

Malaysian Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities (MJSSH)

Volume 4, Issue 1, January 2019

e-ISSN : 2504-8562

Journal home page:
www.msocialsciences.com

Modernism and Postmodernism in Feminism: A Conceptual Study on the Developments of its Defination, Waves and School of Thought

Mohd Hafiz Bin Abdul Karim[1], Ariff Aizuddin Azlan[2]
[1]Institute of Islamic Thought and Civilization (ISTAC-IIUM)
[2]Faculty of Administrative Science and Policy Studies, Universiti Teknologi MARA (UiTM)

Correspondence: Mohd Hafiz Bin Abdul Karim (hafizkarim28@gmail.com)

Abstract

This study seeks to identify the relations of modernism and postmodernism in feminism by looking deeply on the development of its definitions, waves of feminism and framework in its specific schools of thought; liberal, classical Marxist, socialist and radical feminism. By adapting qualitative descriptive study, this study covers mainly secondary data from English language sources, be it from books, academic articles or any literatures pertaining to this topic, which obtained from various databases. This study argues that modernism and postmodernism is the worldviews that become the essence of feminism. By looking at the variations of how feminism is studied, e.g. definitions, waves and school of thought, this study concluded that there are several points indicating the relations that exist between modernism and postmodernism with feminism. Modernism can be seen in the relational approach of the liberal, classical Marxist and socialist feminism in the first wave, which are more centered on education, politics and economic participation. Meanwhile, the relation of postmodernism to feminism is exampled in the deconstructing approach of the radical feminism that began from the second wave shown in their individualist views on sex, sexuality, motherhood, childbirth, and language institution. By identifying modernism and postmodernism as the essence of feminism, it can provide a thorough understanding on how it relates to the construction and development of feminism itself. Besides that, it also delineates pathway and limitation especially in providing critiques to feminism. Moreover, it also helps to provide a new paradigm in looking at the feminism based on its essences that surpasses traditional dimensions of feminism studies that usually separate feminism discourse into specific variations.

Keywords: feminism waves, liberal, marxist, socialist, radical, modernism, postmodernism

Introduction

As frequently discussed as feminism is, or as many books written discussing it, as if there were an authentic and true definition for this notion, it still did not eliminate the fact that the term feminism is yet to be coined properly in an unanimous degree of concurrence among scholars or in the consistency of time and place. This matter then led the scholars to explore feminism from many perspectives, whether based on the dimension of its definitions, years of its emergence or its schools of thought. The fact that feminism emerges based on the specific social condition that is socially and culturally constructed is also one of the main factors that contribute to the varieties of dimensions in understanding feminism. Each variation in defining feminism then became an independent framework

for scholars in understanding and structuring each category of feminism itself. For example, there are studies on feminism conducted solely on defining the feminism and its development of definitions. There are also other studies on feminism that focus on the development of feminism itself by looking at the year of emergence, historical occurrence, movements and so on. Besides that, there are also studies that focuses on the varieties of the feminism school of thought. This study, however, did not centers solely on these three aspect, but rather only recognizing them as variations of feminism study that are inter-related to each other before extracting from these three variations the real essence of feminism, which this study argues as the modernism and postmodernism worldviews. Exploring the essences of feminism is an important task, as it signifies the very core of feminism.

Furthermore, as feminism is indeed a multifaceted notion, thus, it is impossible to understand it by superficially and separately looking at the definitions, its waves, and its school of thought only without looking or examining the relations of all of these to its real essence i.e. the modernism and postmodernism worldviews. In addition to that, understanding this essence of feminism is also important in order to provide critiques to it, enough to maintain the critiques in line and not deviating to other points. Therefore, this study argues that the essence of feminism is actually commences from the modernism and postmodernism worldview, and this is manifested in the variations of its definitions, waves and school of thoughts. This study views that literatures on the relation of modernism and postmodernism through the lens of these three variations is indeed scarce. This is because many previous studies pinpoints the relations of these two worldviews in the sense of studies on feminism's origins only. For example, Shukri (2011: 3) and Kauthar (2005: 184) only mentions modernism as merely the origin of feminism only, and did not divulges deeper on the relations of feminism to modernism through other dimensions of feminism studies.

On the contrary, the relations of postmodernism and feminism however is clearer, presented as one of the specific school of thoughts in feminism, and usually discussed in an explicit manner especially on the questions of its origin and philosophy. This is displayed in the like of the writings such as Rosalind Smith Edman in her article entitled *Feminism, Postmodernism and Thomism Confront Questions of Gender* (Edman 1997: 97). However, this study views that as of this time, there are no studies on modernism and postmodernism in feminism that speculate the relations of these three in a manner of analyzing the variations of feminism studies i.e. its definitions, waves and its school of thoughts like this study attempts to.

Therefore, apart from the literatures related to the understanding of modernism and postmodernism in feminism, this study views that the literatures pertaining to the three variations mentioned before are also important, as it is what really identifies the existing and hidden relation of feminism and its essences of modernism or postmodernism. Hence, this study will analyze the relation of modernism and postmodernism to feminism in four parts. The first part is the analysis on the development of its definitions coined by scholars, the second part is the discussions on the waves of feminism, and the third part is the discussions on the feminism and its specific school of thought; liberal, classical Marxist, socialist and radical feminism. The fourth part is where all of these variations discussed as inter-related to each other, in which it will also be analyzed in the framework of modernism and postmodernism worldviews.

The definition of feminism and its developments

Leffingwell (2018) argued that in general, the definition of feminism carries on the meaning of a notion that propagates the idea and theory of political, economy and social equality of the sexes. This idea manifested in many feminism movements that span from the late 19th century, which in a way signifies that feminism is indeed far-fetched from being recent, contemporary or new phenomenon. However, these feminism movements are related to the historical occurrences, hence, they are not subjugated to a certain bind that curbs them to the same and similar ideas in attaining their political, economy or social equalities of the sexes as the previous meaning implies. These variations in feminism movements led to a complication in defining feminism in precise way (Leffingwell 2018). Before Leffingwell, Delmar (1986: 9) has argued the same thing, as she views that the diversity of feminism and its dependency on

certain historical occurrences are actually laying out a long road to walk for feminists themselves in defining feminism (Delmar 1986: 9). Delmar(1986: 11) further stressed out that unity based on identity is indeed a fragile thing and yet to be achieved among feminists. Although in the first instance, Delmar (1986: 11) argued that the lack of unity between feminists is usually the same as divisions in a political party, which sometimes embracing underlying agreement and merely acts as a prequel episode to overriding history of unity itself, this prediction of hers is indeed proven as false. This is by considering that the feminists still do not achieve that unity even until today, and this is not only in the unification of their diverse thought but also in exercising its definition itself, and this is like what has been argued by Leffingwell earlier (2018).

However, as argued by Tong (2009: 1), this lack of unity is not a deficiency but it is what describes feminism the best. She argued that it shows feminism based on interlocking, intersectional and interdisciplinary way of thought. According to her, this put forward feminism as a non-monolithic ideology as it shows feminists do not have the same thought all together. This also helps the feminists to shape their own interpretation of the feminism itself, analyzing the core problem of women's issues in their contemporarily time or places and at once solving them. In a much contrary argument, there are some scholars that tried to evaluate the definition of feminism by proposing a new kind of definition that was said to be transcending the time and place, at such raising it to a higher level of generalization. One of them that worth mentioning here is Cathia Jenainati (2007: 3). She argued that despite the exercise in defining feminism is considered to facing numerous challenges, i.e. who to start, what and who to include and when to stop, yet the most fundamental definition of feminism is a struggle to end sexist oppression.

However, this study views that this kind of definition then led us to another related question; what do sexist oppression means? These need to be asked as the quality in this definition of feminism that – according to her- is transcendent to every specific history of time and spaces still relatively correlated to the term sexist oppression itself that varies from each other in terms of social, cultural or historical. As a result, there are scholars of feminism who propose many ideas in curbing this limitlessness of feminism definition. For example, Leffingwell (2018), in explaining this phenomenon, she proposes an idea of centering the category of 'women' in each feminism movements. This is by limiting the meaning of 'woman' in each specific feminism movement to the contemporary moment at the first place, this is in order to limit the definition of feminism in an actual moment, and not based on the historical occurrences or different social and culture that varies from each other.

Another generalized definition also worth to be mentioned here is the dictionary definition. Webster (1963: 407), for example, defines feminism as a theory or organized activity that is based on the social equality of the sexes on behalf of women's rights and interest –politically and economically. This definition is then questioned by Offen (1985: 123-124) as she argued that it still lacks in its explanatory as it doesn't give the adequate meaning of rights, goals and interest of women collectively. This is due to the fact that despite the issues of female privileges and accesses to power is important to women, it is not denying the fact that they are also seeking for other goals as well. For example, feminist discourse in Anglo-Americans is dominating on the issue of similarity and equality between male and female while Europeans more focused on elaborations of womanliness, and they celebrated the sexual differences between men and women rather than seeking for an elimination of these differences in the name of equality. Besides that, if the issues on women are on advancing their legal rights in the public sphere, how do feminists evaluate the woman who does not exercise that right? This refers to the women who prefer to sit at home, independent of any organizations and doctrines, exercising private virtues and uplifting the love value as a sole way to their liberation. Are they considered as the woman who does not embrace feminism as a cause? In another example, it is not enough for scholars to generalize feminism definition to a certain social group that struggles with its feminism causes only, because there is another group of women that did not self-identify them to that causes. To put it in a clear way, a 'modern' women social movement with its certain modern feminism causes indirectly imposes certain political goals and activism method that suits their status. By reserving to this social movement only, does it means that other group of woman who did not conforming to that 'modern' causes such as the indigenous, subaltern or marginalized women's social movement is excluded? (Leffingwell, 2018).

In a more recent dictionary, such as the Cambridge Dictionary of Sociology (2006: 199), this multi-faceted layer of feminism is addressed where this dictionary delineates a repudiation on the general look on feminism such as defined by the Webster previously. This is manifested in its propagation on acknowledging the ethnocentricity of feminism that exists in its general traits which is a protest of women against a subordinate social status, while at the same time recognizing its complexity; which is the global traits of feminism that multiplies into different forms based on the cultures that it prevails in. According to this dictionary, the only forms where all of the feminism takes unitary arguments are on the issues of claiming women's rights in education, public voice, and their position in law (Cambridge Dictionary of Sociology 2006: 199). Subsequently, this led to a need of another kind of feminism definition that tend to have the universal quality, which can encompasses the multiplicity of feminism dimensions. In providing this, Offen (1986: 135) proposes another feminism's definition that said to be conforming to this trait and this by first looking at feminism from the duality traits that exist in feminism dimension. This study argues that Offen tries to put a more general lens in studying feminism, and this is of course by shifting the view from looking at each different feminism movements to universal traits joined by each movements.

According to Offen (1986: 135), feminism is a notion that incorporating two traditions; relational and individualist view. Relational tradition, according to her meant familial, a view on feminism that based on the egalitarian vision of the social organization. To put it clearly, it is a tradition that prioritizes preferences to the non-hierarchical male-female couple as a basic unit of society. Their discourse usually circling around women's right and their sovereignty in society. For example, they questioned the rights of women in society by uplifting the role of women in society and their contribution, e.g. childbearing and childrearing capacities in women. On the other hand, Becker (2000: 46) stresses that relational feminism is a new substantive feminism, which values correct responses to the challenges faced by women and not only limited to generalization of equality between men and women. Becker (2000: 47) also posits that relational feminism does acknowledging the biological differences between men and women, and it values those differences by insisting the roles played by both genders e.g. men with their masculine role and women with their feminine role. Besides that, the targeted inequalities of relational feminism much more lies on the cultural overvaluation of masculine qualities and undervaluation of feminine qualities that usually limiting the role and rights of women in public space, education, politics and so on (Becker 2000: 47). In this sense, relational feminist then does not solely centering on the discourse of the gender but also relates to the structural inequities faced by different group of women in certain social group, where this inequities affecting their opportunity to shape their lives better (Banu 2017: 4).

By contrast, the individualist tradition more inclined to hold the view of the individual sex or gender as the basic unit. This discussion of feminism in this tradition also contrary to relational tradition as it is circulating around the abstract concept of human rights in individual and advocating the personal independence in all aspect of life such as sexual freedom, de-structuring the concept of reproductive role in men and women, re-analyzing the concept of marriage, etc. (Offen 1985: 135-136). On another note, McElroy (2003: 4) argues that similar to relational feminism, individualist feminism also envisages their revolutionary causes through human rights discourses but it did not really centers its human rights lens on the equal distributions of opportunities in terms of wealth, power or education through the law. It is, however, posits a radical need on protecting the individual human rights. In this sense, individualist feminists are generally advocating for a protection of their individual choices and rights through the law. This is because they view that this is the utmost cause needed to be protected, as it is what they have to claim in order to be liberated. For example, in delineating the differences between individualist feminism and other kind of feminism, one can considers the issue of abortion, which of course through the lens of individualist feminism; it is indeed one of their choices and rights that have to be protected by the law. However, if the abortion is viewed through the lens of earlier feminism figures, such as the like of Elizabeth Cady Stanton, which is to be said as the founding mother of liberal feminism, abortion is indeed rejected. This is due to the differences of feminism spectrums between them, which the latter posits its view on feminism through relational human rights in the equal distributions of opportunities, while the former is more on the protection of their individual rights (McElroy 2003, 2).

In addition to that, there are also voices that insist that individualist feminism must not conforming only to the existing laws but must goes beyond it through what they terms as revolution. Individualist feminism also differs from the relational feminism as the latter is seen to be more advocating equal treatment under existing law or institutions while the former protested the existing laws and institutions. This is because it views the existing laws and institutions as part of the source of injustice to women and to some extent, it is impossible to reformed like the latter implies (McElroy 2003: 3).

Still, considering the fact that this kind of definition of feminism is proposing dualism, it implies that defining feminism in a general term is indeed a stubborn problem, hard to be confined to one specific definition and limited to a certain variety in its discourse. It is also what had been argued by Dubois (1989: 135) in his commentary to Offen's relational and individualist definition of feminism, which Dubois argues that it is not an attempt of encompassing the multiple dimensions of feminism in one definition, but rather act only as a display of competition between good (relational feminist) and bad (individualist feminists). This is possibly due to the statement from Offen herself saying that individualist feminist is a latecomer, and relational feminist discourse offers a better future for the feminism (Offen 1985: 153-155).

However, this study views that one cannot deny the existence of these two traditions in feminism discourse. Although the argument by Offen is not quite recent, but her classification on the definition of feminism is indeed remains sturdy. There are still scholars who view feminism based on these two dimension up to this day, and this is like what has been mentioned in the previous arguments before on both relational and individualist feminism. Apart from that, this duality of relational and individualist also manifests in another two variations of feminism that this study will tries to attempt to analyze later, which is the studies on its waves and its specific school of thoughts. Hence, in order to delineates more on the relation of feminism to modernism and postmodernism in its essence, this study then will analyze feminism discourse in another two variations in the later section, which are the three feminism consecutive waves and its specific school of thoughts, liberal, classical Marxism socialist and radical feminism.

The development of feminism waves

This discourse on feminism argues that feminism must be studied based on its years of emergence, or waves of feminism. There are those who categorize it into two periods, whether from 1830-1920 or 1960 to the present such as Elizabeth Sarah (Offen 1985: 132) and Olive Banks (Kauthar 2005: 147). The interval from 1920-1960 is to be said as a relative stagnation among feminists (Vincent 2010: 170). On the contrary, there also group of scholars that tried to expand the scope of feminism waves then proposes another wave that called as the third wave feminism, which span from early nineties to the present. This three categorization becomes the most conventional way of categorization circling around feminism-waves debacles.

The first wave feminism span from the period 1830 to 1960. However, there is no exact date stating the parameters of the first wave. For example, Kohli&Burbules (2012: 24) argued that there is discrepancy on its parameter. This is by considering the disputes among scholars on this issue. Some of them marks the beginning of the first wave as early as 1830, 1840, 1879 or 1880. Yet, Kohli&Burbules (2012: 24) insist that feminism as an organized movement in United States and British is actually gaining its foothold in the mid-nineteenth century. First wave feminism generally lies in the classical liberal rights perspectives (Vincent 2010: 170). However, the early wave of feminism is also influenced by the prevalent ideologies of that time ranging from evangelical Christianity, Enlightenment philosophy, communitarian socialism and the changes in social brought by the industrialization (Kohli&Burbules 2012: 24). This period mainly concentrated on the issues of women's suffrage and the extension of civil rights to women. This course is to be said was having a big and immediate impact on America (Vincent 2010: 170). This is because America was still exercising undemocratic practices on 1918, which is by not granting women in political participations, and in this case – the right to vote. Meanwhile, the Germany had already granted women's suffrage, leaving American behind despite they were, or, are the proponents and advocators to the freedom and democracy for all (Krolokke 2006: 2).

The first wave feminism is also caused by certain movement of the human right based organizations and their discourse on the constitutional background of the American Declaration of Independence. This debate was said to be first raised in American Seneca Falls Convention in 1848 which had been organized by Elizabeth Cady Stanton and Lucretia Mott. This then led to an episode of demanding equality in education, profession, and property between men and women in society (Vincent 2010: 170). It is also during this period where women in America are struggling to achieve better educational, employment and social equity rights for them. This is because their situation at that period was oppressing them in many ways. For example, they had no civil status under the law and only pronounced as legally minors if they are not married or civilly dead upon marriage. They were also not allowed to sign a will or contract and had no control on their wages. Having claimed by the society at that time to be having frail physical and limited intelligence, they were also becoming less educated as they are not allowed to attend college alone (Kahle 2005: 4).

On the other hand, some scholars differs on when did the second wave of feminism did emerge, but most of them agree to a certain point that it began in the 1960s under the hand of the Betty Friedan with her 1963's published work *Feminine Mystique* (Farmer 2015: 27). After a period of relative stagnation from 1920-1960, women of that period seem to struggle with another concept of equality. In the earlier period, they struggle to end inequality of opportunities between gender in terms of their rights of voting, having profession, property, and education. As of the second wave period, their struggle seems to be a bit different to the predecessors as their current demographic at that time started to differ. For example, they already constituted as a labor force, some of them postponed marriage, while some of them who married had fewer children, worked outside the home, having a higher divorce rate and seek higher education. This led them to seek another cause of equality. The main starting point for them is equality in the politics of reproduction (Kohli&Burbules 2012: 27, Yuil&Todd 2014: 67). Issues on this reproductive role then caused other pertinent issues in a more private sphere such as sexual freedom, sexuality, abortions and gender issues (Kohli&Burbules 2012: 27). To put things short, in the late 1960s and early 1970s, it displayed two dichotomies of thinking between feminists. The first one offers feminism in a relational way, that is by acknowledging the differences between men and women lies deep in nature and tend to celebrate it, although at the same time they sought advancements of their rights in public sphere through the law. The other one however argued the differences between men and women is actually did not exist and that both genders are the same. The second wave feminism is rooted deep in the latter; demanding a more radical, rebellious and deconstructive equality (Nicholson 1997: 3).

The third wave of feminism began in the early nineties, came to the fore in 1980 to the present (Farmer 2015: 131). It argues the second wave feminism authorities in representing them and all women in the world. This is because the advocators for this wave are emerging from the non-stereotypical women that were not covered in the second wave (the white middle-class women in Europe and America). They are usually coming from the marginalized strata of women, especially from the third world nations whose experiencing the different notion of inequality compared to these middle-class white women, and they usually come from the indigenous, non-white, or non-Christian women (Shukri 2011: 5). Besides being rebellious to the stereotypical class in society, this wave of feminism is also constituted by the class of women that rebelling to a certain prevailing cultural structure of that time. In other words, it was born from the subcultural strata of women. For example, Karen McNoughton, one of these wave famous proponents has come up with an acronym G.R.R.L.S that basically stands for Great Girls. This creation of new self-celebrating words is actually originated from girls-only punk bands such as Bikini Kill and Brat Mobile. This shown that it was born from a specific subculture considering that the punk culture is actually one of the classical subcultures on that time (Clark 2003: 223). It was also correlating with other prevalent subcultures such as Queer Nation, Nigger with Attitude, or Gay and Proud.

According to Krolokke (2006: 15-16), the fact that this wave of feminism that filled with the one who was born with the privileges which the first and the second wave feminists had fought for has led them to be the less pompous girl as they see themselves more capable, strong and assertive social agents. This then led them to be more rebellious kind of women, acting on self-reliance, criticized sexist derogatory forms of languages to women and invented new self-celebrating words and forms of

Malaysian Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities (MJSSH), Volume 4, Issue 1, (page 1 - 14), 2019

communications. This situation according to Krolokke (2015: 16) is one of the linguistic jiu-jitsu come up by these third wave feminists in defending themselves and that is by exaggerating the stereotypes used against them instead of condemning it, and it is likely what G.R.R.L.S and Bikini Kill stand for; a defense mechanism. This happened because the third wave feminists are advocating for a need of developing new feminist theory to distinguish them to their predecessors, and this is, unlike the latter, is by honoring the contradictory experiences of different group of women as well as deconstructing the established categorical thinking on gender, sex, etc (Bobel 2010: 15).

Apart from that, the third wave feminism is also a wave that focuses on expanding women's opportunities and re-emphasizing back the oppressions to them in a new way. To put it in a clear way, this wave of feminism tries to create a new face of feminism by taking a further look at the lives of real women nowadays that struggling with jobs, kids, money, and personal freedom, surpassing their predecessors' feminist movement worldviews (Bobel 2010: 15). This study views that this might be the only stands where the third wave feminism is quite different to the second wave feminism. However, it can be said that there are no clear monochromatic differences exists between this wave and the second wave of feminism as these two waves act as strands, interweaving and not succeeding each other, and the noticeable differences is only between both of them and the first wave feminism. (Kohli&Burbules 2012: 24).

Feminism school of thought and its developments

Apart from the definitions of feminism and its waves, there are another variation of feminism studies that need to be tackled on, which is the feminism school of thought. This goes from liberal, radical, socialist, Marxist, psychoanalytic or neo-Marxist/gender feminism (Tong 2010: v-vii). However, in this section, this study will limits to only four popular school of thoughts in feminism studies, which began with the liberal, classical Marxist, socialist and radical feminism.

Being totally based on the liberal school of political thought that upholds the significance and liberty of man, classical liberal feminists lay down their arguments by saying that both man and woman are rational beings that subjected to equal opportunities for education and political participations (Kauthar 2005: 149). It also opposes monopoly power of men (Farmer 2015: 131). This is because the earlier images of women initiated by Western political philosophers illustrated women as inferior to men. Mary Wollstonecraft, one of the founding mother of liberal feminism, refutes this established illustration of women in the Western society, as she challenged the practice of socio-economic subordination of women in society (Moten&Serajul Islam 2011: 304). She also refuted the idea initiated by Jean Jacques Rousseau in his book Emile that proposed two different programs of education for boys and girls and advocated for an equal education of both genders. According to her, the ignorance imposed by male patriarchy should be eradicated from women as a means to give the opportunities for woman in socio-political and economic structures (Kauthar 2005: 149).

Classical Marxist feminism, however, views that oppression on women lie in differences in class rather than gender. One example of classical Marxist feminist argument is the argument that the same capitalist economic forces and social relations are the sole reason for the oppression of one class to another, one race to another, one nation to another and one sex to another (Tong 2010: 107). However, this does not meant that oppressed women have to seclude themselves together to wage a war against men, but rather she urged them to join oppressed men in a class war that usually depicted by Marxist (Tong 2010: 107). Therefore, they concluded that as long as women not becoming economically dependent by either joining the outside workforce or demanding wages for their housework and creating the balance between men and women in housework and childcare, they are never going to be liberated. (Tong 2010: 15). Another kind of view in Marxist feminist however slightly different with the latter. This second category implied that power and authority in the family and society is the man's economic status (Kauthar 2005: 151). According to them, earlier societies were matriarchal and matrilineal and women were essential in production of material life. Women then lose their vital position as the production moved from home to the outside world. This is also what differentiates them from socialist feminist as they tend to focus more on the domestic realms compare to the socialist that

keen on giving attention to faring issues between men and women in outside workforce sphere (Tong 2010: 108). Besides that, Marxist feminists tend to be more skeptical on working in the 'system' on achieving their objectives and more keen to be having revolution while the socialist feminists are contradicting that (Ampersand 2010). Besides that, both of the socialist and classical Marxist still views that the source of oppression is in the capitalism and women should be liberated from it as well as men should.

This study views that in the earlier phases of feminism, each school of thoughts are actually fighting for their rights in public sphere, and this is by claiming their equal opportunities in politics, economy and education. Their discourses were also not too individualist in its traits but rather more relational. However, their discourses started to transform into individualist as the second wave of feminism started to appear. For example, in the liberal feminism discourse, in looking to their early figures' argument such as Wollstonecraft, it can be said that it still circulated in the relational feminism issues of equal opportunities and did not ventured into individualist argumentation which more fit in the private sphere i.e. sexuality, sex, gender etc. Wollstonecraft had only awakened mankind to the knowledge that women are human beings first and their sex is only a secondary things worth to be mentioned (Pedersen 2011: 250).

However, as the second wave of feminism emerges, changes started to occurs in the discourse among liberal feminists where the individualist traits started to manifest. One of the most influential changes in liberal feminist manifested from the second wave period is the work of Betty Friedan entitled *Feminine Mystique* published in 1963 (Farmer 2010: 131). In this work of hers, she stated that women should break the gap of thinking that housework jobs as a wife and mother is an eternal duty that function solely in giving her satisfaction. This gap is what she refers in her work as 'mystique'. She argues that this kind of women who consider their housework as an eternal duty fails to spare any time for outside activities. This leads them to strive solely to become a competent housewife. In order to do that, these women will go and buy every possible labour-saving device that will make them more efficient and competent. However, after devoting their full effort in this duty, they still felt with dissatisfaction. This is caused by their lack of meaningful goals. These feelings of futility and emptiness then were compensated by their energy in shopping, manipulated by advertising industries that continue promoting them, boosting them to always have shopping-spree, all in order to become a competent housewife (Kauthar 2005: 150). From her arguments, it can be seen several attempts by her that looks to be more individualistic in its traits, such as her attempt to reconstruct the concept of housework in familial institution.

This is also happened to classical Marxist and socialist feminism, in which they evolves from fighting for capitalism-free world and equality of opportunities in economy and politics to a more radical and individualistic approach. Like the liberal feminist, these changes are also manifested in the writings of their prominent figures from the second wave. For example, Juliet Mitchell (1971: 11), one of the neo-classical Marxist and socialist feminist, repudiates the established concept of familial institution through the issue of women subordination in family. Mitchell argues that there are four functions, which show women subordination in the family and society. These are consisted of limitation of women in production and division of labor, limited reproduction women's role in family structure, sexual limitation, and the role of women as socializer of children e.g giving birth, bringing up the children (Mitchell 1971: 11). Mitchell (1971: 36) then proposes that these four functions is actually the structure of the 'bourgeois' family and it is inter-related to each other in keeping women on the leash. For example, in order to have sexual freedom, one must remove reproduction in sexuality; this is, as reproduction will bounds women in the name of marriage, socializing children and so on. This limitation then of course will affects women's production in the workforce. Hence, the revolutionary demands that should have been done to attain freedom according to Mitchell (1971: 36) is to liberate each of these functions from its monolithic structures that is bounding the women, which is the 'bourgeois' family structure. According to Mitchell (1971: 36) also, the way to liberation from this structure is by disassociating each functions that constructing it from each other. For example, the binding traits of reproduction must be disassociated from sexuality using several means such as the contraception tools in sex or by legalizing homosexuality, which is one of the forms of non-reproductive sexual activities. These means can control any uncontrollable or unwanted reproduction

Malaysian Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities (MJSSH), Volume 4, Issue 1, (page 1 - 14), 2019

that can limit women's role in society (Mitchell 1971: 36). This study opines that these kind of views in feminism discourses posit radical individualistic traits in their cause, despite of their differences in attaining separate objectives e.g liberal, Marxist,or socialist. This unitary of individualistic traits led to the birth of another school of thought in feminism, which encompasses all of them in one name; the radical feminism.

Similar to the second wave feminists, radical feminists also assert the individualist traits in their discourses. They did not rejects the mainstream idea that the sole problem regarding the issues of women is rooted in usual discussions on women's daily lives, ranging from political, economic, or education participations (Lorber 1997: 16). However, unlike their predecessors before, they regarded male powers did not imposed on women's participation in society only, but also extended to their private matters from sexual and reproductive roles. This kind of discussions then rendered a theory among them on gender inequality and discriminations that went beyond their predecessors' usual conversation before (Farmer 2015: 132). Therefore, they regarded that the sexual and reproductive liberation is the sole struggle in attaining women's freedom. Patriarchy system is identified as the root caused for this oppression as it has initiated all types of limited sexual and reproductive standard to the woman (Bryson 2003: 163). Another type of feminism that similar to radical feminism is gender feminism. Likewise, gender feminism also bore the same discourse with radical feminist, especially on their view on the liberation of women's sexuality. For example, they view that women's role is socially constructed. According to them, heterosexual marriage and motherhood are political and all kind of new sexuality such as lesbianism or homosexual should be accepted as standard norms. As they find that artificial ways of reproduction should be advocated, they then also advocated the abolition of biological marriage, reproduction and family institutions (Kauthar 2005: 163).To put it in a clear way, this study views that radical or gender feminism posits the individualistic traits in these four structures:

Deconstructing the Concept of Sex, Sexuality, and Marriage

Radical feminists argued that the patriarchal socio-political system is included in all aspects of life including sex. The relationship between man and women is regarded as power relationship as sex is a status category with political implications (MacKinnon 1982: 529). Radical feminists also advocate for the freedom of women by promoting sexual freedom using reproductive technology in order to break the chain of marriage and family institution. In addition to that, radical feminists also refute the legitimacy principle that exists in the patriarchal family institution that dictates the status of child and mother is determined by the male. They asserted that women should have total control of their own body and suggested that a sexual revolution needs to be attained in order to achieve sexual freedom (Kauthar 2005: 154).

Deconstructing the Concept of Childbirth and Childrearing

Apart from sex, sexuality and marriage, radical feminists also argued that the center of oppression to women lies in childbearing and childrearing roles. According to Firestone (1972: 2-12), the liberation of women can only be attained by biological revolution through reproduction technology. In proving this point, Firestone (1972: 2-12) also went deeper on the understanding of the gender in the Western culture, the organization of the culture, and the nature of the women itself. Considered as the feminist version of the materialist theory of history, Firestone (1972: 10) proposed a notion saying: a seize control of the means of reproduction in the biological revolution is necessary in order to abolish the sexual class system (Firestone 1972: 10).

Deconstructing the Concept Word in Language

Another notable trait of radical feminism is the deconstructing of language. For example, radical feminists argued that femininity is a man-made notion and woman should break this morality, deconstructing it back and become rough and wild (Kauthar 2005: 157). In another word, they are deconstructing the value, especially in determining what is good or what is bad. For example, Daly (1978: 15) deconstructs the meaning of the word hag by asking the real meaning of this word, and questioning the negative connotation of this word that has been defined by notable dictionaries such as

Webster. Daly (1978: 15) also contends on whose authority that permits this word to be defined as negative and bad connotation. According to her, to be a hag that was defined by society as the female demon, fury or harpy is good for women, all in order to avoid domestication on women and giving them various direction to move; not sticking to only one road that determined by men (Daly, 1978: 15). Some of them argue that men have suppressing women by exercising control to the level of women language and knowledge (Kauthar 2005: 158). Some of them also assert that men using language in two ways to control women; the first is the continuity of using masculinist English words such as he, men, mankind or bitch. The second one is that language is used to deceive, to protect and to coerce those who held power, and in this case, it refers to men (The Lesbians and Literature Panel of the 1977 Annual Modern Language Association Convention 1978: 5).

According to Isutzu (2004: 4), finding and deconstructing the real meaning of a certain word is indeed a semantic concept that is important, especially in analyzing certain words in order to avoid the 'transmuted concepts' (Isutzu 2004: 4). However, it still did not eliminating the fact that the real meaning of the word itself is still confined to the understanding of the society of the spoken word, i.e. the native society of that language which the word had been spoken. Another example of this that is worth to be mentioned here is the deconstruction of the word gender, usually propagated by gender feminists. Among notable figures of gender feminism is Judith Butler. In delineating this argument, Butler (2004: 185) argues that gender is socially constructed. Unlike the word sex, gender possess the social meaning of masculinity and femininity, and these two words are not the quality of sexual differences (Butler 2004: 185). Hence, there should be a clear dichotomy between sex and gender, as sex is a word that possess biological meaning while gender is more to the cultural meaning, thus, according to radical feminists, gender must be independent from sex in order to free the women from the wrong roles that had been constructed by society (Kauthar, 2005: 163).

Modernism and Postmodernism in feminism

Previously, this study has discussed all of the three variations of feminism, which is the definitions, waves and its specific school of thought. In this section, this study will analyze the relation of all those three variations to modernism and postmodernism especially in terms of highlighting the way modernism and postmodernism becomes the essence of feminism.

Modernism and feminism

Modernism is actually a worldview that can be traced back to Enlightenment philosophy (Kahraman 2014: 3992). It mainly emphasizes that men can attain knowledge, understand his entire individual and collective problem, control the forces problems of nature and the environment through the scientific method and reason (Kauthar 2005: 148). Among the main proponent of this thought are Rene Descartes (1596-1650), Isaac Newton (1687-1789) and Immanuel Kant (1724-1804 (Barrett 1997: 17).According to Shukri (2011: 3), the beginning of philosophy in equality between gender is actually can be linked back to the Cartesian thinkers who followed Rene Descartes epistemological approach, which is on making sure all received ideas evaluated in a methodological doubt in order to achieve a new sound foundation of knowledge.

This then led to certain stages. First, reason becomes a capacity that available in each person, whether men or women, and second, reason alone is what constituted human beings and not gender (Shukri 2011: 3). This then asserts a value that women are equals to men as the thinking process do not posit in the thinker's body as a man or a woman but rather acts independently of that (Shukri 2011: 3). However, this study views that although it is indeed that it can be said that Cartesian thinkers might plays a role in developing the struggles of equality between gender, one might have to question to what extent it did permeates into feminism. In giving answers to that, we have to look first at the feminists of the first wave period. In particular, the feminists in the first wave did not conform fully to the Cartesian ideas of equality of men and women solely based on their capabilities of reasoning, but like what has been illustrated before in the previous section, they are more inclined to appreciate the differences and complementary elements of men and women. The feminists' causes at that time are also considered to

be more relational to the public sphere e.g equal opportunity in politics, economy or education rather than being too individualist as this Cartesian ideas implies. Hence, it can be said that Cartesian thinkers might have, in a way, ignited the struggles for equality between gender in the early phases of feminism, however, it is not what really had been constructing the feminism of that period, but rather on the later period.

On the other hand, Kauthar (2005: 184) posits that feminism is indeed can be traced back to the Enlightenment philosophy and modernism worldview, and it usually circulates around three major problems, which is philosophical, theological and practical problems. According to Kauthar (2005: 184), the philosophical problem is the repudiations from women to the prevailing philosophers at that time who depicted women as inferior being to men, while the theological problem lies on the Biblical revelation of story on Adam and Eve that depicted Eve as a sole cause for the fall of men due to her seductive character. The practical problem, however, lies in the poor treatments that had been received by the women in society at that time in terms of their equal opportunities in education, economy, politics and legal matters. These three problems are the main conflicts that faced by feminism on that time, and modernism is a worldview that appears to be a savior to eradicate these three problems (Kauthar 2005: 184).

Based on the arguments by Kauthar, this study concludes several assertions. First, the philosophical problems posed by Kauthar contends that there are several modernist and Enlightenment thinkers and philosophers who rejected the ideas of equality between gender despite it is also supported by others such as the previous Cartesian thinkers. For example, Kant boldly argues that women can and should feel only and not think like men, because their philosophy is not to reason, but to sense (Shukri 2011: 3). According to Kant, women avoids unrighteous things not because of they think that as morally wrong, but because they percept it as ugly. The also view righteousness as right things not because they think that it is morally right, but because it is a beautiful thing (Mikkola 2011: 89). This also goes to Rousseau that argues women nature is exclusively to the private sphere of household as a wife and mother where they will achieve their own respect and dignity (Shukri 2011: 3).

This affirms an idea that some modernist thinkers like Kant and Rousseau in a way reject the idea of equality between gender solely based on their capabilities of reasoning like what Cartesian implies, but instead, they value the differences and complementary elements between both gender. Second, due to fact that modernism and Enlightenment philosophies were already rejecting the role of religion through the radical assertion of reason at that time, the theological problems related to poor imagery of women in Biblical narration then is only acting as the additional reason for the emergence of resisting movements among women. Third, the practical problems poses as the peak of these three problems, as this is what the women of that period suffered through. Philosophical and theological aside, the practical problems argued by Kauthar here is the trigger for the women emancipation through modernism and Enlightenments philosophy. This is why the feminists' causes in the early period tends to be more relational in its traits and circulating around these practical problems.

In addition to that, this study also views that the feminists' causes in early era more inclined to the philosophy of Neo-Platonist, which is of course not really from the Enlightenment era. This is based on their views that asserts men and women are actually complimentary, interwoven and not above or being better than other (Shukri 2011: 3). However, this is not denying the fact that there are also modernist thinkers who also embraces this value, as seen in the previous arguments by Kant and Rousseau that acknowledges and values the differences of men and women. In conclusion, it is safe to say that the relation of modernism and feminism manifests in three structures. First, modernism worldview can be seen on the celebration of differences between both genders that is seen to be more uplifting rather than condemning the role of women in society. Second, having celebrated the differences of men and women, modernism influenced-feminists does not lay out their struggles on the basis of equality in everything like what Cartesian thinkers illustrated but rather grounded in relational traits of general rights such as in the equal opportunities in public sphere in terms of politics, education, and educations. Third, the struggles for relational rights of women and at the same time conforming to the established law of differences and complementary elements between men and women is primarily prevalent among the first wave feminists.

Postmodernism in feminism

Ironically, even though bearing the term 'post' in its name, postmodernism does not chronologically follow modernism, but rather as a reaction against modernism. Proponents of postmodernism usually linked the emergence of postmodernism back to the riots in Paris in May 1968 where the students demanded radical reformations and changes in the elitist, rigid European university (Barrett 1997: 17). Among famous postmodernism figures are Friederich Nietzche, Martin Heidegger, and Ludwig Wittgenstein. Postmodernist thinkers usually assert that facts are simply interpretations, truth is not absolute, and it is merely constructed by individuals groups, culture and language (Barrett 1997:18). The fact that it is anti-foundational and skeptical to certainty, it does seem complicated in exercising its description, moreover its definition (Edman 1997: 97). This is because exercising them itself is contradicting the postmodernism essence of which advocating the skepticism, uncertainties and relative truths. This led to the absence of unified theory in postmodernism, putting it under the same umbrella with feminism.

However, unlike modernism, the postmodernism relation to feminism is actually very clear. According to Edman (1997: 97), postmodernism in feminism is often associated with a thought in feminism that seeks to develop a new paradigm of social criticism, which does not rely on traditional philosophical underpinnings. Postmodernism in feminism discourses also accentuate the relations of the feminism issues to the languages, sex, and power (Kauthar 2005: 147). The feminism discourses through postmodernism lenses are also inclined to be culturally based (Farmer 2015: 131). For example, a feminist who adopts postmodernism worldview will exercises deconstructive arguments on certain issues and usually discursive rather than being on the track using established fact. For example, in the discourse of gender, postmodernism feminists usually criticize the views that argues gender is rigidly determined at birth rather than flexibly constructed by culture or language. Hence, rather than using established and traditional underpinnings of gender that usually based on biological facts, they usually attempts to deconstruct the gender using culture or language. Subsequently, they always allow multiple gender expressions (Ratliff 2006: 1018).

In a more subtle way, what postmodernism feminism proposes is the predominant and traditional representation of women in the gender are not biologically given and it is changeable as the only natural and interchangeable is the female and feminine nature. Hence, women are a product that exists after learning to adapt to a socially determined notion of femininity, which is of course, implies it as culturally affected, no less (Hutcheons 1989: 26). Unlike modernism, postmodernism offers a new insight to the feminist on empowering their applications as it provides a more constructive look on a certain issue (Mazza 1991: 35). Thus, the old notion of women, femininity, femaleness, reproduction or sexual roles, or even sexuality itself that are applicable to the whole societies in the world now can be looked on the basis of constructive criticism that based on cultural, history and reality.

This study views that postmodernism usually can be traced back in feminism to the second and third wave of feminism. Alongside the Cartesian views that commences from the Enlightenments philosophy, postmodernism then established a new paradigm in feminism discourse. This study argues that the reason behind postmodernism and its relation to the second and third wave of feminism manifests in three structures. The first structures is that the unlike the first wave feminists, the feminists of these two period did not celebrate the differences between men and women anymore. As their predecessors already provided them equal opportunities of relational causes such as their public participations in society in terms of education, politics, economy, etc, the feminists of these two period see themselves as more capable, strong and assertive social agents and started to develop a new kind of thinking that demands a new kind of equality. This is what this study has mentioned before in the previous section. Second, as the did not celebrates the difference between gender anymore, there has been transformations of their demands. In contrary to the first wave feminists whose demands lies in their relational rights in the public sphere, the feminists of the second and third wave period's demands inclined to be individualistic and more private. In fact, their demands posits radical reforms of the established system that their predecessors fought in before, such as in the concept of motherhood, gender, sex, sexuality and so on.

Conclusion

In conclusion, it is safe to say that modernism and postmodernism is indeed can be traced back to feminism. By analyzing, the variations exist in feminism studies, such as the like of the studies on the developments of its definitions, waves and school of thoughts, this study concludes several important points, which pinpoint the relation of modernism and postmodernism to feminism. Modernism in feminism usually manifests in the first wave of feminism. This wave usually incorporates its views on equality in a sense of relational rights in public sphere in terms of women's public participations in education, politics, and economy. This is because modernism worldviews does not propagates the idea of absolute equality between genders, but rather celebrates the differences and complimentary elements between men and women. Hence, its discourses is positioned to be more on the needs of improving women's living standards in public and not on individualistic rights like the postmodern feminism implies. The postmodernism worldview, however, manifests in the second and third waves of feminism from the late sixties onwards. It centers its fights for equality in the private sphere of women's life, such as on the concept of gender, sexuality, sex and so on. In addition to that, it is also important to highlight that there is a need of a more thorough analysis and studies need to be done, especially in analyzing the relation of modernism and postmodernism with feminism. This is because feminism is indeed a multifaceted notion that has many variations and dimensions, and it is not adequate to analyze it through three variations of feminism studies only such as this study attempts. This is important as it can provides a new paradigm in looking at the feminism, which is not limited to separate views on its certain variations only but encompassing feminism in its essence. This study also views that the essence of feminism is the core of discussion in understanding ethnocentricities of feminism, as this is the only center that can pinpoints the real similarities and differences between various types of feminism.

References

Ampersand. What Distinguishes Each Form of Feminism from the Other? Retrieved on 17 December 2015.http://goo.gl/vQ1YdrBanu, Roxana. (2017). "A Relational Feminist Approach to Conflict of Laws".*Michigan Journal of Gender and Law*.vol. 24.Issue. 1.

Becker, Mary. (1999). "Patriarchy and Inequality: Towards a Substantive Feminism". *University of Chicago Legal Forum*.vol. 1999.Issue 1.

Bobel, Chris. (2010) New Blood: Third Wave of Feminism and the Politics of Menstruation. United States. Rutgers Press.

Bryson, Valerie. (2003) *Feminist Political Theory: An Introduction.* New York. Palgrave Macmillan.

Butler, Judith. (2004). *Undoing Gender*. New York. Routledge.

Clark, Dylan. (2003) The Death and Life of Punk, The Last Subculture. In David Muggleton and Rupert Weinzierl (eds.) *The Post-Subcultures Reader*. Oxford. Berg.

Daly, Mary. (1978) *Gyn/Ecology: The Metaethetics of Radical Feminism.* Boston. Beacon Press.

Delmar, Rosalind. (1986) What Is Feminism? In Juliet Mitchell & Ann Oakley (eds.) *What Is Feminism?* New York. Pantheon Books.

Delmar, Rosalind. (1986) What Is Feminism? In Juliet Mitchell & Ann Oakley (eds.) *What Is Feminism?* New York. Pantheon Books.

Dubois, Ellen Carol. (1989) Comment on Karen Offen's "Defining Feminism: A Comparative Historical Approach". *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*. vol. 15.No. 1.

Edman, Rosalind Smith. (1997) Feminism, Postmodernism and Thomism Confront Questions of Gender. In Anthony O. Simon and et al. (eds.) *Postmodernism and Christian Philosophy*. Washington DC. American Maritain Association.

Farmer, David John. (2015) *Public Administration in Perspective: Theory and Practice through Multiple Lenses*. New York. Routledge.

Firestone, Shulamith, (1972) *The Dialectic of Sex: The Case for Feminist Revolution*. United States. William Morrow and Company.

Isutzu, Toshihiko. (2004) *Ethico-Religious Concepts in the Quran.* Kuala Lumpur. Islamic Book Trust.

Jenainati, Cathia. (2007) *Introducing Feminism*. United States. Totem Books.

Kahle, Antje. (2005) *First Wave of Feminism in Politics and Literature*. Germany. Grin Verlag.
Kahraman, Ayse Dersa. (2014). Relationship of Modernism, Postmodernism and Reflections of it on Education. Procedia: Social and Behavioural Sciences.
Kauthar, Zeenath. (2005) *Modern Western Political Ideologies*. Kuala Lumpur. Pearson Prentice Hall.
Kohli, Wendy R. and et al. (2012) *Feminism and Educational Research*. United Kingdom. Rowman& Littlefield Publishers.
Krolokke, Charlotte. and et al. (2006) *Gender Communication and Theory Analyses: From Silence to Performance*. California. Sage Publications.
Leffingwell, Hannah. *Toward a Feminist Definition of Feminism:A historical Exploration of the Word, 'Feminism'*. (Jan 12, 2018). Retrieved 17 May 2018. http://www.publicseminar.org/2018/01/toward-a-feminist-definition-of-feminism/
Linda Hutcheon. (1989) Feminism and Postmodernism. In Ada Testaferri (eds.) *Donna: Women in Italian Culture.* Ottawa. Dovehouse Editions.
Lorber, Judith. (1997) *The Variety of Feminisms and Their Contributions to Gender Equality*. Oldenburg. Bibliotheks- und Informationssystem der Universität Oldenburg.
MacKinnon, Catherine. (1982) Feminism, Marxism, Method, and the State: an Agenda for Theory. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*. vol. 7.no. 3.
Mazza, Mia. (1991) Postmodern Feminism and Frankenhooker. California. University of Southern California.
McElroy,Wendy. (2003). "Gender Feminism and Ifeminism: Wherein They Differ". *Etica & Politica / Ethics & Politics*.vol. 2.
Mikkola, Mari. (2011). "Kant on Moral Agency and Women's Nature".*Kantian Review*.vol. 16.no.1.
Millet, Kate. (1970) *Sexual Politics*. New York. Double Day and Co.
Mitchell, Juliet. (1971). Women: The Longest Revolution in Juliet Mitchell (eds.) *Women's Estate*. (n.p). Pelican Books.
Moore, Jane. (1997) Wollstonecraft's Secret. *Women's Writing*. vol. 4.No. 2.
Moten, Abdul Rashid, & Islam, Syed Serajul. (2010) Introduction to Political Science. Malaysia. Cengage Learning Asia.
Muhamad Shukri Abdul Salam. (2011). Islamic Feminist Discourse: Origins and Development in the Muslim World, paper presented at International Conference on Humanities (INCoH). School of Humanities.UniversitiSains Malaysia.http://goo.gl/02AS9Q. Retrieved on 13 December 2015.
Nicholson, Linda. (1997) Introduction. In Linda Nicholson (eds.) *The Second Wave: A Reader in Feminist Theory*. New York. Routledge.
Offen, Karen. (1985) Defining Feminism: A Comparative Historical Approach. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*. vol. 14.No. 1.
Pedersen, Joyce Senders. (2011) Mary Wollstonecraft: a Life in Past and Present Times. Women's History Review. vol. 20.no. 3.
Ratliff, Clancy. (2006) Postmodernism Feminism in Encyclopedia of Gender and Information Technology.In Eileen M. Trauth (eds.) United States.Idea Group Publishing.
Terry Barrett. (1997) Modernism and Postmodernism: an Overview with Art Examples. In James Hutchens and Marianne Suggs (eds.) *Art Education: Content and Practice in Postmodern Era*. Washington DC. NAEA.
The Lesbians and Literature Panel of the 1977 Annual Modern Language Association Convention. (1978) The Transformation of Silence into Language and Action. *Sinister Wisdom*.vol. 6.no. 6.
Todd, Megan &Yuil, Chris.(2014) Sociology. In Joyce Lishman and et al. (eds.) *Social Work: An Introduction*. London. Sage Publication.
Tong, Rosemarie. (2009) *Feminist Thought: A More Comprehensive Introduction*. United States. Westview Press.
Turner, Bryan S. (2006). *The Cambridge Dictionary of Sociology*. New York. Cambridge.
Vincent, Andrew. (2010) *Modern Political Ideologies*. West Sussex. Blackwell Publishing.
Webster-Merriam.(1963) *Webster Seventh New Collegiate Dictionary*. Massachusetts. G.&C. Merriam Company.
Who's Afraid of Defining Feminism?(2001). Paper presented at Australian Women's Studies Association (AWSA) conference.Macquarie University.http://goo.gl/ZnDaFs. Retrieved on 13 December 2015.