) pp. 35-58.
- Butler, J. 2015 *Notes Toward a Performative Theory of Assembly*, Harvard University Press, Massachusetts.
- Bobel, C. 2007 ‘I’m not an activist, though I’ve done a lot of it’: Doing Activism, Being Activist and the ‘Perfect Standard’ in a Contemporary Movement’, *Social Movement Studies* 6(2) pp. 147-159.
- Boothroyd, S. Bowen, R. Cattermole, A. ChangSwanson, K. Daltrop, H. Dwyer, S. Gunn, A. Kramer, B. McCartan, D. M. Nagra, J. Samimi S. & YoonPotkins, Q. 2017 ‘(Re)producing feminine bodies:

- emergent spaces through contestation in the Women's March on Washington', *Gender, Place and Culture*, 24(5) pp. 711-721.
- Bratich, J. Z. and Brush, H. M. 2011 'Fabricating Activism: Craft-Work, Popular Culture, Gender', *Utopian Studies* 22(2) pp. 233-260.
- Brown, G. and Pickerill, J. 2009 'Space for emotion in the spaces of activism', *Emotion, Space and Society* 2 pp. 24-35.
- Carr, C. and Gibson, C. 2016 'Geographies of making: rethinking materials and skills for volatile futures', *Progress in Human Geography* 40(3) pp. 293-315.
- Chatterton, P. and Pickerill, J. 2010 'Everyday activism and transitions towards post-carbon worlds', *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 35(4) pp. 475-490.
- Chatterton, P. 2006 "'Give up Activism" and Change the World in Unknown Ways; Or, Learning to Walk with Others on Uncommon Ground', *Antipode* 38(2) pp. 259-281.
- Clarke, K. 2016 'Willful Knitting? Contemporary Australian craftivism and feminist histories', *Continuum*, 30(3) pp. 298-306.
- Craftivist Collective, No Date 'Changing our world one stitch at a time...' (online) Available: <<https://craftivist-collective.com/>> Date Accessed: 06/03/18.
- Dombroski, K. 2016 'Seeing Diversity, Multiplying Possibility: My Journey from Post-feminism to Post-development with J. K. Gibson-Graham' in W. Harcourt (ed) *The Palgrave Handbook of Gender and Development*, Palgrave Macmillan, UK, pp. 312-328.
- Dunn, K. 2016 *Global Punk: Resistance and Rebellion in Everyday Life*, Bloomsbury Academic, New York.
- Dyck, I. 2005 'Feminist geography, the 'everyday', and local-global relations: hidden spaces of place-making', *The Canadian Geographer* 49(3) pp. 233-245.
- Dyson, J. and Jeffrey, C. 2018 'Everyday prefiguration: Youth social action in North India', *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 43 pp. 573-585.
- Gillespie, K. 2016 'Witnessing Animal Others: Bearing Witness, Grief and the Political Function of Emotion', *Hypatia* 31(3) pp. 572-588.
- Gökarıksel, B. and Smith, S. 2017 'Intersectional feminism beyond U.S. flag hijab and pussy hats in Trump's America', *Gender, Place and Culture* 24(5) pp. 628-644.
- Greer, B. 2014 'Knitting Craftivism: From My Sofa to Yours' in B. Greer (ed) *Craftivism: The Art of Craft and Activism*, Arsenal Pulp Press, Vancouver, pp. 7-8.
- Greer, B. 2011 'Craftivist History' in M. E. Buszek (ed) *Extra/Ordinary: Craft and Contemporary Art*, Duke University Press, Durham, pp. 175-183.
- Horton, J. and Kraftl, P. 2009 'Small acts, kind words and "not too much fuss": Implicit activism', *Emotion, Space and Society* 2 pp. 14-23.
- Jenkins, K. 2015 'Unearthing Women's Anti-Mining Activism in the Andes: Pachamama and the "Mad Old Woman"', *Antipode* 47(2) pp. 442-460.
- Gibson-Graham, J. K. 2014 'Being the Revolution, or, How to Live in a "More-Than-Capitalist" World Threatened with Extinction', *Rethinking Marxism* 26(1) pp. 76-94.

- Gibson-Graham, J. K. 2005 'Building Community Economies: Women and the Politics of Place' in W. Harcourt and A. Escobar (eds) *Women and the Politics of Place*, Kumarian Press, Bloomfield pp. 130-157.
- Gibson-Graham, J. K. 2006 *A Postcapitalist Politics*, University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis.
- Kelly, M. 2014 'Knitting as a feminist project?', *Women's Studies International Forum* 44 pp. 133-144.
- Knitting Nannas Against Gas, No Date (A) 'The Nannafesto' [online] Available: <<http://knitting-nannas.com/philosophy.php>> Date Accessed: 10/04/2018.
- Knitting Nannas Against Gas, No Date (B) 'The original Knitting Nannas – Les Tricoteuses' [online] Available: <<https://knitting-nannas.com/origins.php>> Date Accessed: 10/04/2018.
- Knitting Nannas Against Gas, No Date (C) 'What do we do?' [online] Available: <<https://www.knitting-nannas.com/what.php>> Date Accessed: 10/04/2018.
- Knitting Nannas Against Gas Lismore 2017, 'We love solar and we vote' [online] Available: <<https://www.facebook.com/1630620140535935/photos/pcb.1821522441445703/1821519861445961/?type=3&theater>> Date Accessed: 10/04/2018.
- Larri, L. and Newlands, M. 2017 'Knitting Nannas and Frackman: A gender analysis of Australian anti-coal seam gas documentaries (CSG) and implications for environmental adult education', *The Journal of Environmental Education* 48(1) pp. 35-45
- Martin, D. G. Hanson, S. and Fontaine, D. 2007 'What Counts as Activism?: The Role of Individuals in Creating Change', *Women's Studies Quarterly* 35(3/4) pp. 78-94.
- McKay, G. 1998 (ed) *DiY Culture: Party and Protest in Nineties Britain*, Verso, London.
- Mott, C. and Cockayne, D. 2017 'Citation matters: mobilizing the politics of citation toward a practice of 'conscientious engagement'', *Gender, Place and Culture* 24(7) pp. 954-973.
- Mountz, A. 2018 'Political geography III: Bodies', *Progress in Human Geography* 42(5) pp. 759-769.
- Mountz, A. and Hyndman, J. 2006 'Feminist Approaches to the Global Intimate', *Women's Studies Quarterly* 34(1/2) pp. 446-463.
- Newmeyer, T. 2008 'Knit one, stitch two, protest three! Examining the historical and contemporary politics of crafting', *Leisure/Loisir* 32(2) pp. 437-460.
- Patchett, M. 2016 'The taxidermist's apprentice: stitching together the past and present of a craft practice', *Cultural Geographies* 23(3) pp. 401-419.
- Pink, S. 2012 *Situating Everyday Life: Practices and Places*, SAGE Publications, London.
- Portwood-Stacer, L. 2012 'Anti-consumption as tactical resistance: Anarchists, subculture, and activist strategy', *Journal of Consumer Culture* 12(1) pp. 87-105.
- Pottinger, L. 2017 'Planting the seeds of a quiet activism', *Area* 49(2) pp. 215-222.
- Price, L. 2015 'Knitting and the City', *Geography Compass* 9/2 pp. 81-95.
- Pussyhat Project, No Date *Pussyhat Project* (online) Available: <<https://www.pussyhatproject.com/>> Date Accessed: 06/03/18.
- Robertson, K. 2011 'Rebellious Doilies and Subversive Stitches: Writing a Craftivist History' in M. E. Buszek (ed) *Extra/Ordinary: Craft and Contemporary Art*, Duke University Press, Durham, pp. 184-203.

- Routledge, P. 2012 'Sensuous Solidarities: Emotion, Politics and Performance in the Clandestine Insurgent Rebel Clown Army', *Antipode* 44(2) pp. 428-452.
- Sherval, M. Askland, H. Askew, M. Hanley, J. Farrugia, D. Threadgold, S. and Coffey, J. 2018 'Farmers as modern-day stewards and the rise of new rural citizenship in the battle over land use', *Local Environment* 23(1) pp. 100-116.
- Sparke, M. 2008 'Political geography – political geographies of globalization III: resistance', *Progress in Human Geography* 32(3) pp. 423-440.
- Stivens, M. 2018 'Gendering cosmopolitanisms: Hospitality and the asylum seeker Other', *Women's Studies International Forum* 67, pp. 85-93.
- Stops, L. 2014 'Les Tricoteuses: The plain and purl of solidarity and protest', *Craft and Design Enquiry* 6 pp. 7-28.
- Turney, J. 2009 *The Culture of Knitting*, Berg Publishers, Oxford.
- Véron, O. 2016 '(Extra)ordinary activism: veganism and the shaping of hermeratopias', *International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy* 36(11/12) pp. 756-773.
- Wright, S. 2014 'Resistance' in R. Lee, N. Castree, R. Kitchin, V. Lawson, A. Paasi, C. Philo, S. Radcliffe, S. M. Roberts and C. W. J. Withers (eds) *The SAGE Handbook of Human Geography: Volume 2*, SAGE, London, pp. 705-726.
- Yates, L. 2015 'Everyday politics, social practices and movement networks: daily life in Barcelona's social centres', *The British Journal of Sociology* 66(2) pp. 236-258.