Introduction

This is the edited text of a roundtable held at City University London, UK in November 2014, organised by Alison Winch and Jo Littler. The event aimed to pay attention to the ways in which age and generation shape mediated conversation about feminist politics: to problematise the dominant media representations of intergenerational "cat fights," or feminist bickering, while simultaneously interrogating the ways in which mediated conflicts and connections shape the potential to work together to enact feminist social change. It therefore aimed to explore a number of different questions in relation to this issue, including: what kind of shared conversations do women have across age groups, and how do these circulate in media cultures? How can intergenerational alliances be built while still remaining sensitive to differences of experience? How are feminist connections being formed by digital media, technology, and platforms? How is feminist conflict mediated, and how might it operate productively?

Speakers

Rosalind Gill is Professor of Social and Cultural Analysis at City University London. Her books include Gender and the Media (2006), New Femininities (2011), and Gender and Creative Labour (2016). She is currently co-writing Mediated Intimacy: Sex Advice in Media Culture. E-mail: Rosalind.Gill.2@city.ac.uk

Hannah Hamad is Senior Lecturer in Film Studies at University of East Anglia and author of Postfeminism and Paternity in Contemporary US Film: Framing Fatherhood (2014). E-mail: H.Hamad@uea.ac.uk

Mariam Kauser recently completed a BA in Journalism at Middlesex University London. She now works at Middlesex as a graduate teaching assistant in the Media Department. E-mail: mkauser89@gmail.com

Diane Negra is Professor of Film Studies and Screen Cultures at the University of Dublin. Her books include What a Girl Wants? Fantasising the Reclamation of Self in Postfeminism and the co-edited Interrogating Postfeminism (2007) and Gendering the Recession (2014). E-mail: dhanniane.negra@ucd.ie

Nayomi Roshini recently completed a BA in Film at Middlesex University London. She now works at Middlesex as a graduate teaching assistant in the Media department. E-mail: N.Roshini@mdx.ac.uk

Diane Negra: This does indeed seem like an opportune moment for a discussion of this kind. There is clearly a new sort of conversation that has been taking place about feminism recently, and it manifests itself in various ways. We have some vibrant feminist solidarities that are giving rise to blogs like Feministing and Everyday Sexism. Heartening campaigns have emerged in both the US and the UK in recent years seeking to shed light on the ongoing cultures of campus-based sexual violence and street harassment. It remains, of course, a key feature of the contemporary sexist ethos that denial of sexism is rampant and persistent. But it does seem as if the virality of sexism is starting to be countered, at least a little bit, by online feminist initiatives. Thinking about 2014 in particular, the inability of high-profile, high-budget films like Interstellar (2014) and Gone Girl (2014), and very good films like Boyhood (2014) to say anything much about women has been notably critiqued this year. There have also been some interesting creative failures, like the abortion comedy, Obvious Child (2014). It seems to me that TV is definitely responding to the deficit of cinematic romantic comedy, and it is getting much harder to automatically equate quality TV with male centrality. So there are good reasons to assert that public feminism, or "representational feminism" is in perhaps some sort

of ascendancy. And yet we can't pretend that feminism isn't still reflexively and routinely disavowed and rejected. And it seems to me that the need for our contributions, as teachers and researchers, in pushing back against persistent patriarchalism, and contesting the disinterest and the distaste that is so often expressed of feminism—this need is immense and glaring.

It's useful to bear in mind that the anti-feminist views that are sometimes expressed by women are sometimes misdirected critiques of deficiencies of the current social order, and a desire for more functional, rewarding, and fairer social and economic roles. One critic who has recently spoken to this in a useful way is Eva Illouz, who has written a short book about Fifty Shades of Grey. She writes that the backlash against feminism is a longing for patriarchy, not because women long for domination per se, but because women long for the emotional bonds and glue that accompanied, hid, justified, and made domination invisible (Eva Ilouz 2014).

So I find myself in an ambivalent position at this particular moment. It still seems to me that feminist practice—whether academic or political—still faces some enormous obstacles. I would like to sketch a few of them in the short time that I have.

One is the challenge of thinking collectively. It is a striking feature of the current moment that feminism has been de-collectivised. The era of niche marketing and niche life-styling is a significant factor in this. Arguably social media reinforces niche modes of identity and community. A related problem is the continuous "partial attention" that we pay to so many things. It is a challenge to do anything collectively at such a moment.

Thinking particularly about academic environments, where so many of us work, it seems to me that the pretexts that are increasingly given by corporate universities for disruptive innovations, and a re-making of university roles along neoliberal lines, is a very significant factor as well. This is depriving us of traditional support structures. This can be seen in terms of the lack of research grants in the humanities, in some cases the lack of travel funding, but I would call attention as well to very quotidian concerns, that include the cuts to libraries and things like this. We have a generally antagonistic institutional environment, in which different departments within universities are now dealing with each other on a competitive footing. We are seeing dwindling support for humanities scholarship, particularly where it is politically-minded. Tremendous pressure is being applied to the humanities subject areas to adopt the modes and methodologies of the sciences. There is a rising generation of academics who are under pressure to force their work into safe, imitative modes. This is exacerbated by the fact that so many junior feminist academics are precariously employed.

Kathleen Rowe Karlyn, among others, has written about the way that feminism has positioned itself generationally. She argues that feminism has absorbed the ambivalence of a generation for whom feminism exists largely as a structuring absence. As she puts it, "in renewing itself, it has distanced itself from the generations that preceded it, thereby replicating the very misogyny that it wished to eradicate" (Kathleen Rowe Karlyn 2011, 4). This point is extremely well-made, and it is vital that any notion of a productive feminism has to be generationally balanced. And that, of course, is what we are here to reflect upon.

I want to say a few other things about my particular concerns about this moment, in terms of feminism in the university and beyond it. I think that academic reflection, as a counterweight to corporatism, is really imperative in revitalising the role of the critical humanities in the cultivation of social empathy. bell hooks has usefully contended that the contemporary feminist movement has not concentrated meaningful attention on the issue of women and wealth. And this takes us right up to some of the most striking developments of this year. It is important to be aware that feminism at

this moment is strongly associated with class and wealth privilege. Its highest profile proponents range from Beyoncé to Sheryl Sandberg. And arguably, its most significant manifestation in recent months was the announcement in October by Apple and Facebook that their employee benefits programmes would now cover the costs of their female employees' cryo-preservation and storage of eggs. So the question arises: is a market-minded, profit-orientated feminism a valid form of feminism? How does a feminism of this kind express and speak back (if it can) to an era of massively increasing inequality, growing nepotism, and a focus on super luxury markets?

The elephant in the room, for any conversation of this kind, is for me the enormous problem of deregulated capitalism and the social norms that accompany it. The book I have co-edited with Yvonne Tasker, Gendering the Recession, originated in part with a sense that the anti-feminist elements of austerity agendas were not well enough understood (Diane Negra and Yvonne Tasker 2014). Yvonne and I and the contributors to that book analyse how the recession is a moment of jeopardy for post-feminism, and how post-feminism then adopts a new kind of character in a moment of consolidation and re-calibration. We demonstrate that post-feminism gets this new value—in an interestingly paradoxical formulation—by mixing an always tempered female authority with cultural concern about the plight of men. So recessionary popular culture over-represents those who are least damaged by the financial crisis, and under-represents those who are most damaged. Post-feminism then becomes a kind of alibi for the kind of social damage being inflicted by the current economic order, and it has proved useful in the management of crisis capitalism. Ultimately, in the book, we are arguing that it is a mistake to understand the recession as a discrete event. What we are calling the recession is only the most conspicuous phase of a broader economic and social shift. And for many people, the yin and yang of recession and recovery narratives is no longer terribly meaningful or credible. We understand that there are bigger, less cyclical changes in economic subjectivity taking place.

Therefore, for me, an intergenerational feminism is profoundly challenged by a share-holder, stake-holder culture, by the death of transparency in the university, by the promotion of intra-institutional competition, and plutocratic governance structures in the academy and beyond. Under the corrupting logics of finance culture, we have a very tricky blend of post-feminism, neoliberalism, and capitalism, all reinforcing each other. The normalisation of ongoing wealth transfers to the top is clearly an enormous problem. Where I live in Ireland, it was revealed in October that women were the most hard-hit category of people under austerity. Yet the popular press in Ireland and beyond told us a story about recession that emphasised a kind of steady drumbeat of concern for the male victims of the so-called "man-session" or "he-session."

Against the sociopathy of contemporary finance culture, I want to come back to a feminism that stands for values of equality, solidarity, and access. In other words, emphasising feminism as a movement of equality, in light of the emotional deficits that are associated with this phase of capitalism, with the numerous forms of public cruelty that we see around us. How can these be addressed, and what role can feminism play? It is imperative to think about the role feminism can and should perform in essentially rebutting and combating this notion of crisis capitalism. The universities in which we work will not change while this is the prevailing mode of economic thought.

Hannah Hamad: When Jo and Alison asked me to speak on the topic of intergenerational feminism and media, the first thing that came to mind was the way I approach this with my students, and the examples of media culture that I use to illustrate the depiction of relations between women across succeeding generations. Unsurprisingly, they all characterise intergenerationality as toxic, and characterised by conflict and divisions that can't be surmounted without major feminist compromise. My starting points come from three main sources of scholarship. The first is Astrid

Henry's Not My Mother's Sister: Generational Conflict and Third Wave Feminism (2004), in which she demonstrates the tendency of succeeding generations of feminists to draw lines of distinction between one another, to the ultimate detriment of the feminist project. The second is Kathleen Rowe Karlyn's Unruly Girls, Unrepentant Mothers: Redefining Feminism on Screen (2011), which I think is the work Diane was referring to, which interrogates millennial cultures of popular film and television from a feminist perspective, honing in on intergenerational conflicts, that she argues characterise the representation of women across generations in terms of depictions or metaphors of troubled mother–daughter relationships. And the third one is Shelley Cobb's article "'I'm Nothing Like You!': Postfeminist Generationalism and Female Stardom in the Contemporary Chick Flick" (2011), which is her take on generational conflict in early twenty-first century Hollywood chick flicks. Discussing how toxic intergenerationality is articulated in this genre, she highlights the formula by which films like Monster-In-Law (2005) and The Devil Wears Prada (2006) "stage this generational conflict by pairing baby-boomer female stars associated with the 1970s with younger female actors" (2011, 31) explaining that "the older actors' stardom is used as a short hand for a politicised and outdated more of feminism that is based around a caricature of the career or neurotic woman" (31). This dynamic is exactly what colours the relationship between the characters portrayed here by Jane Fonda and Meryl Streep, and Jennifer Lopez and Anne Hathaway—the latter pair as heroines of millennial post-feminism.

I use exactly this kind of imagery (movie posters depicting a discourse of toxic intergenerationality between the aforementioned pairings of stars) with my students in the classroom context, inviting them to read the images for meaning. Elsewhere this can be seen in the structuring dynamic of generational toxicity that characterises the relationship between the two central characters of TV legal thriller Damages (2007–2012). Here we have Glenn Close and Rose Byrne playing two generations of lawyers, whose dynamic is marked by intergenerational tensions, increasingly articulated as a toxic mother–daughter dyad as the series progresses. In a UK context, another example is the 2006 episode of Doctor Who "School Reunion" that paired a character inserted into the series originally in the early 1970s—specifically to embody second-wave feminism—with her present-day equivalent played by Billie Piper, who was already a UK icon of girl culture during millenial post-feminism. Pointed intergenerational sniping ensues in the episode.

Karlyn highlights the extent to which popular culture can function as a lightning-rod for intergenerational conflict and toxic intergenerationality. She cites the example of 1990s teen slasher film Scream (1997) as symptomatic in that regard, explaining that it polarised mothers and their teenage daughters. It therefore "stands as a poignant example of missed opportunities for women of my generation—feminists of the second-wave—to learn more about our daughters, and better understand the rifts that divide us" (Rowe Karlyn 2011, 6). She is forthright in situating herself and her feminism in generational terms, as part of the second-wave. This made me consider my own place in this generational spectrum and how it informs the way I approach doing feminist media studies, and the examples from media culture that resonate with me as a result.

I am part of a generation of feminists that came of age at the height of millennial post-feminism. I am from exactly that generation that Diane referred to, for whom feminism was, if anything, largely a structuring absence. To add a bit of auto-ethnography, at seventeen I was the same age as the central character in Scream. Buffy [the Vampire Slayer (1997–2003)] and I were only a year apart in age so we've grown up together. At nineteen I imagined being a metropolitan thirty-something year old single woman like the characters of Sex and the City (1998–2004) to be the most glamorous experience on earth (I have long since been dispelled of that illusion). At twenty-four, by an amazing coincidence, I was the downtrodden underling of a bullying female publishing executive, who was

openly disgusted by my youth, and open with her expression of dismissive contempt for my feminism, not unlike Andy Sachs in The Devil Wears Prada. These icons of popular culture that I have mapped my life in relation to are, of course, media fictions. They are not historical figures with a feminist agenda. This has often served as a key differential between second-wave feminism and millenial post-feminism. In fact it recalls the now iconic 1998 Time Magazine cover featuring Susan B. Anthony, Betty Friedan, Gloria Steinem, and Calista Flockhart playing the title character in Ally McBeal (1997–2002), which I use with my students, as it's a great visual distillation of that separateness by which intergenerational feminism was characterised in media culture at the time. Karlyn also points to the iconicity of this image, which she describes as depicting succeeding generations of American feminism … in black and white, followed by Ally McBeal, TV's most popular character that year in "living color." The headline, "Is feminism dead?" suggested that if it lives, it does so in the fictionalised characters of popular culture. (2011, 7)

This is a good point from which to launch the idea that millennial post-feminism was a discourse circulating in principally cultural, rather than socio-political, spheres. But in 2014, I have found that this image is not quite the conversation starter that it was. Most of my students just don't recognise Ally McBeal anymore. It is therefore necessary to approach the topic with new entry points that are more likely to resonate with their experience of being an emergent generation of feminists. These are some of the flashpoints of celebrity culture to which Diane was referring.

This is something that Karlyn has always advocated for when trying to do feminist media studies across generations. She argues that generations of women who care about the next need to learn more about the popular texts that they are drawn to. As feminist critics of media culture we don't necessarily have to be convinced of this, but we do need to keep pace with the speed of change in media culture. And with that speed of change, issues of intergenerational feminisms circulate in increasingly variegated cultural and technological terrains and online spheres. In the spirit of keeping up, I made myself engage with Girls (2012–present) back in 2012, as it was quickly becoming clear that it was going to be a touchstone text for doing intergenerational feminist media studies today—a text that self-presents as very aware of its status as successor to Sex and the City. But my first response to my realisation of its significance was mild panic, because I tried to watch and I thought "my god, I don't understand this show—what do you mean I am not the target demographic!" This was compounded by colleagues telling me that the really interesting debates about Girls were taking place in the feminist blogosphere, to which I responded "feminist blogosphere?! Why don't I know about this?!" To let myself off the hook: at the time I lived in a town that had literally only just got broadband. That panic also made me question whether my ability to participate fully in feminist media studies would now be hampered by my generational status as a digital immigrant. To my great relief, I then saw Scream 4 (2011) and American Reunion (2012) and I temporarily stopped worrying about it! Yes, resurrected moribund franchises from the 1990s—this I can do! Unsurprisingly, ageing, intergenerational succession, and intergenerationality are thematised very heavily in both of these films. While my initial reading of them was that they were speaking across generations, to latter day Gen Xers and the succeeding generation of millennials, on reflection, it seemed more like the latter were being pathologised in sympathy with the former, and that this toxic cycle of generational discord was renewing itself in media culture, or in popular film culture at least.

Scream 4 in particular takes us nicely back to Karlyn's example, of the original 1996 film of a media flashpoint between second- and third-wave discord. To explain the extent to which toxic intergenerationality is central to the narrative of Scream 4, I am going to have to spoil the ending for you. It's 2011, it is fifteen years since the first film was released in the context of 1990s girl culture

and millennial post-feminism. Perennial "final girl" Sydney (Neve Campbell) has graduated from being a wide-eyed teen to a wizened thirty-something year old. Here, the toxic intergenerationality that characterised the mother–daughter dyad in the original is re-imagined in this new context in the relationship between Sydney and her teenage cousin Jill (Emma Roberts). They are very frequently mirrored in the composition and framing of shots that place them together, while the narrative works quite hard to situate them across generational lines in oppositional terms. Their disconnect is thus informed by their respective, generational affiliations. Sydney is positioned as a latter-day Gen Xer, while Jill is a stereotypically drawn privileged white millennial, imbued with traits like narcissism and entitlement. As you can see, this is all quite reminiscent of responses to the depiction of millennials in Girls. One of the major things that is shown to separate these two characters across generational lines is their respective relations to communications technology and celebrity culture, as the climactic scene of the film illustrates, when Jill delivers the following monologue before stabbing Sydney in the stomach:

I don't need friends. I need fans. Don't you get it? This has never been about killing you. It's about becoming you … You had your fifteen minutes, now I WANT MINE! I mean, what am I supposed to do? Go to college? Grad school? Work? Look around. We all live in public now. We're all on the internet. How do you think people become famous any more? You don't have to achieve anything. You've just got to have fucked up shit happen to you. So, you do have to die, Sid. Those are the rules. New movie. New franchise. There's only room for one lead, and let's face it, your ingénue days? They're over. (Scream 4 2011)

I'll close by returning to Karlyn, who states that "Productive conversations about the future of the feminist movement must take place on the terrain of popular culture, where young women are refashioning feminism toward their own ends" (2011, 8).

Mariam Kauser: I recently graduated from Middlesex University with a BA in Journalism and Media and Cultural Studies. When Alison and Jo invited me to speak, I thought "why am I here? I am a fledgling feminist!" But I guess that's the reason why I am here.

I am an aspiring documentary maker. All my life I feel like I've been collecting people's voices and stories. I feel I should represent who I am and the people in my past. But rather than thinking of myself as a millennial, like Hannah, I think of myself as an in-between. I'm a 1990s kid. I've always been part of a big family atmosphere. I still remember talking really loudly on the phone in the hallway, and listening to my grandma. I'm from Yorkshire, if you can't tell. It's a really mixed place—there's whites, and Pakistanis, and Indians; it has all these diverse generational voices that are often absent from UK media. I shout at the TV constantly! I hate it. So as a fledgling feminist scholar and media producer I want to address that.

One book I have often found myself returning to is Joan Smith's Misogynies (1989). One part that really stuck out for me argues that for men in our patriarchal society, the epitome of a woman is an Edwardian eroticised Madonna: someone who seems to stand above us all, who is always willing, who is steadfast and dependable, full of promises to men in their gaze and how they conduct themselves. This part struck me as inequality being down to an issue of communication and the way we conduct ourselves in society. At some fundament level we're all people who work together collectively to try to better ourselves and life around us. That's the genius of us humans. But women and other minorities have time and time again gotten the bum end of the deal. It's something I've been struggling with, I guess, all my life. How to change the fact that no matter what patriarchal society throws in the face of women and minorities, life still continues to go on, to improve at a rate that isn't even visible in most spaces. Apparently, we can take being paid less money for the same

jobs. We can take being made into two-dimensional characters and caricatures within the media, or have our cultural backgrounds stereotyped, or our accents, or how we choose to dress ourselves, or represent ourselves and who we are. And at the end of the day, we'll keep propping up society. Getting on with those jobs and those roles.

Take for example, working here in London. Like most young women just starting out on the career, I'm regularly judged against stereotypical models of understanding that I haven't signed up to. As are we all I'm sure. For me at the moment this involves negotiating and balancing the greedy "having-it-all" image attached to those of us who are predisposed to working towards their career goals; and conversely, having to negotiate the "work–life balance" model for those of us who are equally interested in and maintaining a social life. If I choose to go out a few evenings in a row, or to stay in the office for a few, I don't feel that my choice is accepted or respected, but belittled. It's a case of "Who are you trying to impress?" We are castigated both ways. Young women rarely seem to be considered as people with brains and intelligence who make considered decisions. That's where I am now as a fledgling feminist: seeing this narrative play out around me, negotiating becoming a something, I don't know what, a documentary maker or a collector of stories, but above all working to make small changes. I'm impatient though, especially when it comes to trying to get the antiquated reductive ways of thinking, that never quite seem to vanish, modified to fit our mental and cultural evolution today. To stop having our knowledge measured against or slotted into the "dominant" knowledge base that seems to come from men who beat their chests out in Parliament to change our pension ages, tax our spare bedrooms, and decide who is worthy of their consideration, just to keep society turning in their favour.

Part of me simply hopes that more of us can work together, that we can all unite under one huge banner. That we can just say: "no, this is the UK, this is the twenty-first century, we're not waiting until 2095 for gender parity, or any sort of sexual parity—we want it all now!" We want it all now and we should have it all now. We are connected and the world is connected. Why can't our TV reflect us and our interconnections properly?

Nayomi Roshini: I have a BA in Film, and I am doing an MA in Film, and I'm going to talk about my feminism in the context of that practice. I want to start with a quote that always guides me when I'm making films. It is from André Tartovsky's book Sculpting in Time, which is about the practice of making a film, and it states: "relating a person to the whole world, that is the meaning of cinema." That is a guiding line for me when making a film; but that guiding line has made me realise that for me it is also feminism that guides. Before I ever thought about feminism I was obsessed with film—it is my biggest passion, my most treasured experience. But it was through starting to make and construct films that I found my feminism, even though I had never thought of myself as a feminist. Now, when I think of myself as a film-maker, I cannot separate the two. When I first started to write female characters, I was always drawn to beautiful women, femme fatales, females that seemed powerful, but mainly because you couldn't take your eyes off them. Then as an undergraduate I read feminist film theory, Laura Mulvey's essays, work on the male gaze. Now, for me, the gaze is like a battlefield when making a film. My obsession with looking and with dress has moved me into fighting for the feminist cause.

Film and visual cultures have a profound effect on the way we see ourselves and the world. When you make films, you have a responsibility to be fully aware of every choice you make—every stylistic choice, and the impact they have and what they say. Images and sounds aren't just images and sounds. Together they form a language. I think female subjects really need to have a chance to use this language fully, and also to be empowered to understand how this language is affecting the way we see ourselves. One of the things I get most upset about is the lack of female directors, and films

with a lack of well-rounded female characters. This is happening despite the fact that the cinema audience is growing, and this growth is often female. And there is also a lack of women doing the vital technical work; so even if you have a female director, you will, often as not, have a male director of photography who will dictate the shot and framing. There's also a lack of women doing technical work in other popular art forms. I went to a talk recently by a feminist music scholar and she was discussing the lack of female music engineers. You know all those 1960s girl group songs that you love? Every single one of them has been produced by a man. This made me really depressed, because not only has the female form been dominated by the male gaze, the female voice that I listened to when I've been heartbroken has also been produced and manipulated by a man.

These kinds of discussions with feminists of different generations have made me reflect not just on the stylistic choices I make, but also my practice. I used to think that generally, women should always work alongside men in a film crew, but having spoken to older female film-makers about their experiences I changed my mind. Often, when you're a lone female in a male crew, you don't mean to, but you assume a gender role, which is the one that remembers everyone's bits of kit and tidies up after everyone. Even if you're the director, you essentially do some of the work of a runner. And this is often the same in other spheres. But I wouldn't have had that realisation without that discussion with that music scholar.

In this way I am a feminist who feels strongly about the need for intergenerational sharing. Learning about the past helps you understand where the obstacles really are. I was always for a long time obsessed with the male gaze, with the idea of women being "the object"; but actually, in many ways the mode of practice is an even bigger issue in film-making, and now I am committed to attempting to have a majority female crew. And I have started to take on narratives that deal with female relationships, whereas before I was obsessed with mysteries and murders. Now I want to use my expertise to present female friendships, because female friendships are rarely presented in their beautiful complexity. They are usually reduced to being solely about competition, and that is just not true.

Ultimately, this makes me a feminist, even though I have felt somewhat unsure in the past. For me, feminism is becoming aware of, and engaging with, obstacles to equality. I strongly feel that one of the best ways to do this is to share knowledge across generations.

Rosalind Gill: I was very pleased to be asked to speak today. But very quickly after feeling pleased, I had another reaction which was "oh no—I've been asked because I'm old!" So my first thought was a fact that is not unconnected to depictions of older women in media culture, obviously; my first thought was "was someone older not available?" I know Charlotte Brunsdon (2015) has just written a great piece on being rendered into history, surely she could come along?

I was born in the 1960s and I got into my feminist activism in the 1980s, and to lots of other activism as well—anti-capitalist activism, queer activism, anti-racist activism—around the same time. I am going to talk about some of the people that have inspired me, including Emma Goldman, Stuart Hall, Angela McRobbie, and Margaret Wetherell.

What I want to do, like everyone who has spoken so far, is resist intergenerational toxicity. Because it doesn't seem like generation has ever been the most significant thing. But I think that is also because I have the privilege of working with so many inspiring PhD students and colleagues, who are just as much my inspiration as the people I have mentioned. And I think that is one of the weird things about growing old in the academy—it's a little bit like living with Dorian Gray. You get older

and older (while secretly feeling you're the same age) and the students stay the same age. It is quite a disconcerting feeling but also very uplifting. I feel inspired by the energy, vitality, and creativity of feminism today. But boy, do we need it. I want to pick up on a few things that are most striking to me. Three or four things. Above all, I guess I want to highlight the idea that feminism is not just about adding women or reaching "equality" whilst everything stays as it is. It's about radical social transformation. As an old political badge used to say, "we don't just want more cake, we want the whole bloody bakery!" (It's funny how even the word "bloody" sounds dated now ….)

I want to start by speaking about hate speech and trolling, and how that seems such an important issue. We really need the current energy and vitality of feminism to contest that. Take Jessica Ennis-Hill, for one example, and the way she has spoken out about football and rape. There are so many other people that we could speak about in the context of trolling. The thing that's so striking is the way trolling is used as a weapon to silence women when they speak out. It's not just a woman being trolled. It's a weapon of sexual politics. It's a sex war.

However, I'm really inspired today by the revitalisation of the language of sexism: of a language that speaks about patriarchy, and about capitalism! Thanks to Diane Negra for raising these issues already. One of my current inspirations is Laura García-Favaro who is doing brilliant work on the vitriolic bile on news sites in relation to the "Lose the Lads Mags" campaign and its coverage (Laura García-Favaro and Rosalind Gill 2015).

My next theme is the entanglement of feminist discourse with other discourses, and how difficult it is becoming to make critiques in the current moment. Because so many advertisers and others are using feminist-sounding discourse: and yet using it against us. The "Love Your Body" advertising trend exemplifies that. We've got Special K telling us—after years of selling us diet products—that we should stop "fat talk." This is what I mean by entanglement. Body politics, ideas of "loving your body" and "being confident with yourself" are discourses that get intimately tangled up with hate speech about the body. Another inspiring person, who is doing a fantastic PhD around these themes, is Ana Sofia Elias (Rosalind Gill and Ana Sofia Elias 2014).

Third, I am struck by the intensification of hostile scrutiny targeted at women on a daily basis: in which no detail is too small, and in which acres of newsprint, and internet time and media time generally, are taken up commenting on women's appearance. There seems to be no area of life that is outside of this 360 degree surveillance—what Ana Sofia Elias calls the "nano-surveillance" of women's bodies. Here, my inspirations are Meg John Barker and Laura Harvey, for their work on mediated sex advice; and Sara De Benedictis for her research on birth and reality TV (Meg John Barker, Rosalind Gill, and Laura Harvey 2016; Sara de Benedictis 2012).

Another big difference from when I started working in feminist media studies is the focus on masculinity and media. This is important in a context where we have people such as Julian Blanc attempting to visit the UK and speak. Here I would like to highlight the work of Rachel O'Neill, who is doing amazing ethnographic work on London's seduction community—producing a really rich ethnography with sexual politics at its heart (2014, 2015). Her work also offers a fantastic critique of the "inclusive masculinities" literature.

More broadly, there is a real attentiveness in contemporary work to other axes of difference—looking much more thoroughly at age, class, sexuality, race, though not enough on disability still. The last of my PhD students that I want to mention is Simi Dosekun, whose intersectional work and transnational work is really pushing at the boundaries of how we theorise post-feminism. She is

asking difficult questions—can we think about post-feminism in an African context? What difference does it make when our theoretical concepts travel? (Simidele Dosekun 2015).

The last thing I want to say is—the question that still keeps me awake at night, even being as old as I am, is: what difference do media make to our sense of self and to our subjectivity and our identity? In a sense—why do media matter? Why do we care so much about media? Implicitly, we care about media because we know that media are important, that representations matter. We've rejected the old "media effects" paradigm. But I think we still haven't got enough of a vocabulary in place to really understand how culture gets inside us and actually shapes so many things about us. A recent cover from The Guardian Weekend magazine encapsulates the contradictory nature of feminist and post-feminist subjectivity. It shows journalist Rhiannon Lucy Cosslett telling us: "I am a feminist. I count calories 24/7. Thinking about food takes up more energy than my career" (Guardian Weekend 2014). I think this cover image captures something about the difficulty of the landscape—not just in media terms, but also emotionally, affectively, and psychologically.

References

1. Ally McBeal. 1997–2002. Television Series. Seasons 1–5. Usa: Fox. OpenURL University of East Anglia

2. American Reunion. 2012. Film. Directed by John Hurwitz and Hayden Schlossberg. USA: Universal Pictures. OpenURL University of East Anglia

3. Barker, Meg John, Rosalind Gill, and Laura Harvey, eds. Forthcoming, 2016. Mediated Intimacy: Sex Advice in Media Culture. London: Polity Press. OpenURL University of East Anglia

4. Boyhood. 2014. Film. Directed by Richard Linklater. USA: IFC Films. OpenURL University of East Anglia

5. Brunsdon, Charlotte. 2015. "On Being Made History." Cultural Studies 29 (1): 88–99. [Taylor & Francis Online], [Web of Science ®]OpenURL University of East Anglia

6. Buffy the Vampire Slayer. 1997–2003. Television Series. Seasons 1–5. USA: The WB; Seasons 6–7. USA: UPN. OpenURL University of East Anglia

7. Cobb, Shelley. 2011. "'I'm Nothing Like You!': Postfeminist Generationalism and Female Stardom in the Contemporary Chick Flick." In Women on Screen: Feminism and Femininity in Visual Culture, edited by Melanie Waters, 31–44. Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave Macmillan. [CrossRef]OpenURL University of East Anglia

8. Damages. 2007–2012. Television Series. Seasons 1–3. USA: FX; Seasons 4–5. USA: Audience Network. OpenURL University of East Anglia

9. De Benedictis, Sara. 2012. "Feral Parents: Austerity Parenting under Neoliberalism." MAMSIE: Studies in the Maternal 4 (2). Accessed January 30, 2016. http://www.mamsie.bbk.ac.uk/articles/abstract/10.16995/sim.40/ OpenURL University of East Anglia

10. Dosekun, Simidele. 2015. "For Western Girls Only? : Post-Feminism as Transnational Culture." Feminist Media Studies 15 (6): 960–975. [Taylor & Francis Online]OpenURL University of East Anglia

11. García-Favaro, Laura, and Rosalind Gill. 2015. "'Emasculation Nation has Arrived': Sexism Rearticulated in Online Responses to Lose the Lads' Mags Campaign." Feminist Media Studies 16 (3): 379–397. [Taylor & Francis Online], [Web of Science ®]OpenURL University of East Anglia

12. Gill, Rosalind, and Ana Sofia Elias. 2014. "Awaken Your Incredible: Love Your Body Discourses and Postfeminist Contradictions." International Journal of Media and Cultural Politics 10 (2): 179–188. [CrossRef]OpenURL University of East Anglia

13. Girls. 2012–present. Television Series. Seasons 1–5. USA: HBO. OpenURL University of East Anglia

14. Gone Girl. 2014. Film. Directed by David Fincher. USA: 20th Century Fox. OpenURL University of East Anglia

15. Guardian Weekend Magazine. 2014. November 8. OpenURL University of East Anglia

16. Henry, Astrid. 2004. Not My Mother's Sister: Generational Conflict and Third Wave Feminism. Bloomington: Indiana University Press. OpenURL University of East Anglia

17. Illouz, Eva. 2014. Hard-Core Romance: Fifty Shades of Grey, Best-Sellers, and Society. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. [CrossRef]OpenURL University of East Anglia

18. Interstellar. 2014. Film. Directed by Christopher Nolan. USA: Paramount Films. OpenURL University of East Anglia

19. Monster-in-Law. 2005. Film. Directed by Robert Luketic. USA: New Line. OpenURL University of East Anglia

20. Negra, Diane, and Yvonne Tasker. 2014. Gendering the Recession: Media and Culture in an Age of Austerity. Durham: Duke University Press. [CrossRef]OpenURL University of East Anglia

21. Obvious Child. 2014. Film. Directed by Gillian Robespierre. USA: A24. OpenURL University of East Anglia

22. O'Neill, Rachel. 2014. "Whither Critical Masculinity Studies?" Men & Masculinities 18: 100–120. [CrossRef], [Web of Science ®]OpenURL University of East Anglia

23. O'Neill, Rachel. 2015. "The Work of Seduction: Intimacy and Subjectivity in the London 'seduction community.'" Sociological Research Online 20 (4): 5. Accessed January 30, 2016. http://www.socresonline.org.uk/20/4/5.html OpenURL University of East Anglia

24. Rowe Karlyn, Kathleen. 2011. Unruly Girls, Unrepentant Mothers: Redefining Feminism on Screen. Austin: University of Texas Press. OpenURL University of East Anglia

25. Scream. 1997. Film. Directed by Wes Craven. USA: Dimension Films. OpenURL University of East Anglia

26. Scream 4. 2011. Film. Directed by Wes Craven. USA: Dimension Films. OpenURL University of East Anglia

27. Sex and the City. 1998–2004. Television Series. Seasons 1–6. USA: HBO. OpenURL University of East Anglia

28. Smith, Joan. 1989. Misogynies. London: Faber & Faber. OpenURL University of East Anglia

29. The Devil Wears Prada. 2006. Film. Directed By David Frankel. Usa: Fox 2000 Pictures. OpenURL University of East Anglia