

Feminism in the Twenty-First Century: Does It Need (Re)branding?

Maria Morelli

University of Leicester

Over the years, the media declared the death of feminism with headlines such as ‘Feminism was something for our mothers’, in the *Independent* (Levenson 2009) and ‘Feminism outmoded and unpopular’, in the *Guardian* (Ward 2003); other headlines such as ‘Warning: Feminism is bad for your health’ in the *Independent* (Dobson 2007) or ‘Bra-burning feminism has reached burn-out’, in *The Times* (Freat 2003) have attached negative connotations to feminism. Similar headlines have been in and out the news since the 1980s. However, the evidence suggests that young women are formulating their own constructions of feminism as a way to carve out a personal space for the redefinition of their own identity. Following on from this and using the British and Italian situation as case studies, I shall provide evidence for the observation that an array of new feminist activities, including national networks, local groups, and blogs, has recently been formed. This article will demonstrate, first, that the feminist movement today is still very much alive and very much needed, and, secondly, that, even current activists are undeniably adopting methods that are different from those of their foremothers, this does not necessarily imply that feminism has ceased to exist.

Although aspects of these issues have already been considered by earlier studies, this article does so from an interesting and original perspective by examining them through a diverse range of sources available within mainstream media: excerpts from newspapers, feminist blogs and the American TV series *Sex and the City*. Furthermore, by not imposing a set definition of feminism but by letting it emerge from the corpus of material under investigation, my research provides evidence for the observation that much ambiguity lies in the meaning of feminism today, as is argued by the work of writers such as Leslie Heywood and Jennifer Drake (Heywood and Drake 1997: 7, 8, 15). Following their lead, I shall argue that the fragmentation of contemporary feminist activism can rightly be seen as a reflection of the on-going dialectic of the movement itself, rather than an internal contradiction denoting political apathy and that third-wave feminism explicitly embraces hybridism, contradiction, and multiple identities.

I shall begin my analysis with a brief introductory outline of the problematic situation concerning the defining of feminism at the present time by examining certain labels which have so significantly informed academic debate in recent years: ‘post-feminism’ and ‘third-wave feminism’.

The use of the first term, ‘post-feminism’, has become increasingly common, during the last ten years, in academic studies of contemporary media, its first use in this context being attributed to Judith Stacey (Stacey 1987: 341–61). In using it, Stacey reclaimed it from popular journalism at the time, explaining that she understood it as referring to a new stage in feminism rather than declaring the demise of the movement. ‘Post-feminism’ has been the subject of considerable debate and is currently used in at least three specific, different ways. First, to connote the ‘death’ of feminism, thus stressing that the equality feminism itself assumes is largely a myth; secondly, to indicate the next stage of the movement and its legacy, which can no longer be defined simply as ‘feminism’; thirdly, ‘post-feminism’ for some, refers to work inspired by poststructuralist or postmodern theory (Showden 2009: 168).

‘Third-wave feminism’ is the name given to a new feminist movement which made its appearance in the United States in the early nineties; calling themselves ‘third-wave’ feminists, this new generation of women has claimed feminism as ‘a birth right, an inherent feature of being of a woman’s life’ (Denfeld 1995: 2). As Jennifer Baumgardner and Amy Richards observe in *Manifesta: Young Women, Feminism, and the Future*, the presence of feminism in their lives is taken for granted by all born after the early 1960s (Baumgardner and Richards 2000). Using ‘third-wave’ as a way to define themselves in opposition to second-wave feminists (often criticised by them for their white, middle class bias), ‘third-wavers’ have frequently invoked *individualism* over the perceived dogmatism of second-wave feminism. Indeed, as Heywood and Drake note in *Third Wave Agenda*, ‘the ideology of individualism is still a major motivating force in many third wave lives’ (Heywood and Drake 1997: 11).

Although these terms, post-feminism and third-wave feminism, are often used interchangeably, there are differences between the two, but a discussion of them falls beyond the scope of the present study; what interests us here is that they are both responses to dissatisfaction with second-wave feminist theory. In view of the hybridism inherent to feminist activism today and Carisa R. Showden’s stance on third-wave feminism, I shall argue that, in this second decade of the twenty-first century, the feminist movement holds

promise for expanding outward from previous feminist theory and moving into political practice.

Critical commentary on third-wave feminism has often accused its work of conflating consumerism and political action, individual change and political change, cultural adjustments and economic and political restructuring (Probyn 1993: 278–94). While not entirely unfounded, these criticisms seem, however, to underestimate the contributions some recent activists are making to the feminist movement. These activities I shall explore, in order to endorse my claim that, such accusations notwithstanding, the so-called ‘third-wave feminism’ shows the potential to move into a politically engaged phase.

I’m not a feminist but..., the title of a well-known paper by Buschman and Lenart, is a phrase which has also become a cliché of our times (Buschman and Lenart 1996). That there is some truth in it is borne out by academic research, which has found that very few young women are willing to identify themselves as feminists (Rupp 1998; Stacey 1987) and that they express feminist ideas without labelling themselves as such (Morgan 1995).

As pointed out by journalist Chloe Angyal in an article published by the *Guardian* in April 2010, if you were to ask most women if they believe in equal rights, the answer would no doubt be a resounding ‘yes’. She goes on to observe that post-industrial regimes are quick to adopt feminist rhetoric yet, paradoxically, these are the very same regimes who generally declare themselves anti-feminist: when George Bush invaded Afghanistan post 9/11, he invoked the allegedly persuasive power of feminism to justify this action by claiming that one of its aims was to free women from the oppressive regime of the Taliban. This illustrates another striking paradox: feminism is well-known and recognised worldwide yet is deemed to be a victim of its own success and accused of having made itself irrelevant to life in the twenty-first century. Woman, in Ouellette’s words, are too often ‘reluctant to define themselves with the feminist label, but they approve of and indeed demand equal pay, economic independence, sexual freedom and reproductive choice’ (Ouellette 1992: 119).

What this suggests is that, while young women embrace the values of feminism, many cannot or do not want to identify with the feminist movement. Why? How can feminism be re-branded nowadays? And does feminism need to change its name or just change the way it communicates itself? In answer to these questions, it will be my contention that the name by which the movement calls itself is of paramount importance, since the naming policy is indeed a powerful political tool by which a social issue is not only ‘discovered and defined but also in some ways created’ (Klatch 2001: 904). However, it will also be my contention

that, as far as the future of feminism is concerned, finding a new name for the movement is unnecessary: feminists do not need to give up their name; they simply need to change the way in which they communicate their message.

The time when sisterhood was on the march and women were fighting side by side calling for equal pay seems to have now lost all of its appeal, to the point of its becoming a mere blurred memory from a distant past. Whilst women today may be the butt of sarcastic humour simply for the purposes of *writing about* feminism, the label ‘feminist’ equates with being old and unattractive (to say the least); as a consequence, more and more women fail to identify with the ‘f-word’. In her study of women of all ages, Sigel has observed that feminism was often characterised by ambivalence (Sigel 1996: 113); Sigel’s interviewees for the purposes of her study saw themselves as feminists to the extent that they advocated feminist goals but refused to accept the label.

As powerfully exemplified by the headlines quoted at the beginning of this article, feminism has acquired a poor reputation over the last decade or so. What is more, influential public figures have castigated it in no uncertain terms. To give just a British example, and quite a recent one, when David Willetts was speaking prior to the launch of the Government’s flagship social mobility strategy, his stance as regards the feminist movement was that ‘feminism has held back working men’ (quoted in Prince 2011). On this occasion, the British Minister for Universities and Science, who has also expressed his views on feminism in his recent book, *The Pinch: How the Baby Boomers Took Their Children's Future — And How They Can Give it Back* (2010), maintained that, as a result of better opportunities for women in terms of work and education than in the past, households now contain well-educated earning couples, thus widening the gap between such households and ones in which no adult is working. Feminism, in Willetts’ view, is the main reason behind the stagnation in social mobility over the past forty years. While maintaining that he is not against feminism *per se*: ‘it is not that I am against feminism, it’s just that [it] is probably the single biggest factor’ (quoted Mulholland 2011), the Minister is, in fact, blaming some of the main feminist achievements, namely, the entry of women into the workforce and universities, as the main cause for the men’s lack of progress.

This is a contentious issue. However, the claim advanced by Willetts that feminist achievements are to be blamed for magnifying social divides is quite hard to maintain; as Cristina Odone, a journalist and broadcaster specialising in the relationship between society and families, aptly observes:

Willetts is right that feminists are responsible for the plight of working class men. But not because they have stolen their jobs. Feminists [...] have undermined working class men with their philosophy that all males are expendable. (Odone 2011)

However, Odone also suggests that the responsibility for introducing this philosophy lies with successive Labour governments which introduced a benefits system that rewards single mothers who do not let the father of their children live under the same roof in order to satisfy the feminists in their party.

Following on from the controversial relationship between feminism and politics, what has just been said about Willetts allows us to draw on the Italian situation to venture a parallel between the British Minister's take on women and that of the Italian Prime Minister Silvio Berlusconi — the obvious differences between the two politicians and their ideologies notwithstanding. In recent years, one term (although used pejoratively) has gradually come to dominate the Italian feminist lexicon: *velinismo*, a neologism deriving from a popular TV show. The programme in question, *Striscia la Notizia*, shows two scantily dressed girls (*veline*) who dance without saying anything at all. From there, the name *veline* has been given to all women appearing on TV just to exhibit their physical attributes. As Marina Calloni, professor of social and political philosophy at the State University of Milano-Bicocca, shows in her study on media portrayal of Italian women titled *Women and the Italian television: the End of an Alliance* (Calloni 2009), such eroticisation of the female body in the media has turned women into saleable objects to the detriment of their professional capabilities. Often bordering on pornography, this new trend became established during the Nineties, thus making feminine beauty the *sine qua non* for successful TV programmes.

These facts, which mark the apotheosis of the debasement of women's body, also referred to as 'body politics', are inevitably linked with Berlusconi too, for the Italian prime minister has made a few TV soubrettes become politicians (Calloni 2009). This is how also Natalia Aspesi, columnist for *La Repubblica*, sees it in *The Times*; in Aspesi's words, economic recession in Italy seems to be reflected in the (mis)representation of the female body: 'It is clear that to enter Parliament, to become a minister, to go to Europe, you just have to be under 30 and very pretty and perhaps have gone to bed with someone' is the journalist's assessment of the condition of women in the *Bel Paese* (Aspesi 2009).

'Body politics' was first used in this sense in the United States during the 1970s, as part of the 'second-wave' of the feminist movement (Calloni 2009). It designates a movement chiefly concerned with the fight against violence against women, the campaign for reproductive rights and, more relevant to our analysis, the objectification of the female body.

The fact that women's physical appearance has become a political weapon begs the question whether all the gains feminists have supposedly made to date have actually been annulled. If so, this would corroborate the assertion that much still remains to be done in order to achieve real equity and justice, and, furthermore, would legitimise the question, as regards their role in civil society, whether women should be more than just passive onlookers when facing such an erosion of their identity.

That the name 'feminism' brings with it all the negative connotations which have been built up over the years, is indeed a given; many women today are led to accept the stereotype as inevitable. However, as Alison Camp pointed out during the two day conference and workshop *(Re)branding Feminism*, organised by the University of London's School of Advanced Study in March 2011, the key to overcoming prejudices (and stereotypes) does not lie in a (re)naming policy but, rather, in understanding what is uniquely good about one's own brand (namely, in this case, feminism) and using it as a starting point to prove its on-going validity. Drawing on her career of twenty years in research and consultancy, Camp examined the successes and failures of some of the great brands and considered how we might use these case studies, the better to promote the aims and ideals of feminism. For example, she brought up the everlasting competition between Coca-Cola and Pepsi as evidence for the observation that a product can be copied by a competitor, whereas a brand is unique. Whenever we buy a product, we also 'buy' what it says about ourselves; in other words, we buy (and value) a product for all the connotations which we see as being inextricably attached to it. As a consequence of this, it can rightly be claimed that, in the same way as does a brand, feminism also constantly renews and re-invents itself. As Jacob and Licona pertinently note (Jacob and Licona 2005: 197-205), today's feminism is to be found in its comprehensive tactics; in other words, it embraces a myriad of political and social activities which, in their changeability, appear to reflect that of present times and which can thus be seen as a positive, rather than a negative, attribute of the movement itself. It follows that, the peculiarity of the feminist movement, lies precisely in that it is not made up of a series of watershed moments but is, rather, a coherent totality; different bits of which blend together to give life to a single-brand personality. As such, there is no real need to find other names.

In order to be effective, [feminists] need to be able to broaden their appeal and to reach a new generation [...] and [those] who call [themselves] feminists have to grapple with that. (Jayatilaka 2001)

As has already been observed, whilst young women of today are often depicted by the media as being indifferent to feminist issues, the activities of young feminists are labelled as

politically ineffectual. To counter this impression, one must also acknowledge the existence of influential initiatives such as, to name but one, the feminism-related website *The F Word*. Founded in 2001 by Catherine Redfern, it plays a significant role in informing a revived interest in feminism among younger women and is one of the most visited feminist websites based in the UK. *The F Word* does not define what contemporary UK feminism is but instead offers a place for people to share their different opinions and views. This is precisely the point: there is no such thing as a 'user's manual' for feminism because, as *The F Word* declares on its home page, 'feminism is whatever we make of it'.

Another example of such a renewed interest in feminism is the attempt by young feminist organisations to re-ignite the consciousness-raising (or 'C.R.') movement in the UK today. The theory-practice of C.R., which had been developed in the U.S. towards the end of the 1960s, came to be practised in every part of the industrialised world from the 1970s (*Sexual Difference, A Theory of Socio-Symbolic Practice* by the Milan Women's Bookstore Collective 1992: 40). Briefly, C.R. is the practise of women to meet regularly in groups, deliberately kept small, in order to discuss and share their common experience of being marginalised by and made to feel different from men, simply because of their own nature. The fact that the women in these groups come to realise that their personal experiences are not unique is another indication of the fact that feminist consciousness did not die along with the twentieth century and that there are still women who openly identify as feminists.

Chitra Nagarajan, who is an active feminist and co-founder of the Black Feminists and Women's History Month in 2010 and who is now committed to organising regular C.R. groups in the capital, ran a C.R. workshop at *(Re)branding Feminism*. Those who attended the workshop were divided into small groups of four to six people and made to confront their own views on what it means being a woman nowadays, drawing on their personal experience to raise points of discussion on whether they had ever felt that they had been discriminated against or treated as being inferior to men.

However, the place where these new and influential initiatives primarily aimed at reviving feminism among younger generations are, in the main, gaining most ground is the net. Today, the web interface is the means whereby contemporary feminist activism can become less narrow than that of earlier generations. More particularly, feminists have recourse to blogs in order to build their own democratic forums of self-expression, using, instead of the actual space of a C.R. group, a virtual space chiefly designed to individuate the needs of twenty-first century women, as well as their issues concerning sexual identity and

gender. Amongst such blogs are *Feminazery*, which is primarily concerned about sexism and pornography, and *PinkStinks*, which deals mainly with the discussion of gender stereotypes. There is a diversity of possible reasons why feminists' activism is being taken off the streets and onto the net: first and foremost, as well-known on-line portal *The Scavenger* states on its home page, 'online' allows for interaction: people want to be part of what is happening, with no limitations of time or space. As each blog has its own comment boxes, visitors may easily join and have their say; hence, the growing number of people taking part in these virtual communities.

In the light of the above and at a time when influential initiatives such as those examined so far are being promoted and gradually adopted, one might rightly question the allegation that feminism is inefficient. It is, perhaps, not without significance that the causes that have given rise to this allegation seem to be found *within* the feminist movement itself: I am referring here in particular to distorted attempts at re-launching feminism in a way that is more palatable to younger women.

Second-wave feminists (those who were campaigning during the 1970s and 1980s) have expressed their fear that younger generations are devoted to a kind of feminism that they identify as style without substance. To put it simply, young feminists are, in their opinion, in danger of taking their position for granted, thus losing sight of what still needs to be achieved. The main accusation older feminists address to younger ones is that of being too concerned about fashion and sexual freedom, while trampling on those very same issues for which their feminists foremothers have been so passionately advocating, namely, economic equality, reproductive rights and violence against women to name but a few (Showden 2009: 178-181).

This is precisely the image of feminism which is well reflected in Nina Power's study of *Sex and the City* and which relates to what she defined as 'Fun Feminism' in her paper 'Feminism and Consumerism: against "Empowerment" through Economics' delivered at '(Re)branding Feminism'. Power chose the term in order to convey the idea, particularly deep-rooted in American society, that feminism has reduced itself to something exclusively aimed at making a woman's life more sparkling and exciting and rescuing her from a tedious routine: in short, a perfectly valid excuse, but one which Power sees as quite 'dangerous' (her term), for indulging in a designer outfit or a chocolate bar — or perhaps a vibrator. And it is precisely here that the feminist discourse entwines with materialism: as Power articulates it succinctly in the introduction to her book *One Dimensional Woman*: 'that the height of

supposed female emancipation coincides so perfectly with consumerism is a miserable index of a politically desolate time' (Power 2007: 1).

There is no denying it: *Sex and the City* portrays women who are chiefly concerned with their appearance and seem to define equality in terms of their sexual freedom. Yet, as Bonnie Dow argues in *Prime Time Feminism*, feminist and feminist characters have been a part, albeit sometimes an infrequent one, of TV's landscape since the second wave of feminism emerged in the late 1960s (Dow 1996: xxiii). Thus, following on from this, if TV reflects the changes in feminist thinking, then *Sex and the City* embodies what is now referred to as 'third-wave feminism': it is the reflection of a 'particular feminist agenda [which] has chosen to stress individuality [...] as a shared ideology' (Henry 2004: 67). Indeed, throughout the series, individual life choices appear to be the principal plot device (from choices regarding sexual partners to motherhood or career). In her recent study 'Orgasm and Empowerment: *Sex and the City* and the third wave feminism', Astrid Henry, currently Associate Professor of Gender, Women's and Sexuality Studies: English at Grinnell College, Iowa, sees this form of third-wave feminism that we have identified with individualism as the most suited for TV, given that the medium seldom depicts political or social issues and does not often suggest a need for change other than on the individual level (Henry 2004: 71).¹

Power's claims, namely, that the series is packed with glossy designer clothes and shoes, are clearly not completely groundless; notwithstanding, the series does certainly tackle more serious issues: the theme of friendship between women, for instance. Although the way in which the genuine nature and importance of female friendship is depicted in the series is clearly not relevant to our analysis, I agree here with the *Guardian* journalist Alice Wignall when, referring to the female heroines of *Sex and the City*, she says 'they identify as each other's soul mates and provide emotional, practical and moral support' (Wignall 2008). Of greater relevance is a discussion point raised later on in the very same article, which goes on to question whether it can be considered a betrayal of women (and feminism) that the series ends with all its female characters, to put it in Wignall's terms, 'paired up'. Nevertheless, while the piece seems to answer to the contrary, a statement such as that of Janet McCabe, currently a Member of the Department of the History of Art and Screen Media, Birkbeck College, University of London and co-editor of *Reading "Sex and the City"*, which claims

¹ When 'Orgasm and Empowerment: *Sex and the City* and the third wave feminism' was published in *Reading "Sex and the City"*, Henry was Assistant Professor of Women's Studies and English at Saint Mary's College, Indiana.

that ‘women are still caught in fairy tale narratives’ is quite a puzzling one.² This statement raises very important questions regarding feminism nowadays: why are the words ‘marriage’ and ‘feminism’ still viewed as incompatible, so that feminism is seen to be synonymous with being a spinster? The distorted yet widespread perception of the feminist movement as comprising man-hating ‘wimmin’ who look a certain way and wear shapeless clothes has contributed to a common misconception of what it means to be a feminist.³

Linked to the perception of what being a woman means today, and therefore relevant to our feminist analysis, is the treatment of pregnancy and maternity in western society nowadays, an issue that has been addressed in the United Kingdom, for instance, by the Equality Act 2010, most of which is now in force. This Act was introduced for the purpose of not only consolidating all earlier legislation, now repealed, which dealt with different aspect of equality and anti-discrimination, but also extending existing legislation by introducing new provisions: sections 17 and 18, for example, are intended to protect women from discrimination both in the work place and outside of work on the grounds of pregnancy and maternity.⁴ However no legislation can change people’s attitudes overnight. Such is the view of Rebecca Asher who, in her latest book, *Shattered: Modern Motherhood and the Illusion of Equality* covers the implications of what being a mother means today, thus exposing the inequalities perpetuated by the state, employers and the parenting industry in terms of childbearing (Asher 2011).

The 1960s is regarded as the period during which the number of women in the workforce increased significantly. Since then, the ‘feminisation of labour’ has become a key concept in economy and philosophy. Although gaining ground in the political and social arena, however, women are still subject to inequalities (in terms of salary in the work place to quote but an example). Paradoxically then, women today are becoming visible, yet voiceless. Thus, the relationship between feminism and work in the twenty-first century may deceive us into thinking that women now enjoy a degree of emancipation; this is a delusion. There are still countries, which in all other respects are considered modern, where a certain rigidity in social norms still obtains and this too often reflects an equal rigidity in gender roles. Wallis suggests

² When *Reading “Sex and the City”* was published, McCabe was Lecturer in Film Studies at Trinity College, Dublin.

³ The term ‘wimmin’ was coined for militant feminists and was applied particularly to the activists who set up and occupied the Greenham Common peace camp from 1981–2000 in protest against the decision to site ninety-six Cruise nuclear missiles there.

⁴ For a summary of these provisions, see, e.g., *Ecu*. The full text of the sections can be found at *Legislation.gov*. The full URLs for the relevant web-pages are contained in the bibliography.

that this explains the phenomenon that Italy has, according to *Eurostat*, almost the lowest rate of female employment in the European Union (Wallis 2008).

I shall conclude my analysis with a final case study to illustrate the fact that many examples can be found in the media of the negative depiction of women in the course of marketing. The case in point is the advertising campaign *Shameless*, launched by Dutch company Suit Supply in November 2010 to promote its winter range of men's suits. The advertisements in question are offensive in that they present explicit images of women caught in pornographic-like poses: in one, a woman has her legs spread around a man; in another, the half-naked woman is lying prone on a kitchen worktop drinking coffee while he is standing behind her between her legs, clutching her thighs.⁵ When the campaign first appeared in the Westfield Centre in White City, West London, the company's flagship store, the outcry of sexism which arose was such that the social network Facebook felt obliged to request Suit Supply to remove the advertisements from its website. Suit Supply is quoted by the *Daily Mail* as replying to a complaint from a member of the public as follows:

Our campaign is called "Shameless" and is shot by the renowned photographer Carli Hermès. In our opinion the photographs of the campaign are a well-balanced mix of style, humour and sex, the essence of fashion! We fully disagree that our campaign would be obscene and denigrating towards women. On the contrary, the women depicted in the photographs are obviously in the lead. (*Daily Mail* Reporter 2010)

Regardless of whether the women are indeed depicted as being 'in the lead' or not, Suit Supply's reply surely begs the question whether it is sufficient merely to assert that this is so in order to exonerate the company from the charge of running a campaign that is sexist.

Moving beyond the arguably sexist connotations of the campaign, this episode does make me wonder whether feminism might, perhaps, focus less on critique and move into a new way of communicating its message. What I am suggesting here is that, instead of simply criticising, it might actually play a more productive role: it seems evident to me that, if in Italy the phenomenon of *velinismo* is so widespread, and if a company such as Suit Supply dares to offer such distasteful images in order to promote its wares, perhaps feminism needs to put across its messages, whatever they are, differently.

As Showden observes in the concluding words of her article, it will take more than empowering cultural messages to realise the political potential of third-wave feminism (Showden 2009: 190); I would go further and argue that these 'cultural messages' may be 'empowering' but they are often confused and distorted as Power's concept of 'Fun

⁵ The full range of images can be seen on various websites, e.g. the blog *Openzedoor*.

Feminism' illustrates. This confused message is exemplified in the title of this article: first, (re)branding is in itself a process of denial, so feminism appears to be critiquing itself; secondly the suggestion that feminism needs to be 'rebranded' like any marketable commodity is in danger of implying that women, its 'contents', are 'saleable' objects: there is absolutely no need for feminism to find new, more appealing names in order to reach out to younger generations.

As this article has demonstrated, it is clear from the growing number of initiatives today (from blogs to C.R. groups to political activism) that, not only has the 'sleeping dragon' of feminism awakened, it seems to be setting off in a new direction, away from its previous political apathy towards newer forms of activism.⁶ It is also clear that the new means by which feminist messages are conveyed do offer some promise for feminism. Whether or not young women are willing to call themselves feminists, they support the movement's ideals. Most important, it is their initiatives, more than their words, that are laying the foundations of change and which 'under the right historical conditions [...] could blossom into the next wave of the women's movement' (Arosen 2003: 919).

Bibliography

Books and Edited Chapters

- Asher, Rebecca, *Shattered: Modern Motherhood and the Illusion of Equality* (New York: Harvill Secker, 2011)
- Baumgardner, Jennifer, and Amy Richards, *Manifesta: Young Women, Feminism, and the Future* (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2000)
- Denfeld, Rene, *The New Victorians: A Young Woman's Challenge to the Old Feminist Order* (New York: Warner Brooks, 1995)
- Dow, Bonnie, J. *Prime-Time Feminism: Television, Media Culture, and the Women's Movement since 1970* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1996)
- Henry, Astrid, 'Orgasms and Empowerment: *Sex and the City* and the third wave feminism', in *Reading Sex and the City*, ed. by Kim Akass and Janet McCabe (London: I. B. Taurus, 2004)
- Heywood, Leslie, and Jennifer Drake, 'Introduction', in *Third Wave Agenda: Being Feminist, Doing Feminism*, ed. by Leslie Heywood and Jennifer Drake (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1997) pp. 1–24
- Milan Women's Bookstore Collective., *Sexual Difference, A Theory of Socio-Symbolic Practice*, translated from Italian by Patricia Cicogna and Teresa de Lauretis, (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1992)
- Morgan, Debi, 'Invisible Women: Young Women and Feminism', in *Feminist activism in the 1990s*, ed. by Gabriele Griffin (London: Taylor and Francis, 1995) pp. 127–36
- Power, Nina, *One Dimensional Woman* (Alresford: Zero Books, 2007)
- Probyn, Elspeth, 'Choosing Choice: images of sexuality and "choiceoisie" in popular culture', in *Negotiating at the Margins: The Gendered Discourses of Power and Resistance*, ed. by Sue Fisher and Kathy Davis (New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers University Press, 1993) pp. 278–94
- Sigel, Roberta, *Ambition and Accommodation: How Women View Gender Relations* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996)
- Willets, David, *The Pinch: How the Baby Boomers Took Their Children's Future — And How They Can Give it Back* (London: Atlantic Books: 2010)

⁶ The term 'sleeping dragon' was inspired by the title of an article by Paddy Agnew which was published in the *Irish Times* in October 2009: 'Berlusconi awakens sleeping dragon of Italian feminism'.

Journal Articles

- Arosen, Pamela 'Feminists or "Post-feminists"? Young Women's Attitudes toward Feminism and Gender Relations' *Gender and Society*, 17, 6 (2003), 903–22
- Buschman, Joan K., and Silvo Lenart, 'I Am Not a Feminist, But...': College Women, Feminism, and Negative Experiences' *Political Psychology*, 17, 1 (1996), 59–75
- Jacob, Krista, K. and Adela C. Lecona, 'Writing the Waves: A Dialogue on the Tools, Tactics, and Tensions of Feminisms and Feminist Practices Over Time and Place' *NWSA Journal*, 17, 1 (2005), 197–205
- Klatch, Rebecca, E, 'The Formation of Feminist Consciousness among Left- and Right-Wing Activists of the 1960s' *Gender & Society*, 15, 6 (Dec., 2001), 791–815
- Ouellette, Laurie 1992. 'Our Turn Now: Reflections of a 26-year-old Feminist' *Utne Reader*, July/August (1992), 118–20
- Showden, Carisa, R, 'What's Political About the New Feminisms?', *Frontiers: A Journal of Women Studies*, 30, 2 (2009), 166–98
- Stacey, Judith, 'Second Thoughts on the Second Wave' *Feminist Studies*, 13, 2 (Summer, 1987), 341–61

Conference papers

- Jayatilaka, Geethika, 'Rebranding Feminism?', paper presented at *Rebranding Feminism*, evening conference held at the Institute for Contemporary Arts, London, 30 November 2001
- Calloni, Marina, untitled paper presented at *The East and the West: Women in the Eyes of the Media*, conference organised by Woman and the Media ReserDoC and The Northwestern University, held at The Qatar Foundation, Doha, Qatar, 19 April 2009
- Camp, Alison, 'What is a brand, what makes it "work", and what does it matter?', presented at *(Re)branding Feminism*, conference by the School of Advanced Study, University of London, held at the Institute of Germanic and Romance Studies, London, 1–2 March 2011
- Power, Nina, 'Feminism and Consumerism: against "Empowerment" through Economics', presented at *(Re)branding Feminism*, conference by the School of Advanced Study, University of London, held at the Institute of Germanic and Romance Studies, London, 1–2 March 2011

Articles in Newspapers and other Media

- Angyal, Chloe, 'You're not a feminist, but ... what?', *Guardian*, 7 April 2010, <<http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/2010/apr/07/feminist-f-word-young-women>> [accessed: 1-May-11]
- Aspesi, Natalia, 'Berlusconi's Italy shows a strange type of feminism', *The Times*, 23 June 2009, <http://women.timesonline.co.uk/tol/life_and_style/women/article6557429.ece> [accessed: 1-May-11]
- Daily Mail Reporter, 'Outrage over 8ft tall 'pornographic' posters in shopping centre...for MEN's suits', *Daily Mail*, 18 November 2010, <<http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-1330845/Pornographic-window-display-Westfield-Outrage-8ft-tall-Shameless-posters.html#ixzz1QZgisy7v>> [accessed: 1-May-11]
- Dobson, Roger, 'Warning: feminism is bad for your health', *Independent*, 25 March 2007, <<http://www.independent.co.uk/life-style/health-and-families/health-news/warning-feminism-is-bad-for-your-health-441730.html>> [accessed: 1-May-11]
- Frean, Alexandra, 'Bra-burning feminism has reached burn-out', *The Times*, 2 July 2003, <<http://www.thetimes.co.uk/tto/news/uk/article1910064.ece>> (subscription) [accessed: 1-May-11]
- Levenson, Ellie, 'Feminism was something for our mothers' *Independent*, 1 July 2009, <<http://www.independent.co.uk/opinion/commentators/ellie-levenson-feminism-was-something-for-our-mothers-1726057.html>> [accessed: 1-May-11]
- Mulholland, Hélène, 'David Willets blames feminism over lack of jobs for working men', *Guardian*, 1 April 2011, <<http://www.guardian.co.uk/politics/2011/apr/01/david-willetts-feminism-lack-of-jobs>> [accessed: 1-May-11]
- Odone, Christina, 'Why David Willets is wrong about feminism', *Daily Telegraph*, 1 April 2011, <<http://blogs.telegraph.co.uk/news/cristinaodone/100082141/why-david-willetts-is-wrong-about-feminism>> [accessed: 1-May-11]
- Prince, Rosa, 'David Willets: feminism has held back working men', *Daily Telegraph*, 1 April 2011, <<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/education/educationnews/8420098/David-Willetts-feminism-has-held-back-working-men.html>> [accessed: 1-May-11]
- Wallis, Emma 'Why Italy's Women are out of Work', BBC News, Rome, 9 April 2008, <<http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/business/7337145.stm>> [accessed: 1-May-11]
- Ward, Lucy, 'Feminism: outmoded and unpopular', *Guardian*, 2 July 2003, <<http://www.guardian.co.uk/uk/2003/jul/02/gender.women>> [accessed: 1-May-11]

Wignall, Alice, 'Can a feminist really love Sex and the City?', *Guardian*, 16 April 2008,
<<http://www.guardian.co.uk/lifeandstyle/2008/apr/16/women.film>> [accessed: 1-May-11]

Websites

Eurostat: <http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/cache/ITY_OFFPUB/KS-SF-08-099/EN/KS-SF-08-099-EN.PDF>
[accessed: 1-May-11]

Ecu: <<http://www.ecu.ac.uk/law/pregnancy-and-maternity-key-legislation>> [accessed: 1-May-11]

Legislation.gov: <<http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2010/15/section/17>> [accessed: 1-May-11]

—— <<http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2010/15/section/18>> [accessed: 1-May-11]

Blogs

The F Word: <<http://www.thefword.org.uk/blog>> [accessed: 1-May-11]

Feminazery: <<http://dmhatingfemisfromhell.blogspot.com>> [accessed: 1-May-11]

PinkStinks: <<http://pinkstinks.wordpress.com>> [accessed: 1-May-11]

Openzedoor: <<http://openzedoor.blogspot.com/2010/11/suit-supply-shameless-ad-campaign.html>>
[accessed: 1-May-11]

The Scavenger: <<http://www.thescavenger.net>> [accessed: 1-May-11]