

**COUNTER-SPEECH IN CONTEMPORARY FEMINISM IN
FINLAND**

A Renegotiation of the Feminist Subject

Sonja Kuvaja

Maisterintutkielma

**Valtio-oppi/ Kansalaisyhteiskunnan
asiantuntijuuden maisteriohjelma**

Yhteiskuntatieteiden ja

filosofian laitos

**Humanistis-yhteiskuntatieteellinen
tiedekunta**

Jyväskylän yliopisto

Lokakuu 2019

JYVÄSKYLÄN YLIOPISTO

Tiedekunta Humanistis-yhteiskuntatieteellinen tiedekunta	Laitos Yhteiskuntatieteiden ja filosofian laitos
Tekijä Sonja Kaarina Kuvaja	
Työn nimi Counter-Speech in Contemporary Feminism in Finland: A Renegotiation of the Feminist Subject	
Oppiaine Valtio-oppi	Työn laji Pro gradu -tutkielma
Aika Lokakuu 2019	Sivumäärä 67
<p>Tiivistelmä</p> <p>Tässä pro gradu -tutkielmassa analysoidaan feministisen <i>Tulva</i>-aikakauslehden ja sen blogin sisältämiä vastadiskursseja liittyen feministisen subjektin uudelleenmäärittelyyn nykyfeminismin inkluusivisten ja antirasististen painotusten mukaisesti. Tarkoituksena on tutkia sitä, millaista vastapuhetta ruohonjuuritason feministiaktivistit kohdistavat Naisasialiitto Unionin institutionalisoitunutta järjestöorganisaatiota kohtaan pyrkiessään muuttamaan sen syrjiviksi koettuja toimintatapoja. Keskustelu Unionin jäsenyyden avaamisesta, muillekin kuin syntymässä naisiksi määritellyille, käsitetään näin kuvastavan laajempaa kysymystä feministisen subjektin – eli poliittisen edustamisen kohteen – uudelleenmäärittelystä. Työssä tutkitaan sitä, kuinka <i>Tulva</i>-lehden edustama kolmannen aallon intersektionaalinen feminismin pyrki neuvottelemaan uutta identiteettiä tuottamalla diskursseja uudesta, inkluusivisesta feminisministä. Lisäksi tutkimuksessa analysoidaan liikkeen ulkopuolelle kohdistettua vastapuhetta, sillä näiden uhkakuvien analysoimisen kautta on mahdollista tarkastella sitä, mitä vasten omaa identiteettiä rakennetaan. Diskurssit kuvastavat naisasialiikkeessä vallitsevaa identiteettineuvottelua siitä, kenellä on omistajuus feministisen subjektin ja feminismin sisällön määrittelyyn. Tutkimusaineisto käsittää vuonna 2013 ilmestyneet neljä <i>Tulva</i>-aikakauslehteä sekä 28 <i>Tulva</i>-blogin kirjoitusta. Tarkasteluvuosi edustaa jäsenyyden keskustelun kulminaatiopistettä, sillä heti seuraavana vuonna Unioni avasi jäsenyyden koskemaan kaikkia naisia, itsemäärittelyä kunnioittaen. Miehet sen sijaan jäivät edelleen jäsenyyden ulkopuolelle. Kyseisen vuoden lähdeaineiston tarkastelu tarjoaa otollisen tilaisuuden sen tutkimiseen, millaisin diskurssein järjestön jäsenyyden avaamisen puolesta argumentointiin. Tutkimuksen menetelmänä käytetään diskurssianalyysia sekä vastapuheen käsitettä.</p> <p>Tutkimustulokset osoittavat, että kolmannen aallon intersektionaalisen feminismin taholta käytiin voimakasta identiteettineuvottelua feministisen subjektin uudelleenmäärittelyn puolesta. Muutos nähtiin välttämättömänä naisasialiikkeen tulevaisuuden ja liikkeen aseman kannalta. Naisasialiitto Unioni esitettiin tämän kehityksen jarruna, minkä johdosta siihen kohdistettiin vastapuhetta. Analyysi erottelee neljä Unionin toimintatapoihin – eritoten jäsenyyden politiikkaan – kohdistettua vastadiskurssia, joiden tarkoituksena oli luoda painostusta sääntömuutoksen puolesta. Diskursseissa hyödynnettiin Unionin toiminnan legitimeettiä arvostettavaa puhetta. Keinoina käytettiin järjestön asemaa uhkaavaa ja järjestötoiminnan feministisyyttä kyseenalaistavaa retoriikkaa. Samalla toimijat representoivat edustamaansa uutta, separatistisesta nais erityisyydestä irtaantuvaa nykyfeminisminä, jonka integroituminen Unioniin nähtiin olennaisena koko naisasialiikkeen tulevaisuuden kannalta. Analyysi paljastaa lisäksi kaksi vastadiskurssia, joilla pyrittiin vastustamaan liikkeen ulkoisia, feminististä toimintaa uhkaavia toimia. Niiden avulla pyrittiin torjumaan feminismin uhkaavien äärioikeistolaisten tahojen yrityksiä käyttää naisten oikeuksien näennäistä ajamista oikeutuksena rasistiselle politiikalle.</p>	
Asiasanat Feminismi, naisasialiike, feministinen liike, Naisasialiitto Unioni, Tulva, vastadiskurssi	
Säilytyspaikka Humanistis-yhteiskuntatieteellinen tiedekunta	

Table of contents

1. INTRODUCTION	1
1.1. Research problem	2
2. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND	4
2.1. Language and feminism	4
2.2 Theoretical origins of hegemony	5
2.3. Counter-discourse and counter-speech	6
2.4. Earlier research	8
2.5. Feminist thought	9
2.5.1. Intersectional framework	13
2.6. Women’s mobilizing as collective action	13
2.7. Women’s movement in Finland	16
2.7.1. First women’s associations emerge: The Feminist Association Unioni	19
3. METHODOLOGY AND DATA	23
3.1. Discourse analysis	23
3.2. Research data: The <i>Tulva</i> journal and blog	24
3.3. Identity negotiation within the feminist movement	26
4. ANALYSIS	28
4.1. The reframing of feminism: detaching from the old	29
4.2. The elitist FAU counter-discourse: power hierarchy within the association	37
4.3. Questioning the FAU’s agency: the radicalizing discourse	40
4.4. A counter-discourse for inclusivity: The man-question	44
4.5. Countering the attack: The threat discourse	50
4.6. Reclaiming authority: A counter-discourse against the depoliticization of gender equality	54
5. CONCLUSIONS	59
6. BIBLIOGRAPHY	63
6.1. Primary sources	63
6.1.1. <i>Tulva</i> journal (2013): no. 1–4	63
6.1.2. <i>Tulva</i> journal blog: January 2013 – December 2013	63
6.2. Printed sources	64
6.3. Internet sources	66

1. INTRODUCTION

The subject for my thesis emerged from a notion of an ongoing renegotiation process of the feminist subjectivity within the Finnish women's movement. While the inner state of feminism has been characterised as ever more fragmented – and according to some scholars, dissolving into its internal contestations (e.g. Budgeon 2011, 1, 10–13; Walby 2011, 1–2.) – others (e.g. Dean & Aune 2015, 375), on the contrary, distinguish an ongoing resurgence of the contemporary feminist movement in Europe. Having moved from strictly women's issues to a broader conception of gender issues, feminism is said to have lost its combat angle in a bid to offer everyone something to relate to. (Budgeon 2011, 1–3, 13.) On the other hand, the remobilisation of the feminist movement, perceived by some, can be interpreted as a countering measure against the changes brought about by the economic crisis and austerity measures, the migrant crisis and the rise of Europe's far-right. Whatever the causes may be, feminism appears to be faced with a challenge: A renegotiation of the feminist subject is inevitable as the new generation of activists seek to change the traditionally considered feminist paradigm relying heavily on the gender-binary relations for a more inclusive, intersectional perspective. Like all social movements, the feminist movement evolves in different spatial and temporal contexts, as it seeks to find answers to the contemporary feminist questions. In my thesis, I will study the representations of the new forms of feminism and the feminist subject from the perspective of the feminist *Tulva* journal and the *Tulva* journal blog, representatives of the intersectional approach of contemporary feminism in Finland. As a point of interest, I will study how the writers position their feminism – or the “feminism 2.0”, as one writer puts it, in comparison with the more traditional conceptions of the feminist subjectivity perceived to be representative of the oldest feminist organization in Finland, the Feminist Association Unioni (in this thesis abbreviated to the FAU or referred to as the Union).

By producing *counter-discourse* and *counter-speech* to oppose socially constructed and forced upon identities, feminism has sought to offer alternative ways of portraying women, womanhood and femininity, but also the feminist subject itself. The ability to define and negotiate a social movement's collective identity works as an exercise of power: certain voices and identities can be marginalised while others gain hegemony within the movement. The question arose: how does the new generation of intersectional feminists operate in terms

of producing collective feminist identity inside and outside the movement in the new context presented? In what discursive ways do the grass-roots level activists of the *Tulva* network produce counter-speech to resist the policies of the power-holding groups within the FAU? I will analyse how the *Tulva* network positions itself as the new generation of feminists, and in so doing, counters against the perceived hegemonic representations employed by the association. The study mirrors the dynamics between the institutionalised organizational section of the Finnish women's movement, with influence over societal decision-making, and its activist offshoot. Another point of focus will be to study how the activists resist the societal effects of the changing socio-political context – most importantly, the rising of the far-right and fascism – by producing counter-speech against the perceived threat to the movement as a whole. I will study the employment of *resistance* against the perceived depoliticizing aims of the far-right forces regarding the concept of gender equality. The research's theoretical framework is based on the theory of social constructionism, which perceives language as both a reflector and constructor of social reality. Albeit, *counter-discourses* have been much researched in social sciences, especially concerning the sources and processes of social construction of discourses, there haven't been recent studies regarding contemporary Finnish women's movements' counter-discourses in late modernity.

1.1. Research problem

The thesis will investigate how the grass-roots level network of the feminist *Tulva* journal's writers, who identify as the intersectional feminists, renegotiate feminism and the feminist subject in their discursive *counter-speech* in a new context of societal and contextual changes. The research question of the thesis is dual: first, it will analyse how the writers position their feminism in comparison with the one of the FAU, and second, how they discursively counter the hegemonic representations of feminism and the feminist subject both within the women's movement and outside of it. The study aims to explore how the pre-given determinations for feminist identity are countered through counter-speech.

The research data consists of the feminist *Tulva* journal and its online blog, which will be studied through discourse analysis. The journal is published by the FAU, the oldest and most influential women's organization in Finland. The analysis comprises four magazines and 28

blog entries from January to December of 2013.

The research at hand does not comment on whether there effectively are subordinating hegemonic discourses regarding feminism – nor does it take a normative stand on matters concerning gender equality, either. However, the feminist movement by definition operates to enact reforms in furtherance of gender equality. Notions of resistance, protest and contention characterise the entire existence of the movement (Jallinoja 1983, 21). Accordingly, throughout its history, the feminist movement has been one to produce resistance through physical, non-lingual and lingual activism. The purpose of this study is to provide analytic descriptions of feminist discursive *counter-speech* of contemporary feminism in the context of late modernity.

2. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

In this chapter, I will present the theoretical background of my thesis. The framework of the thesis is based on the notion of speech as a constructing social practice where meanings, distinctions and values are created. The control and construction of hegemonic discourses are objects of political struggle, for counter-discourses and counter-narratives striving to challenge the prevailing social order continuously confront them. (Bourdieu 1977, 167–170.) I will first present how language and feminism are intertwined and what role linguistic tools play in the feminist movement. Next, I will introduce the main theoretical concepts – *hegemony*, *counter-speech* and *counter-discourse* – used in the thesis. Finally, I will outline earlier research about language and *counter-discourse* in gender studies.

2.1. Language and feminism

The notion of the socially constructed character of social reality is based on the *linguistic turn* that established its position in the mainstream of social sciences during the 1970s and 1980s. According to Ludwig Wittgenstein (1981), a great influential thinker to the theory of *social constructivism*, the construction of social reality is generated in words, concepts and meanings embedded in them. Through the use of language, one can conceptualise one's surroundings and give meaning to the world by creating *systems of meanings*. Meanings are only constructed in relation to other meanings through various social practices. (Jokinen, Juhila & Suoninen 2004, 17, 18 – 21.)

The premise of the research is based on the role of language as a projector and generator of power relations. The understanding of language as a reflector and constructor of meanings, symbols and values – notions of what is of importance – attends the view of *discourses* and *narratives* as embodiments of power and contention. As meanings are socially constructed in continuous renewal processes, the ability to redefine and control them produces political struggle. (E.g. Jokinen, Juhila & Suoninen 1993, 75–76.)

2.2 Theoretical origins of hegemony

The theoretical ground for feminist resistance and *counter-speech* is based on the concepts of *hegemony* and *hegemonic discourses* – the societal prevalence of which opposing forces attempt to challenge. The theorisation of hegemony has its roots in the works of various social theorists, the most prominent ones being Karl Marx (1818–1883), Antonio Gramsci (1891–1937), Michel Foucault (1926–1984) and Pierre Bourdieu (1930–2002). Albeit being greatly influenced by Marx’s legacy, according to Bates, Gramsci differentiates himself from the Marxist theory by placing a greater emphasis on the idealist perception of power and domination in relation to maintaining hegemonic structures. Rather than considering solely material structures as the basis for inequality and hegemony Gramsci employs the concept of *cultural hegemony* to underscore the significance of dominating ideas and norms as maintainers of power. Bates’ interpretation of Gramsci’s concept of hegemony is, however, in many parts similar to what Marx’s earlier theories suggest. According to Bates, both theorists view hegemony as embedded in ideas, which the ruling class controls. Hegemony is thereby defined as political leadership, which maintains its rule by producing and consolidating norms that favour the privileged groups. Those subjected to the leadership’s domination, therefore, tend to adopt the social order as the norms producing it are taken for granted. (Bates 1975, 351–352.)

Bourdieu’s theorisation regarding cultural hegemony approaches the one of Gramsci’s in respect to the idea of socially produced norms being the maintainers of leadership and power. The concept of *common sense* in Gramsci’s theory signifies habitual attitudes that are produced and normalised by the dominant ruling class over the subordinate groups (Ransome 1992, 135–136, 143–144). Bourdieu’s (e.g. 1977, 164–165) concept of *doxa*, on the other hand, refers to the notion of language as an instrument of power, through which prevailing and dominating beliefs are socially constructed and consolidated. *Doxa* can be so deeply rooted in social practices that the judgements, values and conceptions it contains may appear indisputable and self-evident – even natural. Consequently, as the determination of the contents of *doxa* relies on the privileged groups’ instilling notions on how social order is – and should be – structured, the marginalised groups are subjected to *symbolic violence*. In this linguistic and symbolic form of violence, subjects are socially internalised to beliefs and conceptions of themselves and their position in the world in a manner that is disadvantageous

to them. In Bourdieu's theorisation through *heterodoxic discourses*, however, groups subjected to the *symbolic violence* of *doxa* can exercise countering linguistic ways to reconstruct their identities. In my research, I classify the forms of feminist *counter-speech* conformable to Bourdieu's notions of *heterodoxy*.

Another important influence to the concept of *hegemony* is Foucault's (e.g. 1972, 73–76, 111–113, 118) power analysis. He emphasises the role of discourses, constructed through social and institutional practices, both as creations and instruments of power. For Foucault, the power-imbedded nature of language, discourses and social relations continuously construct subjectivity. This has been contested by many feminists for depriving subjects' off agency, which is vital for resistance (McLaren 2002, 2). However, Foucault notes that the identification of oppressive and restrictive discourses creates opportunities for resistance over forced upon identities and false representations. The theorists presented illustrate how language and power are deeply intertwined with each other. This notion serves as the basis for the thesis at hand. Furthermore, since power is constructed by words, meanings and discourses, it can also be challenged by countering ways of constructing social reality through the use of language.

2.3. Counter-discourse and counter-speech

Throughout its history, the feminist movement has strived to challenge the hegemonic discourses and narratives portraying women, for they are seen as categorising, and as such, restricting (e.g. Jokinen, Huttunen & Kulmala 2004, 15–16). As Jallinoja (1983, 8–9, 19–22) notes, from the feminist perspective there is a prevalent tendency within societies to perceive women as a category that shares common features and social reality. Women are formulated as a group in distinction to men, through which an individual's social role is deduced. In the core of the feminist movement, is the notion of these distinctions as creators of oppressing and restricting social categories for women. Noticeable, however, is that these portrayals and representations can be dissimilar while co-existing at the same time. The feminist movement seeks to formulate a new ideology by expressing countering ways to resist and protest these hegemonic representations. However, as feminist politics is

representational, it needs a political subject to represent. The trouble lies in this difficulty of defining a political feminist subject not founded on restricting ways of categorising women. In my thesis I employ the concept of *counter-speech* by Jokinen, Huttunen and Kulmala presented in their work *Puhua vastaan ja vaieta: Neuvottelu kulttuurisista marginaaleista* (2004, 9–12). Counter-speech – defined as manners of speaking that resist and challenge hegemonic and oppressive narratives – illustrates the act of resistance, as it gives marginalised groups a voice to renegotiate their identities. Margins – as a spatial metaphor referring to the periphery position concerning power – are constructed through cultural manners of speech and social practises. The term can be employed to describe how feminism regards gender relations in terms of power: women as a gender are perceived to be in the margins in relation to men – forming the *second sex* (see Beauvoir 1980). However, this does not mean that women are marginalised in all areas of their lives: from the feminist perspective, women can hold a marginal position in one area while holding a central position in another. This is to say that feminism perceives inequalities regarding social practices, such as socially constructed identities and social roles, as places of improvement.

When the hegemonic representations of marginalised groups do not conform to the subjects' perceptions of their identities, the tension generated creates openings for resistance. However, the hegemonic centre with its discourses does not constitute a homogeneous terrain nor do the margins and its counter-speech represent a cohesive act. Instead, feminism and feminist identities are hierarchical, as the margins have their outer periphery, too. (Jokinen et al. 2004, 13.) Much of the critique the second wave of feminism received in the 1970s and 1980s had to do with the exclusion of women and femininities that did not conform to the white middle-class female form. The third wave, however, broadened feminism's take on equality by including queer theory, Black feminism, transgenders and lesbians into the protest movement's agenda.

Even though the feminist movement has been able to enact reforms advancing women's lives and establish gender equality agenda in the centre of everyday politics in many countries, the essence of feminism is historically built upon the identity of the challenger – a countering force of resistance that makes women's marginalised voices heard. For hooks (1990, 206), the margin, in particular, represents a “space of resistance - - for the production of a counter-hegemonic discourse”. The reasoning behind choosing to read and interpret the data in the research through the perspective of counter-speech is based on the notion that feminist

discourses are always constructed in relation to the centre of hegemonic discourses. Thus, feminist linguistic productions cannot be interpreted without acknowledging the elements of resistance and countering action. Another important factor to recognise while interpreting the data is the *particular audience* (vs. Perelman's *universal audience* 1996, 25) the counter-speech is written for. In the case of a feminist-oriented journal and blog, one can argue that while the writings are primarily intended as forces of resistance and redefinition of normalities, they can also be seen through their advice-giving character. As the historical object of feminism has been to raise female consciousness to mobilise women to demand gender equality, the *Tulva* journal and its blog, too, can be read as attempts to appeal to women. In the thesis, I will take account of both the universally intended dimension of resistance the writings employ, as well as the role of appealing and giving advice to the particular audience of feminists.

2.4. Earlier research

There are various researches made on *counter-discourse*, *counter-narratives* and *counter-speech* concerning resistance and containment politics. In this chapter, however, the focus will be on the earlier research on language and discourses regarding feminist resistance. Cohn (1987, 689–690) has analysed the gendered use of language when speaking of the Western conception of “reason” concerning nuclear strategies. In her work, she discovers how the use of language constructs, for instance, gendered perceptions of war as neutral and abstract through men's choice of words, euphemisms and metaphors. In the educational field, on the other hand, in *Critical Race Theory*, Solorzano (1998, 122–132) has studied discourses on racism and sexism hidden in unrecognised forms of discourses and experiences disadvantaging the educational progress of students. The main concept in the study is *a microaggression*, which refers to the subtle everyday acts and meanings, such as narratives and symbols, to maintain subordinated groups marginalised. His study consisted of interviews and qualitative data analysis. The concluding part of the research states that the incentive for resistance is in the notion of one's experiences not being isolated from oppressing structures – in other words: “personal is political”.

In the psychological domain in social sciences, for instance, Talbot, Bibace, Bokhour and Bamberg (1996) have investigated hegemonic discourses and narratives on pregnancy and how women construct counter-narratives to challenge the dominant ones. The study was carried out by a narrative analysis, which revealed that dominant narratives often built on tradition and individual experiences, which in turn take shape as discourses. The study reveals that it is possible to challenge dominant discourses by constructing alternative ways of determining normality. One such strategy is to make concessions following dominant narratives, or parts of them, to seem more credible when challenging another narrative. Another influential attributor regarding power and language is Michel Foucault and his notion of power discourses. However, there remains a polemic reception from behalf of some feminist theorists towards the use of Foucauldian concepts concerning gender studies, for they find it depoliticising the matter (e.g. McLaren 2002, 1–2). In gender studies, language is perceived more as fluid rather than solid substance, which only actualises through interaction.

In the analysis, I employ earlier research on the status of contemporary feminism in Europe by Dean and Aune (2015) and Dean (2010, 127), who studies the London-based feminist *F-Word* blog. He identifies it as the focal point for “resurgence of feminist mobilisation in the UK”. The blog shares similarities to the Finnish *Tulva* journal and its blog in the sense that they both work as autonomous spaces for the young generation of feminist writers to discuss contemporary feminism. However, direct comparisons cannot be made, as the nation-specific cultural and historical contexts vary, not to mention the different feminist trajectories regarding the women’s movements in both countries. Nevertheless, both blogs are characterised by their differences to the second-wave feminism’s legacy concerning the growing emphasis on individualism, popular culture and online feminism.

2.5. Feminist thought

The academic field of women’s studies theorises the social construction of the female gender and womanhood – how they are constructed and how the differences between the genders are produced and maintained. Most importantly, it strives to answer the question of why women are subjected to repression (Julkunen 2010, 25). In her famous work *The Sexual*

Contract (1988), Carole Pateman theorises men's control over women as an established sexual-social contract based on the 17th and 18th centuries' social contract theories. Pateman's theory on *sexual contract* identifies patriarchy as an essential part of the social pact made in the name of legitimate rule over contracted civil society. Accordingly, the public sphere was constituted as a venue for freedom and new political rights, leaving the private sphere apolitical. As explained by Pateman, the classic social contract theories created the foundation for the liberal political subject while excluding women, who were primarily defined through the private sphere, from its conceptual interpretation. (ibid., 1–4.) In this respect, it is no surprise that characteristic to the women's movement has been the politicization of the personal, as according to the gender equality activist and founder of the slogan "personal is political", Kate Millet, it is the social control that defines a woman's economic, social and juridical roles (Hagner & Försti 2006, 170).

The evolution of feminism is traditionally described by a wave-like metaphor because it is seen being constantly in motion, moving from the marginal to mainstream and back. However, the wave theory can be argued as inadequate as the progression of gender equality and feminist activism are always irrevocably subjected to specific national and cultural contexts thus making it difficult to determine clear linear trends (e.g. Dean and Aune 2015, 376). The history of the women's movement dates back to the turn of the 19th century when the early women's rights activists fought for white upper-class women's right to vote (Julkunen 2010, 13). Women's movement was first born as a juridical project to gain women the same civil rights reserved for the men of the owning class. Later on, this phase was named as the first wave of feminism traditionally associated with the advocacy for the negative rights of liberty in the latter chapter of the 19th century and the beginning of the 20th century. Accordingly, women's rights were to be gained by shifting the political, juridical and legal obstacles that stood in the way of women achieving the same civil rights as those of the white owning-class men. The rationale for women's rights was founded on the ideas of Enlightenment and Liberalism. The idea of women being capable of rationality and therefore entitled to the same rights as men was most notably cultivated in John Stuart Mill's *The Subjection of Women* (1869) and Mary Wollstonecraft's *Vindication of the Rights of Women* (1790).

The second wave of feminism marked an era when equal rights between sexes were

understood more broadly, especially regarding women's right to paid employment in the 1960s. In her work, Julkunen (2010, 25) describes the 60s feminism as a project for revealing the gravity of oppression towards women and theorising its origins. However, women's movement was originally considered a white woman's matter, as black women's issues were primarily regarded race-related. In the 1960s, as part of the second wave of feminism, the women's movement radicalised, as it shifted its attention from public to private. As the movement had previously focused on the public sphere of life, now it became clearer that women's rights – or the lack of –, wasn't only derived from juridical or economic origins, but also the private side of life: personal relationships, attitudes, norms, psychology and bodies. This change, however, grew outside many traditional women's associations, as it was from their part often considered as trivializing the gender equality struggle. The radicalisation of the feminist movement, according to Jaana Kuusipalo, changed the way politics was understood: as the private sphere became politicized, the number of issues to be solved by political means grew. Issues previously assumed private, such as body, sexuality, reproduction and violence towards girls and women occurring inside family homes, were brought to the table demanding political attention. The radical approach desired a complete change of the patriarchal system, which was seen as the embodiment of male privilege and hegemony. As Kuusipalo continues, the state was seen as representing and reproducing male hegemony. (Kuusipalo 2011, 19–20.)

In Finland, the liberal feminists of the 1960s regarded it as the state's responsibility to provide opportunities regarding schooling, health care and day care – hereby, advocating for the positive rights of liberty. The responsibility was perceived to also involve the changing of attitudes and societal norms. The FAU with its long history of liberal feminism, however, first took an apprehensive stand on taking issues of private life to the debate on women's rights. The main reason for this was the liberal feminists' view, according to which, the major political and legal rights were to be gained first, after which the rest would naturally follow.

The socialist and radical feminists of the '60s and '70s desired a complete change of the system; a revolution instead of moderate reforms. The oppression was seen as deeply integrated into the economic system of capitalism, which was seen reproducing structures of repression. The male norm, which was viewed as characterizing the liberal tradition – as men and women were thought to be fundamentally similar – was criticised as misogynist. Instead,

female characteristics were idealised. In the 1960s, gender neutrality was emphasised, for instance, by the activism of the Association 9. In the middle of the next decade, this view was questioned and female-centrism emphasised. (Hagner & Försti 2006, 162–169.)

Contemporary feminism is often separated into three main categories: social liberalist, female-centred and deconstructionalised feminism (e.g. Julkunen 2010, 69–71). The female-centred feminism not only recognises the gender difference between women and men but also idealises womanhood and the considered female characteristics over masculinity: in this respect, society is already seen as constructed on male dominance and the male norm. The postmodern perspectives, however, emphasise differences rather than view women as a category. Judith Butler's work *Gender Trouble* (1999) was substantial for the discussion, as it questioned the whole conception of womanhood. (Hagner & Försti 2006, 224.) In this way, the point of view shifted from female-centrism to the idea of a self and identity as constructions of the social and cultural. The third wave of feminism emerged in the cross point of the '80s and '90s when Black feminism was finally included as part of the concept of feminism, previously mainly regarded through white women's experiences. In the '90s, feminism moved from the second-wave's conception of women as a category to emphasising more the differences between women, gender plurality, queerness and the construction of postmodern identities. Its focus moved from strictly women's issues to consider a myriad of other differences constituting to power hierarchies such as class, age, ethnicity, sexual orientations and abilities. (Julkunen 2010, 17, 44– 46.)

As feminism is characterised by the generation of resistance against subordination and power hierarchies, according to Julkunen (2010, 25), it is also characterised by its alertness to self-criticism for constantly revising its inner definitions and means of operation. The movement itself cannot be reduced to a single orientation since it comprises a myriad of different autonomous groups and associations differing in their theoretical paradigms, takes on inclusivity and means of conduct. However, central to the movement is the critique of patriarchy, which refers to a hierarchal and oppressive social system characterised by male dominance in political, social and economic fields of life. (Hagner & Försti 2006, 152.)

2.5.1. Intersectional framework

Contemporary feminism employs the theoretical and methodological analytical framework of *intersectionality*, a term launched by a civil rights advocate Kimberlé Crenshaw, to describe the plurality of attributes and structural mechanisms used simultaneously to discriminate people (Julkunen 2010, 17). The need for women's civil rights was comprehended, at the latest, when the female representatives for the American anti-slavery organizations were precluded from speaking in the World Anti-Slavery Convention in London in 1840. The activists precluded from participation in the convention later initiated the American mobilisation for the women's rights as a social movement. (Von Alftan 1966, 19–23.) As the women's rights movement came along, the question of the feminist subject emerged: whose rights belong to the movement's agenda?

Sojourner Truth, a former slave, raised the question of intersectionality in her famous speech *Ain't I a woman too?* in 1851 bringing awareness to black women facing twofold discrimination, both for their race and gender. (Ibid.) Intersectionality stresses the notion that women are not oppressed and discriminated only for the sake of being defined female in gender, but also for multiple different and intersecting attributes such as race, age, sexual orientation and disability. (E.g. Carastathis 2016, 23.) On this note, according to the intersectional perspective, one cannot envision gender equality for women without considering the different attributes for what women are discriminated for. Also, the recognition of different forms of privilege is inherent to the intersectional perspective. However, the conceptual use of intersectionality within the women's movement has been critiqued for ignoring its origins in Black feminism. For this reason, some have moved from using the concept of "intersectionality" to the concept of "radical inclusive feminism" to describe their take on feminism. However, in this thesis, the former concept will be employed, for that, it is more familiarly associated with the research subject in the data.

2.6. Women's mobilizing as collective action

The early associational activities for women's rights were prompted by substantial societal transformations in the United States and England in the later chapter of the 19th century.

Industrialisation and the new economic demands initiated substantial change in contemporary patriarchal gender relations where a woman's position was primarily determined by her estate and marital status. Class society and the social system of patriarchal control over women and family property were to be demolished to create a free-market economy with free movement and supply of labour force. Women were now needed in factories and public positions to fill the demands the new rising economy presented. However, the early transition reflected the nature of class society, as the state jobs were only available to a few women of the upper classes. (Von Althaus 1966, 19–23, 29.)

The women's movement was first born in the United States within the abolitionist movement, as the Enlightenment's ideas of freedom and equality resonated with the early supporters of women's rights. As described earlier, the mobilisation for the women's rights was initiated when the female representatives for the American anti-slavery organizations were precluded from participation in the World Anti-Slavery Convention in 1840. In other words, female activists first needed to win rights for themselves before they could defend anyone else's. It wasn't until the 1960s and 1970s when women's mobilising reached a more political nature and the feminist movement was born in the United States. This time, also working-class women were highly involved with the movement as Marxism paved the way for gender equality claims. (Von Althaus 1966, 19–23, 29.)

Women's movement as a social and political project comprehends extensively all action that seeks to improve the lives of women. This definition includes women's associations, groups and networks comprising the mobilisation of women as a whole. (E.g. Bergman 1998, 172.) In my thesis, I use the concept of *social movement* in its broadest sense, incorporating under the concept all adequately organized collective action with common purpose in either fostering or preventing social change, and the ability to sustain solidarity between its members with continuity. According to Sidney Tarrow (1998), social movements are constructions of modern times, and as such, embodiments of collective identities and social networks. At the core of Tarrow's theory is the idea of *contentious politics*, which occurs when ordinary people without any access to traditional resources of power challenge the authorities responsible for their grievances. Tarrow considers changing political opportunities as important incentives for collective action when combined with resonant cultural *framings* – similarly, the

different forms of countering action are reflections of these changes. The coexistence of different movements can be fuel for new collective action since social movements oftentimes benefit from each other by utilising already established social and political grounds. For the same rationale alliances and cooperation between movements are common. For instance, women's movement partnered with the abolitionist movement in the United States in the 18th and 19th centuries the same way moral reformists did with the environmentalist and pacifist movements for the advancement of mutual interests in the 20th century England. (E.g. Ilmonen 1998, 29–30.)

For the continuity of a social movement, the challenging actors need to be able to provide its members with sustainable collective identity and bonds of social solidarity. The sociological concept of framing comprises these objectives signifying the need for a broader consensus regarding the movement's purposes and goals for it to be able to create sustainable collective action. (Tarrow 1998, 2–5.) Accordingly, as Ilmonen and Siisiäinen (1998, 11) note, for the continuity of social movements, they need to be able to renew and redefine their grounding purposes especially if the goals they have previously set, have been accomplished. In this sense, the speculations of the death of feminism from the 1990s onwards and the inner stagnation of the women's movement could be interpreted to reflect a failure regarding such renewal process. Therefore, it can be argued that for the continuity of the movement, feminism and the feminist identity must be regenerated for it to better conform to its new surroundings where many of its legislative demands for equality have effectively been attained. Only by conforming to contemporary problems and redefining its goals and nature, the movement can be able to ensure the mobilisation and commitment from its members.

The study of social movements traditionally makes a distinction between old movements – the perceived sources and causes of modernity – from the new movements of the 1960s. The latter emerged following the weakening of industrial societies and their rigid structures allowing new diverse identities and subjectivities to be born. The new movements attack modernity and its vices and are characterised by their emphasis on post-material values and alternative moralities. They differ from the old movements by their un-institutionalised model of organization, as they often operate on the grass-roots level critiquing the dominant culture's way of life. (Ilmonen 1998, 31–33, 37.) As women's resistance in the form of collective action has long roots, the demands for equality can hardly be considered anything new (Bergman 1998, 165, 171). However, the women's movement is oftentimes considered

to have experienced a revival along with the emergence of other new social movements in the 1960s, and as such, to be part of the new era of social movements.

Women's movements, like other social movements, are constructions of given spatial and temporal contexts, as they continuously adapt to new social and political changes and opportunities. Therefore, women's movements have developed with different emphasis and paces in different locations, depending on the resources and incentives available. (E.g. Bergman 1998, 166.) Movements' strategies are consequently reflections of their surroundings and the societal positions they are operating from. Whether the women's movement was once established relatively autonomous from the state's political structures, or if it was integrated into them instead, the effects can be seen in the present day's movements and their strategies. Nonetheless, women's movements have had different strategies and ways of operation. In the following subchapters, I will briefly outline the historical background and the main strategies – framings – of the women's movement in Finland. Evidently, the women's movement cannot solely be reduced to the women's associations since at the cross point of the 19th and 20th centuries women were participating in many associations, such as the Temperance movement, the Labour movement and the Youth associations, which on their part shaped the idea of female citizenship (Sulkunen 1991, 43–44, 80).

2.7. Women's movement in Finland

From the 1860s onwards the Finnish society began its gradual, but slow transition from an agrarian society to urbanisation. Social life was divided into public and private spheres, which shaped the groundings for the gendered social, economic and political societal structures. Women's role was considered within the private sphere, as women were understood to embody family values and higher morale – characteristics considered particularly beneficial in bringing up children. Here also lies the rationale the first-wave liberal feminists argued for: since women were considered to personify family values and morale, women needed to forward those values for the benefit of the whole Finnish nation, at the time of the Fennoman nation-building project in the latter chapter of the 19th century. The belief in a specific female essence characterised by philanthropy helped to legitimise the argument for the upper-class women's right to early associational assembling, ordinarily concerning issues of charity and temperance, which was to form the first pathway for

women's organizing (Hagner & Försti 2006, 70, 76). Accordingly, as theorised by Jaana Kuusipalo (2011, 10), women's early political existence emerged on the base of *social motherhood*. Based on of the nurturing female essence, positions in state administration in the fields of health, educational and social services were considered suitable for women, as well as those positions of lower level without decision-making power (Hagner & Försti 2006, 112). Women's political rights were hereby advocated by the rationalisation of the maternalistic female essence, which was to benefit the nation as a whole (Kuusipalo 2011, 22). It wasn't until the 1960s gender equality movement that equal political positioning and the need for women's full participation in society and labour force were demanded.

The emergence of the women's movement is ultimately connected to the construction of civil society as the Fennoman movement gave rise to a myriad of associations such as the Youth Clubs, the Temperance Movement and the Labour movement in the 1880s. (Hagner & Försti 2006, 29.) The time was favourable for women's claims, as the Fennoman movement aimed at strengthening the position of the Finnish language and culture to further the idea of a nation. According to many nationalists, the whole nation – including women – was needed in the nation-building project. The idea of strengthening women's rights grew in the minds of upper-class women. Concurrently, the moral arguments made for women's rights gained further intellectual support from the contemporary ideas and ideals of liberalism and its theorists – most notably from John Stuart Mill (2009) with his work *The Subjection of Women*. Based on the Enlightenment's ideas of reason and liberty, as opposed to the rule of the king in absolute monarchy, liberalism advocated for individual rights and equality. (Hagner & Försti 2006, 14–15, 29.)

According to Solveig Bergman (1998, 165), in the history of women's movement there have been two particularly active phases: first, in the turn of the 19th and 20th centuries with demands for women's suffrage, and the second, in the latter chapter of the 20th century for women's social and political rights. After gaining the right to vote and stand for election in 1906, the women's movement in Finland experienced a decreased level of activism, as many of its members turned to parliamentary venues in an attempt to impose legislation (Hagner & Försti 2006, 86–88). The 1970s and 1980s, in particular, marked a new chapter in women's political mobilisation albeit it was only in the Nordic countries where women entered political institutions and parliamentary politics in noticeable amounts. The arrival of the new

women's movement – the feminist movement –, in the 1960s resulted in a somewhat different outcome as compared to other Nordic nations. Whereas in Sweden, Denmark and Iceland women's mobilisation was generated through fairly autonomous movement organizations in distinction to state institutions, in Finland women's movement lived only a short period as an un-politicized organization. (Bergman 1998, 166.) Hereby, gender work in Finland integrated relatively early into the state institutions, as activists thought to have better chances influencing the decision-making within the parliamentary system rather than through non-governmental organizations. Inside existing political parties, women established women's associations, which helped to bring female perspective into party politics. (Hagner & Försti 2006, 86–88.) As theorised by Bergman, the Finnish political culture encouraged opposing forces to channel through state institutions. Operating through state mechanisms and political venues women's movement in Finland was able to install demands for equality through state institutions, which can, however, be seen to have contributed to the dilution of the movement's radical edge (Bergman 1998, 166). Women's movements elsewhere have gained mobilising power by criticising the authorities, seen as the producers and preservers of oppressive structures, from an un-institutionalised position.

The new and more radical women's mobilising emerged from the United States in the mid-1960s along with other civil rights movements that emphasised individual rights and needs (Hagner & Försti 2006, 149–150). According to Jallinoja (1983, 123, 149), the feminist movement in the Nordic countries was born in 1973 after a decade of latency from the part of the traditional women's movements, such as the FAU. Association 9, established in 1966, enacted this newly born political feminism, as it addressed its demands towards the state. The association denied the idea of gender difference attacking gendered social roles and emphasising gender neutrality instead – yet choosing the male role as the norm (Hagner & Försti 2006, 138–140). In that same year, a state committee was established, which later formed the base for the Council for Gender Equality established in 1972. The young feminists were sceptical towards the traditional women's associations, which were perceived as old and insufficient because of their readiness to settle for moderate changes within the existing social system rather than going after more drastic societal changes. Nevertheless, gradually through generational changes, the older associations, too, conformed to feminist perspectives. (Jallinoja 1983, 128–130, 198–203.) However, as the women's movement comprises of several autonomous women's associations, the movement cannot be reduced

to a few organizations.

Labour markets opened for women in the 1960s and 1970s and law for municipal day care was legislated in 1973, which further enabled women's employment. During the next decade, the Gender Equality Law and the Surname Law were passed. These steps forward in respect to gender equality came as a result of international declarations for women's rights especially those made in the United Nation's Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women in 1979 and the Beijing's World Conference on Women in 1995. The third wave of feminism brought along new activism, which emphasised postmodern ideas of a multitude of identities and questioned the conception of womanhood in general at the beginning of the 1990s. (Hagner & Försti 2006, 193, 196, 238.)

2.7.1. First women's associations emerge: The Feminist Association

Unioni

The FAU was established when an opposing fraction of the first women's association, the Finnish Women's Association (est. 1884) separated as its own association in 1892. The diversion came as a response to the perceived authoritarian associational practices, as a more active approach to enhancing women's rights was desired among the younger generation of activists. (Hagner & Försti 2006, 17–24; Jallinoja 1983, 321.) This division represents the first of many ideological diversions in the history of women's associations, as the younger generation of activists question existing policies and means of action. The FAU's main concerns regarded women's educational, political and social rights, such as the right to vote and stand for election for municipal positions (Von Alfthan 1966, 115–116). As the association was born amongst the women of the upper classes, they saw it as their duty to accommodate working-class women with their class morals and manners. However, regardless of the paternalistic efforts, the newly born FAU took a more liberal stand from its predecessor by viewing rights in a more individualistic perspective as opposed to a class-related viewpoint of its predecessor. From the beginning, the FAU regarded gender inequality as a matter of human rights: A violation, which was not only to concern women but men as well. (Hagner & Försti 2006, 28–29, 43, 83.)

The FAU remained long an exclusive club for the liberal feminists whose *modus operandi* focused on means of moderate action to achieve legislative reforms. The following decades after the general strike in 1906 and the newly gained universal suffrage saw women's associations waning, as many considered the work for women's rights accomplished. In like manner, in 1930 women's rights movement was largely considered futile as women were considered to have gained the basic civil rights. (Hagner & Försti 2006, 97, 106.) Women's movement faced the dilemma that still today continues to characterise attitudes towards feminism: even though the most evident legal and juridical obstacles to gender equality have been removed, attitudes, social roles and norms regarding gender relations continue to affect women's everyday lives in a restrictive manner.

The feminist movement emerged alongside other new social movements, such as the environmental and peace movements in the 1960s. The members of the FAU of that time represented traditional liberal feminism that saw the new demands and means of action of the younger activists as radical and dangerously on the left. The younger generation insisted on a more holistic, diverse and personal way of viewing society and gender system as a whole. While the liberal feminists considered some of the new issues presented trivial, the new feminists saw them as indicators of larger societal structures that were to be changed through political means – a new mode of operation and different social analysis was called for. Before the feminist turn, the FAU was considered merely a remnant of the old women's movement – if recognised at all – by the young feminists of the 1960s. One of the new feminist associations to emerge at that time was the Association 9, which, rather than aiming for legal reforms in the manner of liberal feminists of the FAU, questioned the social and gender system as a whole. Also, while the older generation's liberal feminists sought for better rights for women, the new feminists of the '60s called for changes to men's gender roles, too. The FAU only embraced a more radical approach after it slowly began to gain ground within the association through its new younger members. Finally, in 1976 the association experienced an intergenerational shift, through which the association became a blend of multiple of orientations ranging from radicalism to liberal and cultural feminism. Through this shift, the FAU began taking a more public role, as the new feminists sought publicity to raise awareness and initiate debate regarding gender equality. (Hagner & Försti 2006, 142–144, 150–152, 156, 162.) The era of the 1960s also marked the arrival of postmodernism and its conception of individualisation and postmodern identity. These types

of transitions act as opening places for social movements' identity formation (e.g. Hall 1999, 11, 14–15).

The FAU changed its mode of operation from the 1970s onwards: it sought publicity and took an active role of a political lobbyist to influence legislation. The 1980s marked a turbulent decade for the women's movement in general, as it became intertwined in inner dialogue regarding contemporary feminism. As a result, the FAU began paying more attention to the diverse experiences and differences between women. Unlike more radical views, the association considered it more important to focus first on the major social and juridical obstacles concerning women in the areas of labour and politics. The critique, however, called for a more holistic view that would tackle the discriminatory gender-related problems of women's personal life, as well. During the 1980s the FAU withdrew from its earlier years of radicalism and by moderating its approach succeeded in its efforts to gain an established organizational position to be consulted by official agents. In respect to gender equality issues, the association was also consulted increasingly more by the media. Towards the end of the '80s and in the wake of the third wave of feminism, the FAU took a more radical turn as it began emphasising the personal, through themes of body politics and sexuality while still holding on to its legislative objectives. The association embraced a strategy considered contradictory to some feminists: while the need for breaking the existing structures that maintain the repressive and hierarchical gender-binary system was recognised, the association chose to categorically exclude men from its membership. Safe spaces from hegemonic masculinity were considered essential for women from vulnerable backgrounds and experiences. During the turn of the '80s and the '90s the FAU had transformed from the exclusive elitist club of the older decades into an established organization enabling diverse feminist groups to get their voices heard. (Hagner & Försti 2006, 157–169, 220, 232–234, 255–256.)

In the 2000s, a new generation of feminists with academic backgrounds took over the FAU. The intergenerational shift resulted in the launching of a new publication in 2002, the *Tulva* journal, to make the association more known to the public. The new feminist agenda involved topics such as women's position in the labour market, violence against women and girls, human trafficking and prostitution. The FAU established its position as an expert organization to be consulted by governmental officials and interviewed by the media in

regards to gender equality issues. (Hagner & Försti 2006, 262, 273, 276, 289.) The feminist association of today continues to enable and sponsor unformal independent feminist groups that may differ in their takes on feminism. The association strives to influence legislation and raise general awareness by initiating public debate. The FAU, however, does not represent the women's movement in Finland as such, as the movement consists of multiple associations, groups and different feminisms and modes of operation.

3. METHODOLOGY AND DATA

In an attempt to study the discursive ways the women's movement resists the perceived hegemonic discourses regarding the representation of the feminist identity, one must focus on the linguistic tools – words, meanings and discourses. In this chapter, I will demonstrate the methodology of discourse analysis used in the thesis and present the data that serves as the research material.

3.1. Discourse analysis

In my thesis, I use discourse analysis as a method of investigating *counter-speech* embedded in discourses and narratives. The concept of *discourse* is defined as a *system of meanings* characterised by regularities and coherence. Discourses are constructed and enacted through interaction in social practices where they are continuously renewed. This renewal process is in the core of constructing social reality establishing and consolidating meanings, perceptions and values. (Jokinen, Juhila & Suoninen 2004, 26–27.) However, discourses are not to be taken as immune to resistance, contestation and, ultimately, change. Instead, they are constant objects to political struggle and attempts to redefine them. The concept of *discourse* is suitable for uncovering forms of *counter-speech* because it presents language as a possible embodiment of conscious and unconscious agencies. By identifying and analysing discourses the contemporary feminist activists employ in their writings, it is possible to observe the ways of portraying feminism from the perspective of the contemporary feminist movement in the 2010's Finland.

I use discourse analysis as a method of processing the research material in a way that allows the reading and interpretation of socially constructed discourses. As a premise, it is important to recognise the possible parallelism and ambivalence concerning the reading and interpreting the material. The object of the study is to investigate how discourses concerning feminist identities are constructed and enacted within produced narratives, connotations, anecdotes, symbols and values – in other words, discourses. (Jokinen, Juhila & Suoninen 2004, 28, 37–38.) The analysis will concentrate in observing the construction of feminist identities by examining the attributes and traits attached to them. Parsing the texts by

distinguishing similarities and distinctions among them, will make it easier to identify discourses. The research strategy applied to examine the portrayal of the feminist identity is dual: first, it will be analysed how the feminist identity is represented, and second, how the discursive representations are constructed.

3.2. Research data: The *Tulva* journal and blog

The Finnish *Tulva* journal is a printed feminist magazine first published in 2002 by the FAU. The journal was not intended to play a role of a mouthpiece for the association, but instead, to become a forum for new writers to discuss feminist issues. The aim was to make both the association and feminism better known to the public and attract new members. The magazine was intended as a forum for a multitude of voices, experiences and narratives. Even though the *Tulva* journal's writers consist of a broad spectrum of feminists, they share a common emphasis on antiracism and intersectionality, for which the journal is considered to have its specific feminist voice. (Hagner & Försti 2006, 285–286.) The magazine publishes four times a year. At the time of the analysis, the magazine also published an online blog on their website which, however, has later been closed down.

The *Tulva* journal is funded by subscription fees and sponsorship from the FAU, the Women's Cultural Organization and the Ministry of Education (ibid., 286). I chose the journal for the analysis based on its popularity and nationally recognised status as a feminist contributor; the journal is relatively well known to the public and has been awarded for its quality standards (e.g. YLE 26.10.2006). Furthermore, the journal can be argued to represent contemporary feminism in late modernity. It also represents a distinguished point of view regarding feminism: for one, it differentiates itself from the FAU by endorsing men to feminism and feminist activism. Several dozens of freelance writers, including journalists and guest writers, such as experts of different areas, also write the journal's blog. The themes of the blog entries concern feminism on a wide scale, for instance, covering topics of intersectionality, inclusiveness, marginal groups' rights and, in general, gender injustice in Finland.

The data's themes range from societal and political issues to culture and entertainment. For

the purposes of this research, I did not include reviews, pictures or reports in the analysis. Instead, the analysis concentrates only on commentaries, for they offer more personal type of texts where writers can voice their opinions in a more explanatory manner. From the perspective of discursive analysis, the research aims to investigate discourses and their constructions by identifying similarities and distinctions in ways of speaking. Moreover, allowing new feminists the liberty of expressing their viewpoints on feminism – without restricting it to predetermined positions – is at the core of contemporary feminism. Therefore, the plurality of different writers and identities might offer the study a broader conception of contemporary feminist counter-discourses.

The time scope of the analysis comprises data from January 2013 to December 2013. The selected year encapsulates the state of the debate regarding the identity negotiation process within the women's movement – yet maintains a sense of temporal perspective. The chosen year represents a particularly fruitful period for examining the feminist discourses since it serves as a turning point for the FAU's policy on exclusivity regarding the membership policy. During the year of 2013, the debates on the membership policy heated and it was the following year that the association agreed to partly change their policy on association's membership. Men, however, remained excluded from the membership. Also, the point of transformation of feminism has been pinpointed to the year 2008 onwards, as some researchers label the transition as evolvement to “the fourth wave of feminism”. (E.g. Philips & Cree 2014, 938–940; Wrye 2009, 187.) Also, the discussion of intersectionality in feminism was in its early phase in 2013 Finland. On the other hand, I wanted to investigate the current state of feminism as close to this day without losing a sense of perspective. The year of 2013 was also chosen for practical reasons since the *Tulva* blog has published only two blog entries in 2014–2015.

During the year of 2013, the *Tulva* blog had posted 33 entries, of which 28 are commentary types of texts after excluding reviews, reports and posts containing solely pictures from the overall number. The entries are mostly short at length and written by several writers. However, some reports have been included on the grounds of having explanatory and reflexive qualities.

3.3. Identity negotiation within the feminist movement

Identity is the combination of meanings individuals and collectives give to their life experiences, values, traits and social relations with regard to others. Identity works as an essential building block to collective action because it allows individuals to form an idea of *them* and *us*; it tells who belongs to the grouping and who is excluded from it. In this respect, identity also incorporates power, as it can be used as motivation to affect emotions. (Della Porta 2006, 92– 94.) According to Donatella Della Porta, solidarities that individuals and collectives hold, form social movement identities. These solidarities, however, can change at different times. For instance, the early feminist identity was based on class, as the white women from the upper-class backgrounds begun assembling. Working women, black women and women from sexual minorities were not seen as representative of women's matters. Indeed, even in the 1980s Finland, lesbian members were seen as a liability to the FAU, as their public presence was feared to delegitimise gender equality claims. However, as Della Porta notes, old identities do not always change into new ones, but rather exist side-by-side. In this way, the feminist identity can be seen as an umbrella, withholding a multitude of identifications. (Ibid., 93.)

The second-wave feminist movement moved from class-based identification to perceiving womanhood as the determiner of shared experience. According to Lloyd, the second wave of feminist politics has traditionally relied on womanhood as its political subject with a conception of a unified front, speaking with an undivided voice. Women were categorically considered to share something in common, whether it be common life experiences or the assumed female essence. Identity politics grounded in the experience of womanhood, however, was later problematised. Postmodernism of the 1980s and the 1990s challenged the concept of subjectivity. Postmodern feminism with its fluid conceptions of identity as a fragmented and ever-going process denied any coherent stable identity. The whole conception of womanhood was questioned and the differences between women regarding privilege and power relations were emphasised. (Lloyd 2005, 3–7.) Also, the conception of the oppressed and the overlapping and intertwining structures of differently manifesting oppression, was re-evaluated. While women were once considered being best represented by the white heterosexual women from privileged backgrounds, now the effects of contesting one form of oppression while neglecting another, were being questioned.

Della Porta names modern technology and the Internet as game-changers for social movements' identities, as they allow the maintaining of solidarities globally. In this way, different and geographically marginal identities can grow transnationally forming larger communities. Accordingly, when framing or reframing an identity, one looks into the past to fit into the pre-given narratives but also gives new meanings to it. However, as Della Porta notes, when negotiating a new identity or the new "us", for what the liberation is aimed for, solidarities may break between social movement actors. This, however, may activate different groups and attract recruits, which strengthens the movement. According to Della Porta, different identifications can serve the movement, as individuals find their motivating perspectives. (2006, 94–98.) Changing the social, political and economic climates within societies, hereby, has an impact on how individuals identify their grievances and what expectation they have for the movements.

4. ANALYSIS

In this chapter, I will present the findings on how the *Tulva* journal's writers position their intersectional thought of third-wave feminism through discourses and counter-discourses in respect to the oldest women's association in Finland, the FAU. To reveal how the writers position their feminism, the analysis also explores the construction of threat images coming from outside of the movement. The discourses reflect the inner dynamics within the feminist movement between the activists of the association and its journal's writers' collective, characteristically considered as the activist offshoot for the young generation of feminists. In this respect, the analysis gains insight into the identity negotiating process within the movement. However, it must be noted that the discourses found cannot be thought to represent the journal's feminism as such, given that the writers' collective is not regular, as it consists of a multitude of writers from different backgrounds and conceptions on feminist matters. Nonetheless, the journal is associated with having a distinctive voice channelled through the young generation of feminist writers. As the research is limited by the time perspective, the scope of research does not intend to make generalisations either of the nature of the contemporary feminist movement nor of the different feminist views separating the actors. The women's movement is fluid and many-voiced in character, which is why the studying of one feminist journal in a narrow time period is unable to produce larger generalisations. In this respect, the findings cannot give absolute representations of the dynamics within the feminist movement in Finland, but merely offer reflections on the matter in the time period presented.

The analysis exposes different, and at times overlapping discourses on positions given to the *Tulva* collective and the FAU, but also to the presumed anti-feminist actors. In particular, I observe the different positionings and roles given to the groups regarding the writers' own identity, but also the women's movement in general. I will examine the roles, characteristics and values attached to the different actors and specify how those attributes are constructed. The analysis seeks to identify the construction of threat images produced through discursive means: what is seen as the main threat to the feminist identity? By detecting and identifying threat images, one is not only able to analyse the framing of the movement's conflict structure but also its goals, solidarities, fears and strategies. Furthermore, by analysing who is not included to the "us", one is able to interpret how the writers position themselves in

respect to the “other”. The analysis reveals altogether six discourses and counter-discourses. The first four discourses presented concern the counter-speech and renegotiation of the feminist identity within the movement. The last two discourses present the perceived threat to feminism coming from outside of the movement.

4.1. The reframing of feminism: detaching from the old

Feminism 2.0 is already underway and the caravan goes on. Roll up your sleeves, sisters, we have our work cut out for us.¹ (Abdulkarim 2013; tr. S.K.)

The main finding of the analysis is that there appears to be an occurring renegotiation process regarding the feminist subjectivity, which shares clear reflections with other research made about the state of contemporary feminism in Western Europe in the 21st century (e.g. Dean & Aune 2015; Dean 2010). According to some scholars, the assertions of the death of feminism are hasty as feminism is conceived to be experiencing a resurgence for that the grass-roots level activism has risen and a new generation of online feminist activists have emerged throughout Europe (e.g. Dean & Aune 2015). *The reframing of feminism* discourse presents a picture of the action-oriented contemporary feminism of the younger generation of activists as a countering measure against the feminism of a more traditional feminist organization, the FAU. The new framing of feminism is characterised by an emphasis on diversity, inclusivity and action-orientatism, as opposed to the perceived anti-feminist practices marked by elitism, bureaucracy and exclusion, associated with the association’s agency. The writers perceive themselves as the reformists fighting the elitist power that only a few have within the association. In this perspective, the writers position themselves as the challengers: The agents of a protest movement emerging from the margins of the association. The discourse frames the new feminism – or “feminism 2.0” as stated above –, as a progressed form of feminism breaking from the old with its more holistic and intersectional way of conceiving equality. The heading “Feminism updates itself”² (Purokuru 2013) presents the ongoing identity change as something organic; certain to happen and destined to be. By positioning the change in a fatalistic manner, the writer depicts the change as

¹Orig. ”Feminismi 2.0 on jo käynnissä ja karavaani liikkuu. Käärikää hihanne, siskot, meillä on vielä paljon töitä.”

²Orig. “Feminismi päivittää itseään”.

inevitable. In my analysis, I employ Tarrow's (1998, 2–5) concept of *framing*, which refers to the construction of purposes, grievances and goals needed for the formation of a sustainable collective identity and bonds of social solidarity – both vital for social movements' continuity. The analysis distinguishes aims at reframing the traditional way of conceiving feminism that the FAU, as the largest and most influential women's organization in Finland, is conceived to represent from the standpoint of the *Tulva* journal's collective. While in the research data the writers direct their criticism towards the association as an authority figure, it must be noted, however, that clear ideological separations are not easy to make, as many activists are simultaneously both influencers within the association and the *Tulva* journal's writers' collective. It is not to say that the FAU, de facto, represents values often associated with second-wave feminism – a subject not touched on by this thesis. Nevertheless, the analysis is based on the young feminists of the journal themselves positioning the association divergent in relation to the new framings of feminism. The FAU does, however, share a long history with liberal feminism, the traces of which might be found in some of its practices critiqued by the young generation of activists.

The Union can remain a female-centric *organization* and we can be a *feminist network*. - - The Union has chosen the female-centric route, but what we want is feminist activities open to all feminists.³ (Unionin ulosmarssijat 24.11.2013; tr. S.K.)

While discussing the question regarding the opening of the membership of the association to all genders, the writer above notes that the FAU represents an “organization”, whereas “we”, as the contemporary feminists, represent a “network”. The conflict between the institutionalised organizational level and the grass-roots level activism can be interpreted through Della Porta's (2006, 13) analysis of the development of social movements in general: dissatisfaction emerges when the existing institutions are unable to answer to the new needs the changing social and cultural structures require. In this perspective, the changes in the post-structuralist and postmodern identities and the social, political and economic changes in Europe in the late modernity can be argued to have shaped the needs for social movements in general.

Is there a flaming intergenerational dispute going on between feminists in the Union? - - The young [members] are rejoiced as long as everyone plays along nicely. But if there would be too many of the young or they disagree too much, they would be *feared* and *opposed*. As with all organizations that run

³Orig. “Unioni voi olla edelleen naiseryityinen järjestö ja me voimme olla feministinen verkosto. - - Unioni on valinnut naiseryityisen linjan, mutta me haluamme kaikille feministeille avointa feminististä toimintaa.”

for a long time with the same team. However, differences remain. *Younger feminists* clearly perceive politics as more *grass-roots level activism* than *cabinet bureaucracy*.⁴ (Purokuru 2013; tr. S.K.)

The writer draws a clear distinction to the feminist means of conduct used by the FAU and the “Younger feminists” that the writer sees represented by the *Tulva* journal’s writers’ collective. The FAU’s proceedings are described with a pejorative expression of “cabinet bureaucracy”, which can be understood to refer to a hierarchical closed up space excluding others than few power holders. The reference to bureaucracy can be interpreted inholding connotations to stiffness and inflexibility – a system that values procedure at the cost of efficiency. This is to insinuate that the association has lost its protest element by forming too organizational in its proceedings. The FAU is positioned as withholding an official standing as opposed to the younger feminists’ “grass-roots level activism”. Indeed, the association has well established its official position, as it actively co-operates with officials and ministries on equality issues in a consultative role. The accusations of bureaucratism against the FAU as an organization are connected to the social movement theory’s conception of *reification*, which refers to the habitual process the social movements are often considered to follow in Finland: once protest movements, such as the women’s movement, establish their position in society and professionalize, the radical edge tends to dilute. As studies show, the new women’s movement in Finland – versus, for instance, to Sweden, Denmark and Iceland – was encouraged to operate through state mechanisms rather than letting the protest movement grow autonomously outside of the state institutions in the 1960s (Bergman 1998, 166). Women’s movement institutionalised by developing formalised and professionalized practices. According to Siisiäinen (1998, 219–220), the evolvement in question is representative to collective mobilisation in Finland, as the movements adapt to formal practices and organize themselves accordingly. As Siisiäinen further states, by forming into a formalised association, social movements distance their operational repertoire away from actionism for a more moderate perceived practice. By stating that the FAU embraces the young only as far as they avoid challenging the association, it is to say that the association’s agency is not seen as legitimate. Rather, it is seen as rejecting challengers inside the movement – behaviour considered anti-feminist by character, as it produces power hierarchies and marginalisation. According to the discourse, the FAU has experienced

⁴Orig. “Roihuaako Unionissa feministisukupolvien välinen kiista? - - Nuorista [jäsenistä] iloitaan, kunhan kaikki toimivat kiltisti yhdessä. Mutta jos nuoria tulee liikaa tai he ovat liian eri mieltä, heitä pelätään ja vastustetaan. Niin kuin kaikissa organisaatioissa, jotka pyöriivät pitkään saman porukan voimin. Eroja kuitenkin on. Nuoremmat feministit käsittävät selvästi politiikan enemmän ruohonjuuritason aktivismiksi kuin kabinetti-byrokratiaksi.”

reification: it has gained an established organizational character, for which, the practices have grown more bureaucratic, elitist and even discriminatory.

By describing their position within the association as the young that are “feared” if not conforming to the existing policies, the writers appear to position the young feminists as the possible challengers to old practices. By attaching new meanings to the movement identity, subjectivity and the means of feminism, the writers seek to detach themselves from the old forms perceived as exclusive, discriminatory and bureaucratic. The young activists are represented as dynamic, forward going and active, as opposed to the association’s state of stagnation, bureaucratic sluggishness and passivity. The FAU’s managing control is depicted as authoritarian with descriptions of conformity demands regarding the association’s rules. As presented by Laclau (1990, 33–34), negotiating an identity has a direct relation to power, which can only be accomplished by repressing other identities that threaten it. In this respect, the question of stability and vitality of the intergenerational solidarities between feminists can be raised, as the reframing of feminism is deeply connected to the conceptions of feminist representation and subjectivity especially regarding the man-question in feminism. The question arises: whose rights does feminism represent and who can represent feminism? Hence, the reframing discourse, produced by the younger generation of feminists, can be interpreted as an act of power, aiming to undermine the FAU’s conception of the feminist identity by declaring the intersectional approach as the only legitimate one. In contrast, a member of the association’s board amounts the *Tulva* collective’s take on feminism to embarrassment to be women in her blog entry titled “The club for the embarrassing” (*Nolojen kerho*) referring to the FAU. She counters the critique by interpreting it in terms of that “being a woman is still not good enough - - [not] even for the feminists”⁵ (Pajusalo 6.3.2013).

Many middle-aged members of the Union are also in favour of opening the membership. As for sex work, many of the young are in favour of the criminalisation of the purchase of sex. Thus, neither controversy directly fits *the young-against-the-grannies-pattern*. - - [the Union] emphasizes the importance of conversation. On the other hand, the regulars of the organization take an *unresponsive attitude* towards the initiatives of the young on sex work and gender diversity.⁶ (Purokuru 2013; tr. S.K.)

⁵Orig. ”- - se, että on nainen, ei edelleenkään riitä - - [ei] edes feministeille.”

⁶Orig. “Jäsenyyden avaamista kannattavat myös monet keski-ikäiset unionilaiset. Mitä seksityöhön tulee, monet nuoret kannattavat seksinoston kriminalisointia. Kumpikaan kiista ei siis suoraan sovi nuoret vastaan mummut –kaavaan. - - [Unioni] korostaa keskustelun tärkeyttä. Toisaalta järjestön vakioporukka suhtautuu penseästi nuorten aloitteisiin seksityöstä ja sukupuolten moninaisuudesta.”

The writer above addresses the possibility of an intergenerational conflict by referring to “the young-against-the-grannies-pattern”. However, the matter is treated with uncertainty, as it is not seen as consistently fitting to the situation as such. The writer continues by expressing frustration towards the association, as it is perceived to take an “unresponsive attitude” to initiatives coming from the young members, despite the emphasis on the importance of conversation. By addressing the young-old-dichotomy, the writer refers to the so-called mother-daughter-trope sometimes used to describe the intergenerational disputes occurring within the women’s movement. However, intergenerational changes and debates are inevitable in all movements when the new generation re-evaluates old practices from the viewpoint of contemporary problematization. For instance, the FAU transformed in 1976 through a generational change, as the younger generation of activists yearned for a more open and dynamic perspective within the association. Likewise, in the 1980s the younger feminists of the unregistered association, Feministit-Feministerna critiqued the FAU for unfeminist hierarchical associational structures, which were perceived to inevitably accommodate masculine hierarchies and power dynamics not permitting members to be equal to each other. At the beginning of the 1980s, the older generation of feminists in the board of the FAU considered the younger members of the editorial board of the association’s *Akkaväki* publication of that time too radical regarding the lesbian feminist content. It wasn’t until the 2000s that lesbianism was included in the official feminist politics of the association. (Hagner & Försti 2006, 260, 262.) However, the FAU perceived the associational form as a necessary instrument for having a more influential standing regarding societal decision-making. (Ibid., 167–168.) In my analysis, the new generation’s activists of the 21st century are equivalently reclaiming the protest movement by criticising the perceived formalised organization for being hierarchical, stagnated, and old-fashioned in opposition to the progressed and inclusive feminists of the grass-roots level. However, one could argue that the intergenerational conflicts of the kind might hurt intergenerational solidarities in the long run. The findings of the data referring to a generational change and a quarrel are compatible with similar research made by Dean (2010, 152), for instance. Dean, who has studied contemporary feminism in the UK in the 2006–2009 period, finds that a generational shift is indeed occurring within the women’s movement, as the new feminism of the young third-wavers rejects the radical legacy of second-wave feminism and offers new feminist politics with new definition to radicalness.

In our view, all those who engage in feminist activities are feminists. We want a mental and physical

space where all feminists can work together regardless of gender. Equal policies cannot be based on *discrimination*.⁷ (Unionin ulosmarssijat 24.11.2013; tr. S.K.)

According to the writers, FAU's feminist politics is based on "discrimination" as long as only juridically recognised women can be members of the organization. I perceive the man-question – studied more thoroughly in section 4.7. – to be strongly connected to the individualisation process deriving from the 1980s, which has altered the conceptions of identity and subjectivity and therefore problematised the question of political representation. Likewise, the critique the third wave of feminism often faces has to do with an individualistic narrative, which refers to the critique claiming that what used to be radical feminist politics of the second-wave feminism in the '70s, has turned into a depoliticized "lifestyle feminism" diluted off radicalism. According to Jonathan Dean's (2010, 138–141) study on contemporary feminism in the UK, the third-wavers are sometimes critiqued for ignoring the key issue of the struggle against inequality of the second-wave feminists of the '70s. Contemporary feminism is critiqued for neglecting matters of equal pay, childcare and male violence towards women and girls at the expense of more trivial matters such as identity and lifestyle-related issues. However, as Dean has studied the English *F-Word* blog, much similar to the Finnish *Tulva* journal, the young feminists respond to the criticism by stating that the themes the young generation of feminists emphasise resonate to the young, and by trivialising them, feminism would stay esoteric. By popularising feminism, in respect to consumerism, popular culture and girl-power narratives, feminism can be argued to have reached a larger group of recruits, even though some criticise this having an unpoliticizing effect on feminism.

According to Della Porta (2006, 18), the reframing of social movement's agenda can work as a great mobilising force when the new demands and discourses resonate with the experiences of a greater amount of people. My thesis suggests that by reframing feminism, the challenging actors take advantage of the discursive opportunity structure to grow sympathy for the movement's demands in the eyes of the public. Changes in political opportunity structures, caused by the European migration crisis and the rise of the far-right, for instance, have likely contributed to the growing emphasis on antiracism and the rights of

⁷Orig. "Meidän näkemyksemme mukaan feministejä ovat kaikki, jotka tekevät feminististä toimintaa. Haluamme henkisen ja fyysisen tilan, jossa kaikki feministit voivat toimia yhdessä sukupuolesta riippumatta. Tasa-arvoisen politiikan lähtökohta ei voi olla syrjintä."

ethnic minorities in feminist politics. By combining feminism with the fight against antifascism – which presents a major theme within the research data –, it can be easier for the feminist movement to gain greater support from the public, in so far as fascism is understood to endanger public safety. In this way, the condemnation of fascist activities works as a discursive opportunity aligned with feminist politics. From this perspective, the activists take advantage of the political opportunity by critiquing the system and the True Finns party, in particular, for permitting the growth of the far-right, known for its street patrols. By reframing feminism as a movement for all of the discriminated, including minorities, – rather than focusing on women’s rights –, the movement can gain new recruits. As Della Porta (2006) puts it, the pre-existing ideas of a social movement agenda and demands can be used as a basis for new forms of intersectional framework.

The reframing of feminism appears to be occurring in the international context, as well. The findings go together with a recent study made by Dean and Aune (2015, 127, 275, 386), which portrays contemporary feminism in Britain regarding the feminist objects and ambitions of the new generation of feminist activists. What is noteworthy, is the following finding of the study: the first outlined objective for feminist activism in Britain was found from the uncertainty of the state of feminism itself. In other words, for the contemporary feminism, the reshaping of the feminist identity was found to be a major objective in itself. The study suggests – in contrast with common postfeminist discourses – that the feminist movement is, in fact, in resurgence due to the growing mobilising force of the new online spaces, such as feminist websites and blogs, run by the young generation of third-wavers. However, generalisations of the status of feminism in Europe cannot be made, as social movements are always bound to specific national, historical and cultural contexts and even within the national contexts, movements are manifold and fluid in character. Another study made by Dean (2010, 142) issues a commonly stated concern regarding third-wave feminism’s endorsement to individuality and popular culture at the expense of political engagement. According to Dean, there is a feminist individualisation narrative implying a shift from the affective-based and anger-driven second-wave feminism of the 1970s towards a less politically perceived contemporary feminism. According to the narrative, the challenge the contemporary feminism is faced with derives from this new approach, which tends to reject the anger-driven character of the second-wave feminism. Dean concludes: “- it is assumed that contemporary feminism is underwritten by a standpoint largely unthreatening to dominant patriarchal logics”. In his study (2010, 379) on contemporary

feminism in the UK, Dean refers to the young feminist generation's feminism as "the new feminism", distinguishably different from the second-wave. In this respect, the new feminism in question is characterised by poststructuralism, which also in my analysis, characterises the findings of the data from the Finnish *Tulva* journal. Even though Dean and Aune (2015, 379–380) point out that this sort of criticism is more representative of the contemporary feminism in the American context, in his earlier study (2010, 139) on the British *F-Word* blog in the 2006–2009 period, Dean distinguishes " - a shift from a politically engaged and critical feminism, to one characterised by affirmations of individualism at the expense of politics." Even though the findings are not comparable with each other, as national contexts vary and movements comprise multitudes of different activist groups and different modes of feminisms, matters relating to identity, anti-racism and popular culture appear strongly in the *Tulva* journal's data, too. However, contemporary feminism, characterised by postmodernism, has raised criticism for neglecting structural matters. Dean and Aune (2015, 379) refer to the dynamics between the second- and third-wave feminists as a mother-daughter-relation, in which, the young contemporary feminists' rebellion is taken for ungratefulness in the American context – a response much similar to the previously referred quote from the member of the FAU blaming the young generation of betraying feminism for that women's issues are not treated as a priority.

Another noteworthy distinction concerning the perceived young-old-dichotomy derives from the means of activism in feminist politics. The young feminist activists are oftentimes associated with active use of the Internet, as both for the means of activism, as well as a generator for a new sense of collective solidarity internationally. Some scholars argue that the new generation of feminists represents the fourth wave of feminism consisting of online activists who employ the Internet in a new manner. This evolvement is demonstrated through the Me Too movement, feminist online spaces and online forums revealing daily sexual harassment towards women in public spaces, to name a few (e.g. Philips & Cree 2014, 938–940; Wrye 2009, 187). Whether or not the third wave has progressed into fourth – as some critics identify it merely as representing another fraction of the third wave – it is obvious that the *Tulva* collective positions its take on feminism as new. Furthermore, the discourse describes the collective's take on feminism as the new mainstream feminism even though the official decision-making power is still seen belonging to the official association. However, the discourse reflects an identity negotiation, through which the perceived old feminists are persuaded to join the new crew, for instance, depicted by the heading "Feminist,

who are you?”⁸ (Auvinen 11.11.2013).

4.2. The elitist FAU counter-discourse: power hierarchy within the association

The leadership position the FAU holds is perceived as elitist and discriminatory, as “the power-holding group” of the association continues to argue for the exclusion of all those, who are not assigned female at birth, from its membership. The discourse constructs a reality where the feminist movement forms a centralised, top-down managed entity with only a few members having the decision-making power. The association is attached with elitist attributes such as privilege, patronage and salvation. Its policies are seen as directly discriminating other feminists, and on a larger scale, holding back feminist progress. What is noteworthy, is that while the FAU is positioned as the hegemonic actor, its take on feminism is nonetheless positioned in the marginal. This contradiction works to create a contrast: The few have power over the majority, who, however, does not share the elite’s vision of feminism. In this view, feminism has progressed and moved forward whilst the power-holders are stagnated in the past. The association’s policies are seen as back-warded, as they continue to perceive cis women’s matters as the main feminist issues, as opposed to fighting for all the discriminated, despite the gender. The discourse aims to question the power structures within the feminist movement, not only by branding the FAU’s control as unfair, discriminatory and elitist – attributes unfeminist by definition – but also as dangerous for the movement’s vitality.

The fact that feminist politics can still be made from top to bottom in the name of “all women” and that *patronizing* and *salvaging* are still commonly used strategies, demonstrates the existence of unconscious privileges. - - It is practically impossible to always gather around at the same table. At those times it is good to pause to consider why the active players are made up of certain types of groups while others are underrepresented. What does the setup tell you and what could you do about it? It is also the responsibility of those sitting at the table to ensure that feminist politics is not based solely on the views of *the power-holding group*. In the worst-case scenario, the rights of a marginalized group of people are further trampled on in the name of women’s rights.⁹ (Jussila 3.5.2013; tr. S.K.)

⁸ Orig. ”Feministi, kuka sä oot?”.

⁹Orig. ”Se, että feminististä politiikkaa voidaan edelleen tehdä ylhäältä käsin ’kaikkien naisten’ nimissä, ja että holhoaminen ja pelastaminen ovat edelleen yleisesti käytössä olevia strategioita, kertoo tiedostamattomien etuoikeuksien olemassaolosta. - - Aina saman pöydän ääreen kokoontuminen ei ole käytännössä mahdollista. Silloin on hyvä pysähtyä pohtimaan, miksi aktiivitoimijat koostuvat tietynyyppisistä ryhmistä toisten ollessa aliedustettuina. Mistä asetelma kertoo, ja mitä sille voisi tehdä? Pöydän ääressä istuvien vastuulla on myös

The nature of the elitist characteristics, attached to the composition of the association's decision-making and power-holding groups, is also distinguished by Lotta Viinikka, the FAU's Secretary-General of the time, by stating: "it is easiest for those, who are well-off, to get their voices heard best". However, while acknowledging the power structures favouring the privileged activists, she concludes that, nevertheless, the FAU aims to improve conditions for all women:

*Surely it is the easiest for those, who are well-off, to get their voices heard best in all established societal organizations and societal processes. However, the Union's object is to improve the position of all women.*¹⁰ (Viinikka 2013; tr. S.K.)

Take a critical look at the structures of feminist organizations. Why do all the professional feminists in Finland seem to be *carved from the same tree regarding their educational and social class backgrounds?* - - The words of Sojourner Truth apply to present-day Finland as much as they did in the 19th century United States. Here, too, feminism is *a playground for the privileged*, where the position of the minorities is not strong.¹¹ (Abdulkarim 2013; tr. S.K.)

The critique the association faces has strong links to social class and privilege. The FAU's professional activists are referred to being "carved from the same tree regarding their educational and social class backgrounds". Feminism in Finland is referred to being "a playground for the privileged", which is to say that the FAU's power holders are perceived as a specific group of people who enjoy certain privileges deriving from opportunities provided by their social class – privileges outside of the reach for many of the association's ordinary members. As the writer above states, the words by Sojourner Truth, an African-American abolitionist and women's rights activist, still apply in Finland as they did in the 19th century United States. Hereby, the writer draws direct resemblance in the way early feminism was born as white women's activism, to the 2010s feminism in Finland being defined by white women's privilege and prerogative.

huolehtia siitä, ettei feminististä politiikkaa laadita ainoastaan valtaryhmän näkemysten pohjalta. Pahimmassa tapauksessa käy niin, että naisten oikeuksien nimissä poljetaan entisestään jonkin marginaalisen ihmisryhmän oikeuksia."

¹⁰Orig. "Varmaankin kaikissa vakiintuneissa yhteiskunnallisissa järjestöissä ja yhteiskunnallisissa prosesseissa äänensä saavat parhaiten kuuluviin hyväosaiset. Unionin tavoitteena on kuitenkin parantaa kaikkien naisten asemaa."

¹¹Orig. "Tarkastele kriittisesti feministijärjestöjen rakenteita. Miksi kaikki ammattifeministit Suomessa vaikuttavat olevan samasta puusta veistettyjä koulutus- ja luokkataustoineen? - - Sojourner Truthin sanat pätevät tämän päivän Suomessa yhtä paljon kuin ne pätivät 1800-luvulla Yhdysvalloissa. Feminismi on täälläkin etuoikeutettujen leikkikenttä, jossa vähemmistöjen asema ei ole vahva."

Although the feminist movement considers itself operating from the marginals of society to voice grievances experienced by the marginalised, even the movement itself has its hegemonies and marginals within (e.g. Jokinen et al. 2004, 13). The elitist counter-discourse positions the FAU as the hegemonic actor within the feminist movement in Finland. The early women's movement, however, was elitist by character: The activists were of the upper class and bourgeois backgrounds. The core purpose of the movement at the time was to educate the lower class and working-class women with ethics and manners, which were distinctly associated with the upper classes. The activists perceived it as their duty to share virtuousness to the common people. However, the legislative rights the activists promoted for were only meant to be available for the women of their class. It wasn't until the early 20th century that working-class women detached themselves from the upper-class patronage by embracing socialist and Marxist views and established separate associations. In Finland, these associations cut off their relationship with the liberal women's associations, such as the FAU. After the general strike in 1905, the FAU, too, had to recognise the lower classes' right to vote, as well (e.g. Hagner & Försti 2006, 83).

The women's movement's upper-class history might still today affect how well feminist activism and its agenda resonate to women from different backgrounds. For instance, a study by Skeggs's (1997, 143, 199) suggests a correlation between class and resonance to feminism. In the study about white working-class women in Britain, the interviewed took a class-related and apprehensive attitude towards feminism, for it was not perceived as something that resonated with their own class identity. However, as Skeggs suggests, while the feminist identity was perceived in negative terms, the young English working-class women valued gender equality on a general level. The contradiction came from the intellectual feminist discourses, articulated from specific class positions, which were not seen as representative of the daily life experiences of the interviewed. In the Finnish context, Julkunen (2010, 15), too, detects negatively associated discourses regarding feminism and the women's movement.

Feminism must be *many-voiced*, otherwise, it will not represent all. At the same time, it must be acknowledged that there are the same contradictions within the movement as elsewhere in society. The more privileged can easily dictate how things are to be taken forward.¹² (Saarikoski 2013; tr. S.K.)

¹²Orig. "Feminismin pitää olla moniäänistä, muuten se ei edusta kaikkia. Samalla pitää tunnustaa, että liikkeen sisällä vallitsevat samat ristiriidat kuin muuallakin yhteiskunnassa. Etuoikeutetummassa asemassa olevat sanelevat helposti miten asioita viedään eteenpäin."

The writer above insinuates that the FAU's feminism is currently one-voiced, as opposed to the preferred "many-voiced" feminism that would better represent all women. Accordingly, the feminist movement is not seen as immune to the contradictions that appear in society in general referring to the power hierarchies within the association.

4.3. Questioning the FAU's agency: the radicalizing discourse

- - 'We will not fight against *the windmills* – instead, we will pass them by and make anew' - -.¹³
(Unionin ulosmarssijat 24.11.2013; tr. S.K.)

When addressing the FAU's policy on excluding men from its membership, the *Tulva* journal's writers represent the association's agency as weak and its feminism as radical and dated. According to the writers, feminism belongs to everyone, regardless of one's sex, as they advocate for allowing men to be members in the name of equality and inclusivity of feminism. The discourse questions the FAU's ability and will to represent all women – as they are seen as focusing solely on cis women's rights – which, according to the writers, goes against the idea of feminism. While the association justifies its stand on the matter on historical grounds and the need for women-only spaces, which will allow women to fully co-operate with one another (Pajusalo 6.3.2013), the *Tulva* collective labels the organization's feminism as radical (Tulvan toimituskollektiivin jäsenet 25.2.2013) and "Tsarist" (Unionin ulosmarssijat 24.11.2013). The FAU's unwillingness to update its membership policy is systematically contributed to "fear of change" deriving from feelings of threat and concern. The association is referred to as "the windmills", which paints a picture of a hopeless struggle against the obstacles that appear to make it difficult to either have a critical discussion within the association or to seek to change its policies.

The *Tulva* journal's and its blog's writers accuse the FAU of being radical based on its female-centric membership policy. However, some scholars claim that it is, in fact, the concept of radicality that has altered. According to Dean (2010, 127, 144–145), who has studied contemporary feminism in the British context in the 2006–2009 period, the young generation of third-wave feminists have moved away from the legacy of Radical Feminism, which associated the level of radicalness with commitment, towards a more subjective

¹³Orig. "- - 'Emme taistele tuulimyllyjä vastaan vaan menemme ohi ja teemme uutta' - -."

conception of what is considered radical. The subject of his study, the *F-word* blog – which he considers to have been in the epicentre of resurgent mobilisation of the feminist movement in the 21st century Britain – in his view, has detached the matters of patriarchy and female sexuality from the conception of radicality. At the same time, third-wave feminism is under scrutiny for abandoning radical politics at the expense of individualism, which some scholars fear will depoliticize the movement.

When referring to the FAU, the writers attach inability to its agency. In reference to the membership debate, writers analyse the association's stand on excluding men from its membership as follows:

The fear of change paralyses and stiffens. However, motion and change *cannot be stopped*, they can only *be stalled*. To be *vital* and *present-day*, every ism *must be able to renew itself*. If the ism is not able to renew itself, it will *wither away*. *Rightly so*.¹⁴ (Auvinen 11.11.2013; tr. S.K.)

- - If the Union wants [to be] at the heart of the feminist movement in the future, it must also be able to critically review its own policies and also update its own feminism.¹⁵ (Tulvan toimituskollektiivin jäsenet 25.2.2013; tr. S.K.)

At its autumn meeting on Sunday, 24.11.2013, the Feminist Association Unioni was *unable* to vote on the question of opening the membership and decided not to make a statement on the matter. - - This is just the sort of contempt towards organizational democracy we got to witness at the meeting. Aino-Iiris Meura, who has been a member of the Union for four years, plans to resign. 'Is this it? Keep your damn jack', she comments disappointed. At the autumn meeting, a few people were allowed to dominate the conversation and be very vocal about their opinions. Through these individuals, the Union appears as a separatist and exclusive association. - - We, as the members who would like to open the historically important association to all feminists, are very disappointed with such *fear of change*.¹⁶ (Unionin ulosmarssijat 24.11.2013; tr. S.K.)

According to a writer above, "the fear of change paralyses and stiffens", which is to say that the FAU's decision on excluding men is not based on reasoning found on empowerment and

¹⁴Orig. "Muutoksen pelko halvaannuttaa ja jäykistää. Liikettä ja muutosta ei voi kuitenkaan pysäyttää, sitä voi ainoastaan hidastaa. Ollakseen elinvoimainen ja ajassaan kiinni, jokaisen aatteen täytyy kyetä uudistumaan. Mikäli aate ei kykene uudistumaan aikaansa vastaavaksi, se kuihtuu pois. Hyvä niin."

¹⁵Orig. "- - Jos Unioni haluaa jatkossa [olla] feministisen liikkeen keskiössä, sen on pystyttävä myös kriittisesti tarkkailemaan omia käytäntöjään ja päivittämään myös omaa feminismiään."

¹⁶Orig. "Naisasialiitto Unioni ei kyennyt syyskokouksessaan sunnuntaina 24.11.2013 äänestämään jäsenyyden avaamiskysymyksestä ja päätti olla antamatta julkilausumaa asiaan liittyen. - - Juuri tällaista järjestödemokratian halveksuntaa pääsimme kokouksessa todistamaan. Neljä vuotta Unionin jäsenenä ollut Aino-Iiris Meura aikoo erota järjestöstä. 'Tässäkö tämä nyt oli? Pitäkää tunkkinne', hän toteaa pettyneenä. Syyskokouksessa muutaman henkilön annettiin hallita keskustelua ja pitää kovaa ääntä mielipiteistään. Unioni näyttäytyy näiden henkilöiden kautta separatistisena ja ulossulkevana järjestönä. - - Me jäsenet, jotka haluaisimme avata historiallisesti tärkeän järjestön kaikille feministeille, olemme hyvin pettyneitä tällaiseen muutoksen pelkoon."

certitude, but rather, on defensive behaviour justified with fear and perceived threat. In other words, the association's decision does not come from a place of power and prowess, but rather from weakness. Change in itself is portrayed as feared and undesired from the perspective of the association. However, the writer points out that while the change can "be stalled", it "cannot be stopped". The writer urges for change by appealing to the greater good for the feminist movement by stating that only by renewing itself, a movement can stay "vital" and "present-day". By phrasing the plea with the words "must be able to renew itself", the writer highlights ability – capability and power to make changes. The FAU's agency is both weakened by the representations of inability – referenced with remarks of paralysis, stiffness and capability – as well as reluctance to change, as insinuated by its will to stall the change. The writer continues by warning the association of the fate of withering away, if unable to renew itself. By concluding with a remark of "Rightly so", regarding the possibility of the withering away of the association, the writer uses the rhetoric of intimidation, as in to say that there will either be a modern feminist association or not one at all.

In addition to questioning the ability of the association, the writers attach unfairness to its proceedings. A headline of a press release regarding the FAU's convention about the membership issue states: "The democratic process was nixed"¹⁷ (Unionin ulosmarssijat 24.11.2013), which attaches unfair and undemocratic nature to its agency. According to the press release, the discussion was tried to paralyse with "gimmicks regarding meeting technicalities":

- - A rule change has been prepared and discussed for a year. We felt that there was an attempt to *paralyse* the debate on the subject. The use of the bequeathed assets and *gimmicks regarding meeting technicalities* are repeatedly made an instrument for sabotaging *democratic decision-making*. - - Farewell to *Tsarist* feminism! Persons to walkout headed to Kallio, accompanied by feminists not welcome to the Union or its meeting. We want diverse feminism – not feminism that excludes other feminists, friends and our allies. Female-centrist feminism represents only one orientation of feminism but we have had enough of it and we will take our feminism elsewhere. (Unionin ulosmarssijat 24.11.2013; tr. S.K.)¹⁸

¹⁷ ”Demokraattinen prosessi torpattiin”.

¹⁸ - - Sääntömuutosta on valmisteltu ja keskustelua käyty aiheesta vuoden ajan. Koimme, että keskustelu aiheesta pyrittiin halvaannuttamaan. Testamenttivarojen käytöstä ja kokousteknisestä kikkailusta tehdään toistuvasti väline, jolla sabotoidaan demokraattinen päätöksenteko. - - Hyvästit tsaarinaikaiselle feminismille! Ulosmarssijat siirtyivät Kallioon ja mukaan liittyi feministejä, jotka eivät ole tervetulleita Unioniin tai sen kokoukseen. Me haluamme moninaista feminismiä, emme feminismiä joka rajaa ulos toisia feministejä, kavereita ja liittolaisiamme. Nais erityinen feminismi on vain yksi suunta feminismistä, mutta me olemme saaneet siitä tarpeeksemme ja viemme feminismimme muualle.”

Another writer questions the FAU's position as a feminist forum altogether by conditioning its feminism with inclusiveness. The accentuation of the association's significant position – as “Finland's largest feminist organization” – is followed by a critique of its narrow conception of feminism:

*For the Union to truly be a forum for feminism, it should equally involve all kinds of feminists in its activities, not just women. - - However, as a criterion for membership in Finland's largest feminist organization, separatism limits feminist activity to just one kind of feminism. - - The removal of the female clause would enable the return of the action-oriented contemporary feminism back into the Union.*¹⁹ (Tulvan toimituskollektiivin jäsenet 25.2.2013; tr. S.K.)

- - The crucial question is how feminism is perceived in the Union. - - The role of the Union needs to be redefined: The aim must be to improve the position of all those affected by the gender system and eliminate all forms of gender discrimination.²⁰ (Punamäki & Vähäpassi 22.11.2013; tr. S.K.)

The phrasing “For the Union to truly be a forum for feminism” attaches uncertainty to the association's feminist character by conditionalizing it. Its feminism is hereby portrayed as questionable – not yet a legitimate feminist forum, but more like a work in progress. The writer accuses the FAU of supporting only “one kind of feminism” referring to its separatist considered nature. However, by amending its membership policy, it would be possible for the “action-oriented contemporary feminism” to return to the association. By this, the writer suggests that it is something that used to characterise the FAU – something that later has been lost. The old-fashioned and passive association is contrasted against the inclusive and modern contemporary feminism that the writers view themselves to be representatives of. The association is seen as stuck in the past at the expense of gaining greater good for the movement in the form of new recruits.

The discourse works to counter the radical nature associated with the FAU's stand on the man-question, which is rooted in the ideas of Radical Feminism. In the '60s and '70s, women-only spaces grew more common, as radicalness was directly equated with the level of commitment to the feminist movement. Hence, the writers seek to detach themselves from

¹⁹Orig. “Jotta Unioni todella olisi feminismien foorumi, sen tulisi ottaa yhdenvertaisesti mukaan toimintaansa kaikenlaisia feministejä, ei ainoastaan naisia. - - Suomen suurimman feministijärjestön jäsenkriteerinä separatismi rajaa kuitenkin feministisen toiminnan vain yhdenlaiseksi feminismiksi. - - Nais-pykälän poisto mahdollistaisi toimintaan keskittyvän nykyfeminismin paluun takaisin Unioniin.”

²⁰Orig. ” - - Olenainen kysymys on, miten Unionissa feminismi nähdään. - - Unionin tehtävä on määriteltävä uudelleen: tähtäimessä on oltava kaikkien sukupuolijärjestelmästä kärsivien aseman parantaminen, ja kaiken sukupuolisyrynnän poistaminen. - - ”

this radicalness associated with female-centricity. According to Dean's (2010, 9, 36–37) study on contemporary feminism in Britain – regardless of having distinguished an occurring resurgence of feminist mobilisation – feminism has lost its radical element when compared to the second-wave feminism of the 1970s. He identifies a tendency of rejecting the past legacy of Radical Feminism within the contemporary movement. The same phenomenon, according to Dean, can be detected from common discourses which, on one hand, reject feminism as an ideology, yet on the other hand, claim to advocate for gender equality. In his study, Dean identifies these discourses reflecting the narrative of the death of feminism. However, as he points out, the new modes of operation and thematic focal points of contemporary feminism do not, as such, represent non-radicalism, but merely new forms of radicalism. In my study of the *Tulva* journal, the radicalising discourse can be seen as reflecting this development, which sees contemporary feminism moving towards more individualistic discourses.

4.4. A counter-discourse for inclusivity: The man-question

When analysing the intersectional approach of third-wave feminism, as opposed to the more traditional feminist perspectives the writers attach with the FAU, one cannot avoid touching the theoretical discussion on the feminist subject (e.g. Dean & Aune 2015, 382–383). The more traditional liberal women's movement is often associated with relying more heavily on gender-binary relations and viewing inequality directly rooted in gender. The concepts of representation and the feminist subject have hereby become problematic to the movement, as third-wavers argue for the representation of all of the discriminated, not only of the white cis women. Others, however, perceive gender fundamentally distinctive and not to be paralleled with other categories of discrimination, as it might conceal the different root causes for sexism and racism (e.g. Grahn-Wilder 2016, 25–26). In Judith Butler's work *Gender Trouble* (1999, 4–5), the feminist subjectivity gains a paradoxical character, as it is challenging to determine whether there is a feminist subject pre-existent to structures of oppression. The question arises: is the category of “women” – historically understood as the feminist subject – solely a category that the societal, juridical and discursive structures, such as norms, values and ideals, repeatedly construct, as these structures themselves can be thought as mechanisms of oppression. According to Foucault, to whom Butler refers to, subjectivities are pre-given because as they are always penetrated through manifold power

structures. As Yvonne Hirdman states, the perpetual continuity of gender hierarchy and gender difference prevails and capsulizes itself in every triumph of gender equality: as a previously male-preserved position is established, that position then rewrites itself as the new hierarchical determiner of gender difference (as cited in Julkunen 2010, 20). This refers to the idea of a constantly re-emerging gender system, which works as the container of gender hierarchy through artificial gender difference. In my view, this capsulizes the problematisation made by Butler, in which the oppressed subject cannot be represented by the definitions its oppressors give it. Unarguably, the concept of representation is crucial for the women's movement: who does feminism represent and can men be representatives of it? As an answer to this question, intersectional feminism does not only aim to reach women in their countless attributes and situations but also all of the discriminated – other non-binary genders, trans men and cis men. It is to look at the oppression of women and femininity from all possible perspectives to allow the full representation of women, but also to counter the gender system that produces harmful gender roles for men. Intersectional feminism critiques liberal feminism for its gender-binary emphasis, which fails to represent the feminist subject in full – reaching merely the able-bodied white western women.

In respect to the feminist trajectory, one can understand contemporary feminism through its political aspirations of expanding the representation of those represented by feminist politics. In other words, third-wave feminism's intersectional perspective has landed with the broadening of the subject of feminism, traditionally perceived within the category of "women". Hence, contemporary feminism is characterised by the opening of the feminist political subject for debate. This notion of the importance of the conception of representation has led to the growing emphasis on different variables to oppressing power relations relating to race, ethnicity, class, ability, sexual orientation and age, instead of looking at equality issues solely through the gender-binary lenses alone. Jonathan Dean, who has studied contemporary feminism in the UK, describes the narrative of individualisation – often associated with the third wave of feminism – as "unthreatening to dominant patriarchal logics". This is to say that while the second-wave feminism of the '70s is characterised by a more affective based identification to feminist politics, contemporary feminism places more emphasis on issues of self-identification and popular culture, rather than issuing the age-old matters regarding unequal pay, childcare and violence towards women. The counter-discourse regarding the man-question, in my view, relates to this generational shift in feminism. As second-wave feminist politics has long been characterised by anger – as Dean

describes it – towards the patriarchy, and by strong support for a collective feminist subject of women, the new inclusive demands of the younger feminists may represent to some a more apolitical feminist approach. (2010, 138–141.)

The reason for opening the Union to non-women is not that privileged men should also be included. First and foremost, the opening up of the Union would enable the inclusion of those, who are not women, but who share the oppression of the gender system. They are the people who are not men or women “the right way” or who get altogether caught in-between or outside of the male-female-categorisation. - - The category of men is not uniform, either. For instance, men who are considered too feminine, or individuals who have a male body but who neither identify as male nor trans women experience oppression of the gender system.²¹ (Punamäki & Vähäpassi 22.11.2013; tr. S.K.)

The counter-discourse constructs the pursuit of allowing all sexes – not only those assigned female at birth – into the FAU a necessary change of policy. This would provide the movement with a better battle angle and also allow trans women and those, who identify as women, into the association. The necessity emerges from the notion, that by excluding men from the FAU’s associational activities, also those who identify as women, but don’t possess the Social Security number of a female, are excluded. Accordingly, the pursuit of opening of the membership for all sexes and genders is legitimised for that it will improve minority rights – the rights of gender minorities, in particular. The discourse is used as a negotiating strategy to define the feminist identity and the ownership to its membership against the FAU’s policy, which draws on the female experience, excluding everyone not assigned female at birth. At the core of the discourse lies the theoretical question of representation of the gendered political subject of “women”. The FAU rationalises the exclusion of men from the association’s membership by the idea of female-specific experiences and spaces, which would allow women to work without the presence of male hegemony. However, it still faces the question of whether men are considered as legitimate representatives of the political subject of women. These findings go together with a recent study made by Dean and Aune (2015, 386), which portrays contemporary feminism in Britain in regard to its objects and ambitions. Correspondingly, the study found the question of inclusivity regarding the man-question, a significant theme.

²¹Orig. “Peruste Unionin avaamiseen muillekin kuin naisille ei ole se, että myös etuoikeutetut miehet pääsisivät mukaan. Unionin avaaminen mahdollistaisi ensisijassa sen, että myös ne, jotka eivät ole naisia, mutta jotka jakavat sukupuolijärjestelmän sorron, voisivat olla mukana. Kyseessä ovat ihmiset, jotka eivät ole ‘oikealla tavalla’ miehiä tai naisia, tai jäävät tavalla tai toisella kokonaan mies-nais-lokeroinnin väliin tai ulkopuolelle. - - Myöskään miesten ryhmä ei ole yhtenäinen. Esimerkiksi ne miehet, joita pidetään liian feminiinisinä, tai ihmiset joilla on miehen keho mutta jotka eivät koe olevansa miehiä, mutta eivät myöskään transnaisia, kokevat sukupuolijärjestelmän sortoa.”

Negotiating a movement's identity strongly relates to the concept of ownership. The determining of who belongs to "us" is vital for the ability to raise a sense of collective belonging, solidarity and mobilisation for the movement. The FAU's stand on female experience, as the requirement for the membership, has historical roots in the female-centric feminism. According to Kuusipalo, who has studied the gendered political representation in Finland, the female-centrism, to which the FAU appeals to in its reasoning for excluding men from the association's membership, was constructed as part of a nationalistic discourse in the 18th and 19th centuries. The intention was to justify women as modern political subjects apart from men. (2011, 14–15.) The idea of female-specific experiences, that the first-wave feminists used to legitimise women's entrance to political arenas, later contributed to the demarcation of areas where women were allowed to enter after the right to vote and nominate oneself was achieved. The female experience and the understanding of women's specific needs were considered convenient in the areas of social and educational policies, whereas the areas of economy and foreign policy were reserved for men. In this manner, according to Kuusipalo, the early feminist movement in Finland produced the political subject of female citizenship in the form of *mother citizenship*. Hagner and Försti (2006, 82) concur with the view of nationalistic arguments being used to further women's rights in the late 19th and the early 20th centuries. According to them, the activists of the FAU based their view on the idea of social motherhood, which was to compliment a man's world with a more humane and caring approach. The FAU, however, abandoned the idea of a natural gender difference after the first decades of the association's existence. Nevertheless, the association's female-centric view of today is rooted in these ideas of essentialist female characteristics. The present-day FAU defends women-only spaces arguing that they make it easier for women to work together without overpowering masculinity. The idea of female-centrism refers to the conception of a specific female culture and history, which the FAU pursued in the 1980s in an attempt to construct a new female identity on its own terms, separate from masculinity (Hagner & Försti 2006, 202–204). In response to this segregating tactic, the feminist thought moved from female-centrism to post-structural feminism's emphasis on differences between women. The category of women was altogether questioned for its socially constructed nature, which was believed to maintain hierarchical gender system by naturalising gender. Accordingly, Judith Butler argues in her famous work *Gender Trouble* (1999), that gender is a performance continuously produced by the hierarchical system of power.

As the essential threat concerning the opening of the membership has been regarded the joining of men, who do not share feminist goals, with the intention of disturbing the association's work. It is also feared that men will begin to dominate spaces and conversations and that they will be difficult to work with. - - However, if all non-women are excluded due to the threat and fear of these men, *the price is too high*. In that case, one does not only – or even primarily – exclude those privileged by the gender system, but also a large amount of people oppressed by the gender system.²² (Punamäki & Vähäpassi 22.11.2013; tr. S.K.)

Even though feminism is a female-centric movement, in this day and age, we need to understand to broaden our view on whose cause we, as feminists, pursue. Does a trans woman deserve less support than you, sister? What about a person who was born into a female body but does not feel accordingly and reassigns his gender as a male? Does a man advocating for gender equality deserve to be left outside of the movement only for his Social Security number? - - Feminism is needed to promote the position of the oppressed genders. And to fight that oppression, *we need every single enthusiastic pair of hands, regardless of their hairiness* or Social Security number.²³ (Auvinen 11.11.2013; tr. S.K.)

The discourse positions the question of exclusiveness, regarding the FAU's membership, as a salient problem, which will determine the whole women's association's faith and survival. It paints a picture of feminists being forced to first benefit men before being able to benefit women and the movement in return: The risk of letting in ill-willed men must be taken for the greater good. Hereby, the allowance of other genders (genderqueer, cis men, inter, trans women) to join as members, is presented as an instrument for gaining better equality for those who identify as women. According to the discourse, men should be granted the membership on the grounds that "we need every single enthusiastic pair of hands, regardless of their hairiness" and without amendments to the policy, "the price is too high" (Punamäki & Vähäpassi 22.11.2013). The discourse constructs an idea of men as allies, that are essential in the battle to fight oppression. This plea utilises emotion-based commitment to raise concern for the survival of the movement in the described state of emergency.

The female category is also problematic because there is no way to control whether one is a female or not. The current control based on name and ultimately on the Social Security number is problematic because it excludes those who identify as female but who do not have the last part of the Social Security number referring to the female sex. Besides, the current policy excludes all other feminists:

²²Orig. "Keskeisenä uhkana jäsenyyden avaamisessa on nähty se, että järjestöön tulee miehiä, jotka eivät jaa feministisiä tavoitteita, ja joiden pyrkimyksenä olisi pikemmin häiritä yhdistyksen toimintaa. Pelätään myös, että miehet alkavat hallita tiloja ja keskusteluja, ja että heidän kanssaan on vaikea toimia. - - Kuitenkin, jos näiden miesten tuottaman uhan ja pelon vuoksi suljetaan ulos kaikki ne, jotka eivät ole naisia, on hinta liian suuri. Siinä ei nimittäin tulla sulkeneeksi ulos vain tai edes ensisijassa sukupuoli-järjestelmässä etuoikeutettuja, vaan myös suuri määrä ihmisiä joita sukupuoli-järjestelmä sortaa."

²³Orig. "- - Vaikka feminismi onkin nais erityinen liike, on meidän tänä aikana ymmärrettävä avartaa näkemystämme siitä, keiden kaikkien asiaa me feministit ajamme. Ansaitsee ko transnainen vähemmän tukea kuin sinä, sisko? Entä henkilö, joka on syntynyt naisen ruumiiseen, muttei koe oloaan oikeaksi ja korjaa sukupuolensa mieheksi? Ansaitsee ko sukupuoli-tasa-arvoa ajava mies jäädä liikkeen ulkopuolelle vain sosiaaliturvatunnuksensa takia? - - Feminismiä tarvitaan ajamaan sorrettujen sukupuolten asemaa. Ja taisteluun sitä sortoa vastaan me tarvitsemme jokaisen innokkaan parin käsiä, niiden karvaisuudesta tai sotusta riippumatta."

men, transgender, intersex, transgender, queers and also women, who refuse access to political activity based on the last part of the Social Security number.²⁴ (Tulvan toimituskollektiivin jäsenet 25.2.2013; tr. S.K.)

Historically, the FAU has encouraged men to co-operate with women regarding gender inequality matters. While the association has perceived men as necessary allies in furtherance of political aims, for instance, it has thought it necessary to grow women's autonomy as individuals and as a collective. The FAU denied the association's membership from men in 1987. The man-question actualised in 2005 when a board member expressed fear that by excluding men, the movement loses out on new recruits vital for its influence. However, most of the 2000s activists interviewed by Hagner and Försti for the biography of the association, appreciated the radical element of female-centricity and perceived it symbolically important. In this view, women needed to act together and build solidarity towards each other without male hegemony taking up space. (2006, 180–182, 280.) Considering the historical context of the 1980s, when a woman's position was unprotected in many spheres of life – at a time when the Equality Act, the Surname law and discrimination of marital rape were merely on a level of thought and women's position on the labour market poor – it is easy to understand the need for women-only spaces. However, the feminisms of the 1970s and 1980s regarded gender issues on different terms when it came to the plurality of gender. This is not to forget that feminism was a contested subject in the '80s. While at the beginning of the '80s, the women's movement aimed to establish unity and coherence regarding the idea of womanhood, at the end of the decade, women's differences and different experiences grew emphasis. (Ibid., 198.) A member of the FAU's board suggests that the *Tulva* collective's take on feminism is caused by embarrassment to be women in an article titled "The club for the embarrassing" (Pajusalo 6.3.2013). The writer continues by explaining that "it feels as though being a woman is still not good enough". The critique can be interpreted to insinuate that the *Tulva* collective's membership agenda is found on a mindset, according to which, only through the presence of men and masculinity, the women's movement can be considered legitimate – a non-embarrassing club.

²⁴Orig. "Nainen-kategoria on ongelmallinen myös siksi, että mitään tapaa kontrolloida onko joku nainen vai ei, ei ole. Nykyinen nimen ja viime kädessä sosiaaliturvatunnuksen mukaan tehtävä kontrolli on ongelmallinen, sillä se sulkee ulkopuolelleen naiseksi identifioituvat, joilla ei ole naisen sosiaaliturvatunnuksen loppuosaa. Lisäksi nykyinen käytäntö sulkee ulkopuolelleen kaikki muut feministit: miehet, transsukupuoliset, intersukupuoliset, transgenderit, queerit ja myös naiset, jotka eivät halua suostua siihen, että pääsy poliittiseen toimintaan perustuu sosiaaliturvatunnuksen loppuosaan."

4.5. Countering the attack: The threat discourse

Feminists, wake up: equality has become a striking weapon for the far-right - - The shift in the concept of equality is a major challenge for feminism - - By this logic, feminists are *false prophets* seeking to weaken and dominate Finnish men. - - The *struggle* for equality and its meaning is far from over for the feminists. The new twist is a reminder that feminism cannot afford to take the immigrant struggles as a secondary concern.²⁵ (Tulva 2013; tr. S.K.)

The threat discourse constructs a reality, where the state of feminism is being threatened by a deliberate attack posed by the radical far-right. The threat is treated as the single biggest threat to feminism and the Finnish society in general. The main opponents to the feminist movement are named as the “far-right”, “Nazis” and “fascists”. Furthermore, society, in general, is described as “unfeminist” with an “anti-feminist atmosphere” (Saarikoski, 31.1.2013), which is only growing stronger. The discourse identifies forces that aim to delegitimise the feminist agenda and marginalise its influence. It appears that the discourse does not only demarcate the considered “other”, as opposed to “us” by naming the main enemy, but more importantly, it leverages the threat in order to mobilise its members and gain new recruits for the movement in the wake of a “battle”, “struggle” and “attack” against feminism. What is perceived as the biggest threat, also reflects what is seen vital for the movement: protection of minorities as a primary concern. As Julkunen confirms, multiculturalism and minority rights have emerged as strong forces along with the emphasis on gender diversity and differences between women concerning equality policies (2010, 15). These findings are compatible with a study made on contemporary feminism in Europe by Dean and Aune, which illustrates the effects of the migrant crisis in Europe that have recast anti-racism and multiculturalism as the new major themes in feminist politics. The study finds that migration and pluralism of religious communities in Britain and Belgium have shifted the feminist focus on religion, especially regarding the Muslim population. (2015, 388.) Although one cannot draw generalisations on feminist objectives of contemporary feminisms in Europe, the findings by Dean and Aune are compatible with the results made in this thesis concerning the growing emphasis on minority rights. As right-wing politics have re-entered the party politics in Europe and strengthened the far-right radicalism in the 2010s, antiracism appears as the key feminist theme emerging from the data. Antiracist

²⁵Orig. ”Herätys feministit: tasa-arvosta on tullut äärioikeiston lyömäase - - Tasa-arvon käsitteessä tapahtunut siirtymä on merkittävä haaste feminisille - - Feministit ovat tämän logiikan myötä vääriä profettoja, jotka pyrkivät heikentämään ja alistamaan suomalaisia miehiä. - - Feministien kamppailu tasa-arvosta ja sen merkityksestä ei siis suinkaan ole ohi. Uusi käänne on muistutus siitä, että feminisillä ei ole varaa pitää siirtolaiskamppailuja toisarvoisina - - .”

feminism sees all inequalities intertwined with each other and involving all genders, ethnicities, ages, physical abilities and sexual orientations. Thereby, all inequality struggles are seen as feminist struggles, not only those that involve women. Antiracism is understood as an inherently feminist view and racist attacks are perceived as direct attacks against feminism.

In identity politics, the construction of the enemy, or the “other”, are essential in legitimising a social movement's identity (e.g. Hall 1999, 14, 251). A collective conception of the enemy also works to generate cohesiveness and solidarity within the movement. In feminist theorising, the considered “other” has historically been referred to as the patriarchy, the men benefiting system of privilege. Now, however, one can detect a shift of paradigm from opposing the gender-binary system to opposing the gender system as a whole. On the one hand, the discourse marginalises “the other” to the radical far-right, but on the other, popularises it by representing the opponent as the gender-binary societal system on a larger scale, for that it naturalises gender. Kuusipalo (2011, 14) refers to this process as a transition to post-structural feminism critical of conceptions that reproduce and maintain gender hierarchy. The strategy the writers use appears to work in a directly opposite manner as opposed to the far-right’s hegemonic discourse against feminism identified by the writers. Whilst the perceived enemy strives to appeal to the masses in the name of women's safety and gender equality, as a countering act, the writers accentuate the threat of the radical far-right. However, this might not appeal to the masses, as far-right radicalism is not generally understood as a severe threat that resonates with ordinary people’s everyday concerns and fears in the Finnish context. In the following quotation (Peltonen 2013) from the *Tulva* journal, Tiina Rosenberg, a known academic and queer feminist, describes the development of the current political atmosphere:

Fascism has returned to Europe. *The far-right* and racist parties were ridiculed at the beginning, but now they have real power. Old *Nazis* and the old Finnish right-wing can also be found amongst them. Not exactly a nice bunch of people.²⁶ (Peltonen 2013; tr. S.K.)

Correspondingly, the perceived threat of the rising far-right to the feminist cause and the democratic system in general, shows clearly in the following interviews with feminist

²⁶Orig. ”Fasismi on palannut Eurooppaan. Äärioikeistolle ja rasistisille puolueille naurettiin alussa, mutta niillä on nyt todellista valtaa. Niistä löytyvät myös vanhat natsit ja vanha suomalainen oikeisto. Ei mitään kivaa jengää.”

activists in the article titled *Is it okay to beat up a Nazi?*²⁷ (Viljanen 2013):

- - because it convinced people of the threat of *the far-right*. - - I believe that fascism in Finland will grow because left-wing parties have failed. - - Fascism must be resisted with many different means. - - If *the fascists* are not stopped on the street, they will also succeed in parliamentary. - - Fascism is everyone's problem.²⁸ (Viljanen 2013; tr. S.K.)

Even before the stabbing in Jyväskylä, the gas *attack* against the Pride march prompted queer circles to discuss *the threat of far-right*. At that time, attention was drawn to the fact that opposing the far-right should not turn into macho-moronism, which brings out the fight culture. Warmongering or name-calling the opponent as human garbage is problematic. - - Those opposing the far-right should not use the same destructive rhetoric. - - The gender system is maintained through *violence* - - In public debate, anti-minority speech has gained new momentum. - - Opposing the far-right is not an isolated *battle*, but part of a broader action for an equal society.²⁹ (Viljanen 2013; tr. S.K.)

The threat discourse is constructed by descriptions of fear, intimidation and threat of physical violence the enemy instils in the feminist activists. The threat is seen as dual: not only does it cause direct intimidation on the activists, but it is also thought to have the intention to malign the feminist movement in the eyes of the general public. According to one writer, feminist activists are name-called as “false prophets” (Tulva 2013). The attack is seen as a project to scapegoat the feminist movement as a risk factor to the society – a threat that needs to be defeated. According to the writers, feminism is now more threatened than ever and the danger has taken the movement by surprise. The next text fragment illustrates a FAU’s representative’s view on the general atmosphere hostile to feminism:

It was not until the safety and the feminist ideology of the Feminist Association Unioni came under threat, that I decided to take action. After the events in the Library of Jyväskylä, the Feminist Association Unioni has also had to review the safety of both its employees and the events it organizes. - - There is a certain atmosphere of *fear and insecurity* in society at the moment and it has finally reached the threshold of the Union. - - I will not accept living in a climate of fear.³⁰ (Vähämaa 2013; tr. S.K.)

²⁷Orig. ”Saako natsia vetää turpaan?”

²⁸Orig. ”- - koska se vakuutti ihmiset äärioikeiston uhasta. - - Uskon, että fasismi Suomessa kasvaa, koska vasemmistopuolueet ovat epäonnistuneet. - - Fasismia vastaan pitää käyttää monia eri keinoja. - - Jos fasisteja ei pysäytetä kadulla, he onnistuvat myös parlamentaarisesti. - - Fasismi on kaikkien ongelma.”

²⁹Orig. ”Jo ennen Jyväskylän puukotusta Pride-kulkueeseen tehty kaasuisku sai queer-porukat keskustelemaan äärioikeiston uhasta. Silloin kiinnitettiin huomiota siihen, ettei äärioikeiston vastustaminen saisi mennä tapelukulttuuria korostavaksi machourpoiluksi. Sodanlietsonta tai vastapuolen nimittely ihmisastaksi on ongelmallista. - - Äärioikeiston vastustajien ei kannata käyttää samaa tuhoretoriikkaa. - - Väkivallalla ylläpidetään sukupuolijärjestelmää. - - Julkisessa keskustelussa vähemmistövastainen puhe on saanut uutta nostetta. - - Äärioikeiston vastustaminen ei ole yksittäinen taistelu, vaan osa laajempaa toimintaa tasa-arvoisen yhteiskunnan puolesta.”

³⁰Orig. ”Vasta silloin kun Naisasialiitto Unionin turvallisuus ja feministinen aate tulivat uhan alaisiksi, päätin ryhtyä toimiin. Jyväskylän kirjaston tapahtumien jälkeen myös Naisasialiitto Unioni on joutunut uudelleen tarkastelemaan sekä työntekijöidensä, että järjestämiensä tapahtumien turvallisuutta. - - Yhteiskunnassa vallitsee tällä hetkellä tietynlainen pelon sekä turvattomuuden ilmapiiri ja lopulta se saavutti Unionin kynnyksen. - - En hyväksy elämistä pelon ilmapiiriin alaisena.”

The attack was not only targeted against the people present, but also the anti-racist and feminist activities in Finland. Mikael Brunila and Li Andersson explained in the event how *far-right racists* want a country based on racial segregation, where women are at home giving birth to white children. - - Therefore, it is important that we do not talk about isolated stabbers but also pay attention to *the racist and anti-feminist atmosphere* prevailing in society, which enables such attacks.³¹ (Saarikoski 31.1.2013; tr. S.K.)

By describing how finally the “fear and insecurity” have reached the FAU’s threshold, it is to say that whilst it is not safe or free of fear at the best of times to engage in feminist activities, now it has reached the breaking point forcing the association to take action. The writer later describes how she signed herself up for a security guard training course in the wake of the Jyväskylä library stabbing committed by the Finnish Resistance Movement in 2013. At the time of the attack, the library was holding a book-publishing event titled “*The Far-Right in Finland*” by Li Anderson, the chairman of the Left Alliance, and Mikael Brunila, a researcher. In the data, the attack is widely interpreted as a direct attack on feminism specifically and as a clear demonstration of the danger, the feminist movement is now faced with. By stressing the graveness the threat of the far-right represents, the discourse produces a sense of collective resistance – a countering act to defend feminism and its activists.

For me, feminism is *a self-evident everyday matter*. - - In my opinion, feminism has done a great deal of good both societally and globally. Why, then, is it still today perceived as such a frightening and threatening matter? - - My speech on equality and feminism has been perceived as a societal threat on several different online forums. The mere fact I have been called an expert on some occasions has been perceived as a distortion of the truth. - - Besides, I have received personal messages where I have been accused of *familicides, school shootings and the marginalization of young men*. - - I will not accept that feminism – which I hold as self-evident – is perceived as such *a major societal threat* that its public representatives should be threatened.³² (Vähämaa 2013; tr. S.K.)

The threat discourse works to counter the perceived hegemonic anti-feminist discourse

³¹Orig. ”Hyökkäys kohdistui paitsi paikalla oleviin ihmisiin myös rasismin vastaiseen ja feministiseen toimintaan Suomessa. Mikael Brunila ja Li Andersson kertoivat tilaisuudessa, kuinka äärioikeistolaiset rasistit haluavat rotuerotteluun perustuvan maan, jossa naiset ovat kotona synnyttämässä valkoisia lapsia. - - Siksi on tärkeää, ettemme puhu yksittäisistä puukottajista vaan kiinnitämme huomion myös yhteiskunnassa vallitsevaan rasistiseen ja antifeministiseen ilmapiiriin, joka mahdollistaa tällaiset hyökkäykset.”

³²Orig. “Minulle feminismi on arkipäiväinen itsestään selvyys. - - Mielestäni feminismi on tuonut paljon hyvää niin yhteiskunnallisesti kuin myös maailmanlaajuisesti. Miksi se sitten vielä nykyäänkin koetaan niin pelottavaksi ja uhkaavaksi asiaksi? - - Puheeni tasa-arvosta ja feminismistä on useilla eri internetin keskustelupalstoilla koettu yhteiskunnalliseksi uhaksi. Jo pelkästään se, että minua on jossain tapauksissa kutsuttu asiantuntijaksi, on koettu totuuden väristelyksi. - - Lisäksi olen saanut henkilökohtaisia viestejä joissa minut koetaan syylliseksi perhesurmiin, kouluampumisiin ja nuorten miesten syrjäytymiseen. - - En hyväksy, että minulle itsestään selvä feminismi koetaan niin suureksi yhteiskunnalliseksi uhaksi, että sen julkisia edustajia saisi uhkailla.”

maintained by the far-right supporters. The writers associate attributes such as maliciousness, danger and tendency to resort to violent rhetoric to the opponents. As the chairman of the FAU describes above, for her, feminism represents “a self-evident everyday matter”. By referring to it as self-evident, feminism is represented as a necessary movement with an agenda not in need of justification. However, in her words, despite the usefulness of feminism on a societal and global level, it is treated as “a major societal threat” exposed to intimidation. The writer recounts how she has been blamed for “familicides, school shootings and marginalization of young men” merely for working for a movement that advocates for human rights. By describing the striking contrast between the nature of the feminist movement and the hate speech its representatives are exposed to, the writer highlights the hegemonic anti-feminist discourse regarding feminism.

4.6. Reclaiming authority: A counter-discourse against the depoliticization of gender equality

The counter-discourse derives from the notion that gender equality arguments are being employed and exploited in advantage of far-right politics. The discourse stems from the concern that the core feminist concept, equality, is deliberately being used and its meaning altered in an act to disguise racism. According to the writers, women’s rights and equality claims are been used as “a striking weapon” (Tulva 2013) in racist attacks against Islam. The alleged strategy is perceived as appropriating feminism as it intends to speak for women about women’s rights in a jeopardising way for genuine equality claims. Concurrently, the discourse constitutes as feminist counter-speech striving to expose the deliberate deception and depoliticization of gender equality matters. The countering act can be seen as bolstering women’s movement’s agency in reclaiming the authority for determining the rightful agenda and definition for equality. The discourse aims to reinforce gender equality work by repoliticizing it as a political struggle and mobilising others to counter the alleged anti-feminist attempts. It seeks to identify the use of quasi-equality rhetoric and the misuse of the concept of equality, allegedly used to justify racist conduct. The concept of politicization by Kari Palonen (2014, 5, 16, 49), refers to the idea of politics in reference to time instead of space, as new possible places for politics can be found outside the traditionally thought arenas of politics.

When approaching the perceived hegemonic anti-feminist – even fascist – discourses

countered by the *Tulva* journal's writers, one cannot dismiss a larger underlying hegemonic narrative significant to the issue. The late modern shift in the domains of economy and politics towards neoliberal principles has established new rationalities and subject positions of individuality, which in turn have impacted gender relations (e.g. Budgeon 2011; Walkerdine 2003). According to Julkunen (2010, 10), we have adopted a "formal conception of equality" in Finland, which goes hand in hand with the larger modernisation narrative. The need for feminist politics is frequently questioned, as women are now considered entitled to the same rational choice-based agency that men are. Hence, the need for feminism in the 21st century Finland has been under scrutiny for many perceive equality as an already accomplished matter.

The discourse demonstrates a strong display of distrust concerning the far-right's employment of equality arguments – demands traditionally regarded as feminist. Instead, the concept of equality is being exploited to carry out racist attacks on Islam. The discourse portrays a reality where women's movement is now faced with dual repression: in addition to being restrained from equal rights, the gender battle is used as an asset for anti-feminist practice. As Tiina Roseberg – a prominent queer theorist and gender equality activist – argues in the *Tulva* journal, the feminist theorist Judith Butler forecasted the exploitation:

Now we see what Judith Butler wrote about long ago: how *these movements* use pro-gay and gender equality arguments in the name of Islamophobia. Racist policies are used to promote the rights of gay and women.³³ (Peltonen 2013; tr. S.K.)

Rosenberg expresses distrust that has long roots dating back to the mid '90s when Butler wrote her prominent work *Gender Trouble* (1999). By "these movements" she refers to the far-right, which is seen as gaining political power and attacking feminism using its core concepts against it. It is seen as an attempt to appropriate feminist concepts to normalise gender equality as a natural state of affairs. The control over words and meanings is linked to the intention to monopolise the use of equality and women's rights. Following theories of social constructionism, words, meanings and discourses shape social order. Gramsci (as cited in Ransome 1992, 135–136, 143–144) refers to this construction as *cultural hegemony* produced and normalised for the advantage of the dominant classes. This discursive

³³Orig. "Nyt nähdään se, mistä Judith Butler kirjoitti jo kauan sitten: miten nämä liikkeet käyttävät pro gay – ja tasa-arvo-argumentteja islamofobian nimissä. Homojen ja naisten oikeuksien edistämiseen käytetään rasistista politiikkaa."

hegemony materializes in the form of habitual attitudes, norms and values. In the sense of *symbolic violence* by the words of Bourdieu (e.g. 1977, 164–165), language can be used as an instrument of symbolic violence, as subjects are socially internalised to pre-given conceptions of their positions and identities for subordination and marginalisation. In Bourdieu's theorisation through *heterodoxic discourses*, however, groups subjected to the symbolic violence of *doxa* can exercise countering linguistic acts and reconstruct their identities. In this manner, by expressing distrust towards the hegemonic discourses, the writers seek to dispute and reinforce their definition of gender equality:

Feminists, wake up: equality has become a striking weapon for the far-right. Equality is now regularly demanded in conservative, far-right and right-wing populist commentaries. - - it [equality] is being used as a racist weapon against multiculturalism and immigration. The shift in the concept of equality is a major challenge for feminism - -.³⁴(Tulva 2013; tr. S.K.)

By presenting gender equality as a natural state of affairs, equality appears as an already established matter to be defended and protected from the threats of immigration and Islam, according to the perceived far-right agenda. The discussion at hand has strong links to *postfeminism*, which sees feminism futile since, according to the theory, women have been effectively empowered and their full gender rights gained. (Julkunen 2010, 51.) In the state of postfeminism, gender work activists are seen as unnecessary, as gender equality has already triumphed. According to the following writer, feminists are labelled as “false prophets” with no justifiable agenda other than to “dominate Finnish men”. With the following discursive tactic, the far-right rhetoric places equality outside of the political sphere, depoliticizing the concept. In doing so, feminism is being deprived of its political agency:

The argument about the natural nature of equality places equality outside of politics. It gives an idea of an equal Finnish gender order where feminism is not needed. By this logic, feminists are *false prophets* who seek to weaken and *dominate Finnish men*.³⁵ (Tulva 2013; tr. S.K.)

The observed quasi-similarities between the feminist and anti-feminist forces' arguments are

³⁴ Orig. “Herätys feministit: tasa-arvosta on tullut äärioikeiston lyömäase. Tasa-arvoa vaaditaan nykyään säännöllisesti konservatiivisissa, äärioikeistolaisissa ja oikeistopopulistisissa puheenvuoroissa. - - sitä [tasa-arvoa] käytetään rasistisena lyömäaseena monikulttuurisuutta ja maahanmuuttoa vastaan. Tasa-arvon käsitteessä tapahtunut siirtymä on merkittävä haaste feminisminille - -.”

³⁵ Orig. “Väite tasa-arvon luonnollisuudesta sijoittaa tasa-arvon politiikan ulkopuolelle. Se luo käsityksen yhdenvertaisesta suomalaisesta sukupuolijärjestyksestä, jossa ei tarvita feminisimiä. Feministit ovat tämän logiikan myötä vääriä profettoja, jotka pyrkivät heikentämään ja alistamaan suomalaisia miehiä.”

becoming an inconvenient matter for the women's association as one writes: “- - when the women's movement and fascists are on a common cause, it is probably the time to take a look in the mirror”³⁶ (Auvinen 2013). Correspondingly, Tiina Rosenberg, interviewed by the journal, raises concern by stating: “I, too, have been told that your arguments are similar to ours. In these situations, one has to be careful not to supposedly become their ally, all of a sudden”³⁷ (Peltonen 2013). The writers raise alarm regarding the quasi-similarities with used concepts and require taking a look in the mirror and precaution to not be used for a political weapon.

A main element of the repoliticizing counter-discourse is exposing the perceived appropriators of feminism. The act of unmasking emerges from the data in several ways: for instance, by incorporating in the journal the next citation originally published in the *NYT* magazine by Maria Pettersson (1.11.2013). The test intends to expose those who use feminist arguments in their own favour from those with genuine equality concerns:

Here's a little test to see if you are a fake feminist. Have you ever addressed women's rights without referring to Islam? Are you doing something concrete to promote the rights of women and sexual minorities? Are you opposed to the oppression of women practised in the name of all religions, such as yours? If you answered yes to all of the questions, you may be a true advocate of equality. If you answered no to some of the questions, you might be James Hirvisaari.³⁸ (Pettersson cited in Tulva 2013; tr. S.K.)

By incorporating the test in the journal, one aims to reclaim the authority to define the substance of feminism and feminist actors. It highlights the partiality of only attacking some religions – in this case, Islam – rather than criticising all discrimination against women done in the name of religions. By presenting two opposing categories – genuine feminism and James Hirvisaari – the test can be interpreted to polarise feminism and the True Finn's Party. James Hirvisaari, a member of the party, is known for his racist attacks on minorities. In this way, the appropriation and false gender equality claims are associated with the party as a whole. The test also represents an unconditional and absolute vision of the right to consider

³⁶Orig. “Kun naisasialiike ja fasistit ovat yhteisellä asialla, lienee peiliinkatsomisen paikka.”

³⁷Orig. “Minullekin on sanottu, että teidän argumentithan ovat samanlaisia kuin meidän. Näissä tilanteissa pitää olla varovainen, ettei yhtäkkiä ole muka heidän liittolaisensa.”

³⁸Orig. “Seuraavalla pienellä testillä voit selvittää, oletko valefeministi. Oletko joskus ottanut naisten oikeudet puheeksi ilman, että puheenvuoro on liittynyt islamiin? Teetkö jotain konkreettista edistääksesi naisten ja seksuaalivähemmistöjen oikeuksia? Vastustatko kaikkien uskontojen, esimerkiksi omasi, nimissä harjoitettua naisten sortoa? [- -] Jos vastasit kaikkiin kysymyksiin kyllä, saatat olla oikeasti tasa-arvon kannattaja. Jos vastasit joihinkin kysymyksiin ei, saatat olla James Hirvisaari.”

oneself a feminist. It presents an act of reclamation of authority and aims to orthodoxise feminist practise by excluding the appropriators.

The writers gather evidence on behalf of the accusations of the attempt to appropriate feminism. By uncovering the claimed real agenda behind the far-right movements' gender equality arguments, the nature of the appropriation is documented:

- - But why on earth is a right-wing movement [Finnish Defence League] embracing gays and women? "Pink-washing" refers to the branding of a matter or entity commonly perceived to be anti-gay as pro-gay. This is exactly what the DL movement is aiming for. By finding the lowest common denominator, new supporters are recruited.³⁹ (Auvinen 2013; tr. S.K.)

- - Still, the True Finns, the Finnish Resistance Movement, which attacks with adhesive stickers and pepper gas, and the FDL, 'advocate for the human rights and equality', are the same: racists who refuse to call themselves racists. Of these, the Finnish Defence League is central to the feminist movement for that it ruthlessly uses the apparent advocacy of the rights of women and gays to justify its racism.⁴⁰ (Auvinen 2013; tr. S.K.)

By describing the far-right Finnish Defence League (FDL) movement, the writer suggests the real reason behind the equality claims: gaining new recruits for their mission. The discourse works as counter-speech against the threat of being depoliticized. As the far-right is perceived as deceptive in their equality advocations, the appropriation is considered dangerous for genuine gender work. The discourse counters this intent by claiming it to be intentionally diminishing the political aspect of gender equality. The need for repoliticization of feminism lies in the fact that – as Julkunen (2010, 29) puts it – in a society where feminism is considered in negative determiners, women's specific interests cannot be enhanced in political arenas.

³⁹Orig. "- - Mutta miksi ihmeessä oikeistolainen liike [Finnish Defence League] syleilee homoja ja naisia? 'Pinkwashing' tarkoittaa yleisesti homovihamieliseksi mielletyn asian tai tahon brändäämistä homomyönteiseksi. Juuri tätä DL-liikkeessä tavoitellaan. Löytämällä pienin yhteinen nimittäjä yritetään värvätä mukaan uusia kannattajia."

⁴⁰Orig. "- - Perussuomalaiset, tarroja liimaava ja pippurikaasulla hyökkäävä Suomen Vastarintaliike ja 'ihmisoikeuksia ja tasa-arvoa kannattava' FDL ovat silti yhtä ja samaa: rasisteja, jotka eivät suostu kutsumaan itseään rasisteiksi. Näistä Finnish Defence League on feministisen liikkeen kannalta olennaisin, sillä se käyttää sumeilematta naisten ja homojen oikeuksien näennäistä ajamista oikeutuksena rasismilleen."

5. CONCLUSIONS

The thesis investigated how the grass-roots level network of the feminist *Tulva* journal's and its blog's writers intended to renegotiate a new feminist identity in contrast to the policies of the biggest women's organization in Finland, the Feminist Association Unioni (FAU). The renegotiating efforts culminated in the debate on the man-question concerning the opening of the association's membership to men. The inner dynamics between the feminist actors can be seen as reflecting an intergenerational dispute occurring within the women's movement in 2013 – one year before the FAU finally amended its exclusive membership policy for one that welcomes all those identifying as female. Men, however, remained excluded from the membership. The analysis identified six discourses the activists used to construct the new inclusive identity and, at the same time, to counter the hegemonic representations of feminism perceived to be manifested through the discriminatory and unfeminist policies of the association. The first four discourses dealt with the network's aim to renegotiate the feminist identity by persuading the association to allow men to become members in a bid to broaden the understanding of the feminist subject. The last two discourses, on the other hand, sought to counter hegemonic and oppressive representations of feminism coming from outside of the movement, as feminism was perceived to be under an attack by the far-right movement.

The reframing of feminism counter-discourse aimed to reframe feminism for a more inclusive and action-oriented feminism. This was done by representing the FAU as reified, authoritarian and intentionally holding back the progress essential for the movement's vitality. The association was depicted as a reminiscent of the second-wave feminism's legacy because of its female-specific policies that were considered irrelevant to contemporary feminist issues. The change was depicted in fatalistic terms as inevitable. The elitist and radicalizing counter-discourses overlapped with the reframing discourse in their efforts to question the FAU's leadership position, authority and agency. The elitist discourse presented the FAU as an elitist and top-down managed organization controlled by feminists from privileged social class backgrounds. The association's management was presented as authoritarian, as criticism of the organization was not tolerated. The association was attached with elitist attributes such as privilege, patronage and salvation. The radicalizing discourse, on the other hands, sought to portray the association's agency as weak and radical based on

its separatist considered nature in a bid to question its role as the representative of feminists. The FAU's agency was weakened by representations of inability and reluctance to change. The counter-discourse utilized rhetoric of intimidation concerning the association's faith if unable to renew itself. Out of all the discourses, the counter-discourse of the man-question demonstrated the intergenerational dispute concerning the feminist subject most clearly. The discourse amounted the association's exclusive membership policy to its fear of change. The writers refused to accept the fact that access to political activities was made dependent on one's juridical sex – a constraint once used to exclude women from basic citizen rights. A strategy of persuasion was applied: by transforming, the movement would gain a better battle angle. The discourse positioned the question of exclusiveness as a salient problem, which would determine the whole women's movement's faith and survival.

The threat discourse painted a picture of society hostile to feminism, as it was seen to be under an attack by the far-right movement. The discourse sought to counter the perceived hegemonic portrayals of feminism, according to which, the feminist movement was a risk factor to the society – a threat to be defeated. According to the discourse, feminism was more threatened than ever and the danger had taken the movement by surprise. The far-right threat was treated as the single biggest threat to feminism and the Finnish society in general. At the same time the threat image was leveraged to mobilise members and gain new recruits in the wake of an attack against feminism. The discourse was constructed by descriptions of fear, intimidation and threat of physical violence the enemy instilled in the feminist activists. The threat was seen as dual: not only was it to intimidate the activists, but it was also thought to have the intention to malign the feminist movement in the eyes of the general public.

The counter-discourse against the depoliticization of gender equality perceived equality work jeopardized because of the far-right's attempts to normalise gender equality as a natural state of affairs. The discourse suggested that the real reason for the enemy's appropriating actions lied in the purpose of gaining new recruits for its mission. The counter-discourse derived from the notion that gender equality arguments were being employed and exploited in advantage of far-right politics. The discourse stemmed from the concern that the core feminist concept, equality, was deliberately being used and its meaning altered in an act to disguise racism. Furthermore, the discourse saw women's rights and equality claims weaponized for racist attacks against Islam. The alleged strategy was perceived as appropriating feminism as it intended to speak about women's rights in a jeopardising way

for genuine equality claims. Concurrently, the discourse constituted as feminist counter-speech striving to expose the depoliticization. The countering act can be seen as reclaiming authority in determining the rightful agenda and definition for the concept of equality by repoliticizing it as political struggle.

According to the analysis, it appears that – in contrast with the assertions of the death of feminism – contemporary feminism is resurging and searching for its new form in Finland. Changes in the socio-political context regarding the economic recession, the growing far-right movements and the European migration crisis have recast anti-racism and multiculturalism as the new major themes in feminist politics. The new generation's intersectional feminists appear to be awakening the protest element of the women's movement with transformative demands regarding the feminist subject. These demands require answers to the following questions: whose cause does feminism represent and who can represent it? One can detect a shift of paradigm from opposing the gender-binary system to opposing the gender system as a whole. At the same time, however, third-wave feminism is under scrutiny for abandoning radical politics at the expense of individualism, which some scholars fear will depoliticize the contemporary movement.

As a single feminist writers' collective cannot be considered to represent the entire third-wave of feminism, one cannot make generalizations of the state of contemporary feminism in Finland. Also, feminism and the women's movement cannot be reduced to a single orientation since it comprises a myriad of different autonomous groups and associations differing in their theoretical paradigms, takes on inclusivity and means of conduct. Both the small number of research subjects and the study's narrow time scope prevent making any larger generalizations. However, the study at hand indicates strong transformative demands coming from the young generation of third-wave feminists regarding the substance for feminist politics: the political subject to represent. While not being able to give comprehensive conclusions on the matter, the study does portray an array of counter-discursive ways the activists employ in their attempts to redefine feminism. Many of these work as direct acts of resistance questioning the legitimacy of FAU's policies. Furthermore, the study displays the inner dynamics between the grass-roots level activists and the professionalized members of the institutionalized women's organization. In respect to further research, it would be of interest to study these dynamics more thoroughly with a more comprehensive sampling of research subjects. Also, it would be worth further study to

analyse the ramifications the broadening of the feminist subjectivity might cause to the intergenerational solidarities between feminists.

The original purpose of the study was to analyse contemporary feminists' counter-speech directed towards the hegemonic portrayals of feminism coming from outside of the women's movement. While the study did reveal such discourses portraying hostility towards feminism, what came as a surprise, was the heated debate – even conflict – occurring within the movement. Contrary to the hypothesis, the larger dispute lied in the clashing of different forms of feminism. The chosen method – discourse analysis on counter-discourses – was intended to fit the purpose of examining hegemonic discourses on a societal level. However, as the *Tulva* collective positioned itself in the marginal in respect to the decision-making power of the women's association, I decided to apply the method into the analysis regarding the inner identity negotiation process, as well. In retrospect, other methods for the study of identity politics might have been more appropriate for the study's purposes.

6. BIBLIOGRAPHY

6.1. Primary sources

6.1.1. *Tulva* journal (2013): no. 1–4

Abdulkarim, M. (2013): Ain't I a woman? *Tulva*, no. 4, 33.

Auvinen, S. (2013): Suomen puolustajat: Finnish Defence League rakastaa sekä Israelia että homoja, mutta vihaa islamia. *Tulva*, no. 3, 14–16.

Peltonen, S. (2013): Taideyliopiston uusi rehtori Tiina Rosenberg on Ruotsin tunnetuin queerfeministi. Hän muistuttaa feministejä rodusta, sukupuolen moninaisuudesta, luokasta ja vanhojen natsien uhasta. *Tulva*, no. 1, 9–10.

Pettersson cited in *Tulva* (2013): Saksitut. *Tulva*, no. 4, 7.

Purokuru, P. (2013): Feminismi päivittää itseään. *Tulva*, no. 1, 6.

Saarikoski, A. (2013): Pääkirjoitus. *Tulva*, no. 4, 3.

Tulva (2013): Herätys feministit: tasa-arvosta on tullut äärioikeiston lyömäase. *Tulva*, no. 2, 33.

Viinikka, L. (2013): Hallintokiemuroita ja suoraa toimintaa. *Tulva*, no.1, 28.

Viljanen, V. (2013): Saako natsia vetää turpaan? *Tulva*, no. 2, 28–29.

Vähämaa, T. (2013): Ideologinen vartti: Henkilökohtainen on poliittista. *Tulva*, no. 2, 38.

6.1.2. *Tulva* journal blog: January 2013 – December 2013

Auvinen, S. (11.11.2013): Feministi, kuka sä oot? Retrieved from the *Tulva* journal blog <<http://tulva.fi/blogi2.php?aid=116081&k=-3>>, accessed 12.9.2015. Archived on <<https://web.archive.org/web/20160324030715/http://tulva.fi/blogi2.php?aid=116081&k=-3>>.

Jussila, S. (3.5.2013): Ensiapua etuoikeuksien tiedostamiseen. Retrieved from the *Tulva* journal blog <www.tulva.fi/blogi2.php?aid=116028&k=-3>, accessed 25.10.2015. Archived on

<<https://web.archive.org/web/20130929011015/www.tulva.fi/blogi2.php?aid=116028&k=-3>>.

Pajusalo, S. (6.3.2013): Nolojen kerho. Retrieved from the Tulva journal blog <www.tulva.fi/blogi2.php?aid=116011&k=-3>, accessed 12.9.2015. Archived on <<https://web.archive.org/web/20130929011003/www.tulva.fi/blogi2.php?aid=116011&k=-3>>.

Punamäki, L., Vähäpassi, E. (22.11.2013): Unioni kaikille, sukupuolesta riippumatta – miksi? Retrieved from the Tulva journal blog <www.tulva.fi/blogi2.php?aid=116088&k=-3>, accessed 16.9.2015. Archived on <<https://web.archive.org/web/20160324030411/http://tulva.fi/blogi2.php?aid=116088&k=-3>>.

Saarikoski, A. (31.1.2013): Terveiset Jyväskylästä. Retrieved from the Tulva journal blog <www.tulva.fi/blogi.php?aid=115997&k=-3>, accessed 12.9.2015. Archived on <<https://web.archive.org/web/20130929010906/www.tulva.fi/blogi.php?aid=115997&k=-3>>.

Tulvan toimituskollektiivin jäsenet (25.2.2013): Feminismiä kaikille. Retrieved from the Tulva journal blog <www.tulva.fi/blogi2.php?aid=116005&k=-3>, accessed 15.9.2015. Archived on <<https://web.archive.org/web/20130929012609/www.tulva.fi/blogi2.php?aid=116005&k=-3>>.

Unionin ulosmarssijat (24.11.2013): Ulosmarssijat: ”Demokraattinen prosessi torpattiin”. Retrieved from the Tulva journal blog: <www.tulva.fi/blogi2.php?aid=116090&k=-3>, accessed 12.9.2015. Archived on <<https://web.archive.org/web/20160324031131/http://tulva.fi/blogi2.php?aid=116090&k=-3>>.

6.2. Printed sources

Beauvoir, S. (1980): *Toinen sukupuoli*. Translated by Annikki Suni. Helsinki: Kirjayhtymä.

Bergman, S.: *Naisliikehdinnän moninaisuus: ”Uusi” suomalainen naisliike yhteiskunnallisena liikkeenä*. In Ilmonen, Kaj, Matti Siisiäinen (eds.): *Uudet ja vanhat liikkeet*. Vastapaino, Tampere 1998, 165–186.

Bourdieu, P. (1977): *Outline of a Theory of Practice*. Translated by Richard Nice. Cambridge UK; New York: Cambridge University Press.

Budgeon, S. (2011): *Third-Wave Feminism and the Politics of Gender in Late Modernity*. Basingstoke; New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.

Butler, J. (1999): *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. New York: Routledge.

Carastathis, A. (2016): *Intersectionality: Origins, Contestations, Horizons*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

- Dean, J. (2010): *Rethinking Contemporary Feminist Politics*. London: Palgrave Macmillan UK.
- Della Porta, D., Diani, M. (2006): *Social Movements: An Introduction*. Malden (Mass.): Blackwell.
- Foucault, M. (1972): *The Archaeology of Knowledge and the Discourse on Language*. Translated by A.M. Sheridan Smith. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Hagner, M., Försti, T. (2006): *Suffragettien sisaret*. Helsinki: Unioni Naisasialiitto.
- Hall, S. (1999): *Identiteetti*. Translated by Mikko Lehtonen & Juha Herkman (eds.). Tampere: Vastapaino.
- hooks, b. (1990): *Yearning: Race, Gender and Cultural Politics*. Boston (Mass.): South End Press.
- Ilmonen, K.: Uudet ja vanhat yhteiskunnalliset liikkeet. In Ilmonen, Kaj, Martti Siisiäinen (eds.): *Uudet ja vanhat liikkeet*. Vastapaino: Tampere 1998, 15–42.
- Ilmonen, K. & Siisiäinen M.: Johdanto. In Ilmonen, Kaj, Matti Siisiäinen (eds.): *Uudet ja vanhat liikkeet*. Vastapaino, Tampere 1998, 7–14.
- Jallinoja, R. (1983): *Suomalaisen naisasialiikkeen taistelukaudet: naisasialiike naisten elämäntilanteen muutoksen ja yhteiskunnallis-aatteellisen murroksen heijastajana*. Porvoo; Helsinki; Juva: WSOY.
- Jokinen, A., Juhila, K. & Suoninen, E. (1993): *Diskurssianalyysin aakkoset*. Tampere: Vastapaino.
- Jokinen, A., Juhila, K. & Suoninen, E. (2004): *Diskurssianalyysin aakkoset*. Jyväskylä: Vastapaino.
- Juhila, K.: Leimattu identiteetti ja vastapuhe. In Huttunen, Laura, Arja Jokinen, & Anna Kulmala (eds.): *Puhua vastaan ja vaieta: Neuvottelu kulttuurisista marginaaleista*. Gaudeamus, Helsinki 2004, 20–32.
- Julkunen, R. (2010): *Sukupuolen järjestykset ja tasa-arvon paradoksit*. Tampere: Vastapaino.
- Laclau, E. (1990): *New Reflections on The Revolution of Our Time*. London: Verso.
- Lloyd, M. (2005): *Beyond Identity Politics: Feminism, Power & Politics*. London: Sage.
- McLaren, M. A. (2002): *Feminism, Foucault and Embodied Subjectivity*. Albany (NY): State University of New York Press.
- Mill, J. S. (2009): *The Subjection of Women*. Waiheke Island: Floating Press.
- Palonen, K. (2014): *Kootut retoriikat: esimerkkejä politiikan luennasta*. Jyväskylä: Jyväskylän yliopisto.
- Perelman, C. (1996): *Retoriikan valtakunta*. Translated by Leevi Lehto. Tampere: Vastapaino.
- Ransome, P. (1992): *Antonio Gramsci: A New Introduction*. New York: Harvester Wheatsheaf.
- Siisiäinen, M.: Uusien ja vanhojen liikkeiden keinovalikoimat. In Ilmonen, Kaj, Matti Siisiäinen (eds.): *Uudet ja vanhat liikkeet*. Vastapaino, Tampere 1998, 219–243.
- Skeggs, B. (1997): *Formations of Class and Gender: Becoming Respectable*. England: Sage

Publications.

Sulkunen, I. (1991): *Retki naishistoriaan*. Helsinki: Hanki ja jää.

Tarrow, S. G. (1998): *Power in Movement: Social Movements and Contentious Politics*. Cambridge (England); New York: Cambridge University Press.

Von Alftan, M. (1966): *Seitsämän vuosikymmentä Naisasialiitto Unionin historiaa*. Joensuu: Pohjois-Karjalan Kirjapaino Oy.

Walby, S. (2011): *The Future of Feminism*. Cambridge; Malden (MA): Polity Press.

Walkerline, V. (2003): *Reclassifying Upward Mobility: Femininity and the Neo-Liberal Subject*. *Gender and Education* 15:3, 237–248.

Wittgenstein, L. (1981): *Filosofisia tutkimuksia*. Translated by Heikki Nyman. Porvoo; Helsinki; Juva. WSOY.

Wollstonecraft, M. (1970): *The Vindication of the Rights of Woman: With Strictures on Political and Moral Subjects*. Farnborough: Gregg.

6.3. Internet sources

Bates, T. R. (1975): *Gramsci and the Theory of Hegemony*. *Journal of the History of Ideas* 36:2, 351–366. Available from: <http://raforum.info/Ronald%20secours/Topics/Politics/Hegemony/Bates%20Gramsci.pdf?fclid=IwAR3VUC9LAebAJ1_A9ZVZQwj4Y8tDrpSZlhCPqZSrx7p_4qhs39jE6xr4Zqk>, accessed 14.11.2015.

Cohn, C. (1987): *Sex and Death in the Rational World of Defense Intellectuals: Within and Without: Women, Gender and Theory*. *Signs Journal* 12:4, 687–718. Available from: <<http://www.ic.ucsc.edu/~rlipsch/pol179/Cohn.pdf>>, accessed 20.11.2015.

Dean, J., Aune, K. (2015): *Feminism Resurgent? Mapping Contemporary Feminist Activisms in Europe*. *Social Movements Studies* 14:4, 375–395. Available from: <<http://repositorio.gire.org.mx/bitstream/123456789/2641/1/Feminism%20Resurgent%20Mapping%20Contemporary%20Feminist%20Activisms%20in%20Europe.pdf>>, accessed 21.5.2017.

Grahn-Wilder, M.: *Intersektionaalisuus, feministinen filosofia ja ymmärtämisen kehä*. In Moisio, Olli-Pekka, Martina Reuter, Kristina Rolin & Miira Tuominen (eds.): *Sukupuoli ja Filosofia*. Jyväskylän yliopisto, Jyväskylä 2016, 14–28. Available from: <<https://jyx.jyu.fi/bitstream/handle/123456789/51116/978-951-39-6610-2.pdf?sequence=1>>, accessed 1.4.2019.

Kuusipalo, J. (2011): *Sukupuolittunut poliittinen edustus Suomessa*. Tampere: Tampereen Yliopistonpaino Oy – Juvenes Print. Available from: <<http://urn.fi/urn:isbn:978-951-44-8454-4>>, accessed 02.12.2016.

Pateman, C. (1988): *The Sexual Contract*. Cambridge: Polity. Available from: <<http://www.feministes-radicales.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/04/Carole-Pateman-The->

Sexual-Contract.pdf>, accessed 02.12.2018.

Philips, R., Cree, V. E. (2014): What Does the Fourth Wave Mean for Teaching Feminism in Twenty-First Century Social Work? *Social Work Education* 33:7, 930–943. Available from: <<http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/02615479.2014.885007>>, accessed 02.12.2015.

Solorzano, D. G. (1998): Critical Race Theory, Race and Gender Microaggressions, and the Experience of Chicana and Chicano Scholars. *Qualitative Studies in Education* 11:1, 122–132. Available from: <<http://www.unco.edu/cebs/diversity/pdfs/CRTMicroaggressChicanoScholars.pdf>>, accessed 27.11.2015.

Talbot, J., Bibace, R., Bokhour, B. & Bamberg, M. (1996): Affirmation and Resistance of Dominant Discourses: The Rhetorical Construction of Pregnancy. *Journal of Narrative and Life History* 6:3, 225–251. Available from: <<http://www.massey.ac.nz/~alock/virtual/mbamberg.htm>>, accessed 15.11.2015.

Wrye, H. K. (2009): The Fourth Wave of Feminism: Psychoanalytic Perspectives Introductory Remarks. *Studies in Gender and Sexuality* 10:4, 185–189. Available from: <<http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/15240650903227999>>, accessed 02.12.2015.

YLE (26.10.2006): Laatuhehtipalkinto feministiselle naistenlehdelle. Available from: <http://yle.fi/uutiset/laatuhehtipalkinto_feministiselle_naistenlehdelle/5753314>, accessed 15.11.2015.