

None of this is New (Media):  
Feminisms in the Social Media Age

Alice E. Marwick, Data & Society

*Do you consider yourself a third-wave feminist?*

I don't much like the terminology, because it never seems very accurate to me. I know people who are considered third-wave feminists who are 20 years older than me.

*Maybe we're onto the fourth wave now.*

Maybe the fourth wave is online.

Jessica Valenti, founder of Feministing.org (Solomon 2009).

The need for unity is often misnamed as a need for homogeneity.

Audre Lorde

Introduction

Feminism is enjoying a moment in the pop culture spotlight. Pop musicians Beyoncé and Taylor Swift openly identify as feminists, comedians Mindy Kaling and Amy Schumer helm explicitly feminist television shows, terms like “rape culture” and “slut-shaming” are mainstream, and acts of feminist activism, from Slutwalk to Pussy Riot, make headlines around the world. While just a few years ago, older feminists bemoaned the lack of action by younger women, today's feminism is youth-centric, often brash and confrontational, and largely coordinated online (Evans 2014; Keller, Mendes, and Ringrose 2016). On social media sites like Twitter, Tumblr, and YouTube, young feminists voice opinions, debate transgender identity and police brutality, spread memes and jokes, and share activist strategies. The tools that young feminists use today look different from those of the past. The petition, the protest march, the flyer and the newsletter have their online equivalents, but social media brings with it similar social dynamics leveraged across a different set of media technologies and, thus, possibilities. Tracing the history of feminism and internet communication demonstrates that many of these tensions are intrinsic to

feminist activism, yet the scope and scale of modern digital communication brings some into sharper relief.

Social media is an umbrella term for a diverse set of technologies, websites, mobile apps, and protocols that facilitate the creation, annotation, and sharing of digital media. While broadcast media like television and radio limited content creation to professionals, social media makes it possible for ordinary people to create and spread their own media to wide audiences; Henry Jenkins calls this blurring of the line between media producers and consumers *participatory culture* (2006). While social media applications differ in functionality, danah boyd identifies four common characteristics of user-generated content: digital media is *replicable, scalable, persistent, and searchable* (boyd 2010). Content created by individuals is replicable as it can easily be copied and spread; it is scalable because it can be potentially seen by millions; it is persistent since it leaves digital footprints in archives and search engines; and it is searchable, often instantly (Marwick and Ellison 2012). These material functionalities allow users to perform certain actions, such as combing through archives, annotating tweets and blog posts, commenting on videos, and otherwise remixing and drawing from vast digital histories. Despite these new possibilities, we should avoid fetishizing digital technologies; as new media scholar Nancy Baym writes, “Any medium that allows people to make meaning together is social. There is nothing more ‘social’ about ‘social media’ than there is about postcards, landline telephones, television shows, newspapers, books, or cuneiform” (2015). As Baym points out, media artifacts and communication technologies of all kinds inspire and facilitate discussion and connection.

For many years, scholars have documented women’s online activities (Baym 2000; Bury 2005; Shade 2002), but there are fewer historically-informed accounts of *feminist* internet activity. In this chapter, I conduct a literature review of early social technologies to trace a rough

history of online feminism, from early computer-mediated technologies (1980s through mid-1990s), to personal homepages and ezines popular during the late 1990s to mid-2000s, to the blogging wave of the mid-to-late 2000s. While these periods are blurry, imprecise, and necessarily overlapping, they are distinguished by the specifics of available technologies (which in turn affect what users can do) and the demographics of the user base. I then turn to the contemporary technological landscape, and explore feminist practice on sites like Twitter and Tumblr. Using two case studies, GamerGate and the debate over intersectionality, I show that while social media facilitates connection and collaboration, it also highlights conflict; not only between feminists and their detractors, but within feminism itself.

While excavating these hidden histories, several themes came to light. There is a prominent and persistent tension between the fantasy of online community as collaborative and collective—the cyber-utopian narrative of digital exceptionalism that Nancy Baym urges us to abandon—and the reality of “feminism” as an enormously diverse group of people with varying opinions, what might more accurately be called *feminisms*. For instance, women of color have recognized the normative whiteness of online feminist activism for more than 25 years, calling for more intersectional and global perspectives (Kolko 2000; Nakamura 1999). Feminist participation, both on and offline, is consistently framed in ways that privilege adult activism and pushes out young women’s activities and experiences (Harris 2008). And, unfortunately, men have harassed female users of social technologies since such technologies existed, since misogyny and sexism do not disappear once socializing moves online. The narrative of “social media” as open and democratic allows for feminist education, networked activism, and camaraderie, but it also opens participants to conflict and cruelty online. Social media can be

simultaneously feminist and misogynist; like all media, it is subject to the structural power relations that exist between those who use it.

As this volume shows, defining “feminism” is easier said than done. Whenever possible, I keep to accounts of self-defined feminist communities, whether they are the cyber-feminist theorists of the 1990s or the young feminist blog Fbomb in the 2000s. However, it is important to note that this essay centers on U.S. internet use; while I use examples from other contexts, many of the technologies and practices highlighted here originate in North America.

### Excavating a Feminist Pre-History of Social Media

Although the internet and the World Wide Web did not drift into public consciousness until the mid-1990s, an expansive network of digital communication existed for years before that.

Independently-run bulletin board systems (BBSs) and commercial dial-up networks like Prodigy, CompuServe, and Delphi existed alongside early internet services including listservs (electronic mailing lists devoted to particular topics) and Usenet groups (topically organized discussion forums), which were primarily available to those affiliated with large Western universities.

While these spaces and groups looked nothing like the social media of today—they were entirely textual and required a substantial amount of specialized knowledge to use and access—they are one of the earliest examples of computed-mediated communication and user-generated content. Users shared thoughts and opinions on popular culture, politics, their personal lives, and a vast array of specialized interests. And, much like the social media of today, women in general and feminists in particular faced an array of difficulties participating in early electronic spaces.

For one thing, the participants in these spaces were remarkably alike by modern standards. The vast majority of electronic communication well into the early 1990s was heavily

dominated by white, educated North American men, and the presence of any women at all was often a curiosity (Shade 2002). One 1992 study estimated that 95% of internet users were men (Herring 2003). As a result, simply asserting the existence of women in cyberspace became a political issue. For instance, in 1983, CompuServe user Pamela Bowen submitted a proposal to create a women's forum, as women were getting together regularly to talk, but were frustrated by interruptions and chat requests from men. Her suggestion was rejected because there "were not enough women online to justify it" (Balka 1993). The women who did exist in these spaces tended to be, like their male equivalents, highly-educated professionals, primarily affiliated with the technology industry and the sciences.<sup>1</sup>

Despite their elite status, women in early electronic communities faced a number of obstacles to full participation, including harassment and conversational monopolization by men.

Ellen Balka summarizes:

...women users of other computer networks frequently complain about attacks upon their views by men, their continuous struggle to keep the 'conversation' focused upon women, and their boredom with debates about fundamental assumptions (that men should help change diapers, that daycare should be more accessible) (1993).

Cheris Kramarae and H. Jeannie Taylor, members of the University of Illinois's influential Women, Information Technology, and Scholarship working group, elaborated on these points. They noted that women face "obscenities, racial slurs and vicious personal attacks" online "from people who might not say such things in face-to-face interaction," that virtually all open forums, even those dedicated ostensibly to women's issues such as the Usenet groups soc.women and soc.feminism, are "overrun by men." They also remarked upon the increasing presence of sexual harassment in groups devoted to academic and professional concerns, such as sexist or sexual jokes and limericks, which women were often afraid to criticize for fear of jeopardizing their

own careers (Kramarae and Taylor 1993). Laurel Sutton's analysis of the alt.feminism Usenet group similarly found that 67% of posters were male, with 74% of posts coming from men, who were overwhelmingly likely to adopt hostile, aggressive, or adversarial posting styles, and dominate conversation for weeks at a time, which was likely to alienate interested women (1994; Herring 1993). Thus, even spaces that were set up for discussion of feminism and women's issues were often hostile to women themselves.

Despite this, women did participate in early electronic communities, often in explicitly feminist ways. Many set up women-only networks, groups, and listservs as a way to combat harassment, flaming, and trolling from men. Soc.women, originally called net.women, was so frustrating for its participants that they created the mail-feminist mailing list as a response to what they saw as "boring, endless" conversations and "women's opinions... treated as dumb, stupid, or ignorant by men" (Balka 1993). Others in the late 1980s and early 1990s created computer networks specifically to address broader social concerns. The Women's Bulletin Board System (WBBS) was established in the mid-1980s by social justice activists for women's groups to facilitate feminist organizing (Balka 1993).<sup>2</sup> Women's centers used the Big Sky Telegraph network, created to connect small rural classrooms in Montana, to connect and share resources (Uncapher 1999).

### *Cyberfeminism*

While today it seems unsurprising that women online faced harassment and sexism, to many early scholars of cyberculture, one of the primary virtues of textual online spaces was that they made it possible for people to communicate without corporeal cues like appearance or voice (Stone 1996; Turkle 1995). In its less progressive version, such disembodiment was a fantasy of mind/body dualism in which people could disconnect from their "meat-space" identities and

meet as pure intellect. This was present in cyberpunk fiction such as William Gibson's *Neuromancer* and Neal Stephenson's *Snow Crash*, and echoed in celebratory accounts of early online community such as Howard Rheingold's *Virtual Community* (2000). To many feminist scholars influenced by Judith Butler's work on performativity (1990), *the disembodiment hypothesis* held that internet users, liberated from the constraints of the flesh, could actively choose which gender or sexuality to "be," perhaps creating alternate identities nothing like their own (Wynn and Katz 1997). By making it possible for users to self-consciously adopt and play with different gender identities, online communities would reveal the choices involved in the production of gender, breaking down binaries and encouraging fluidity in sexuality and gender expression. Sherry Turkle wrote, "like transgressive gender practices in real life, by breaking the conventions, [online gender play] dramatizes our attachment to them" (1995, 212).

In the early 1990s, with the gradual opening of the internet to more diverse populations, a new *cyberfeminist* movement emerged to combat the male, technophile culture which alienated women. "Cyber" being a popular signifier during this time period to describe a wide variety of online and computer-generated experiences, the term surfaced in multiple locations (Paasonen 2011; Reynolds 2013). The Australian artist collective VNS Matrix published "A cyberfeminist manifesto for the 21<sup>st</sup> century" in 1991, which drew from French feminist theory, futurism, and cunt art<sup>3</sup> to claim a space for feminism within cyberpunk. British cultural theorist Sadie Plant popularized the term in her own cyberfeminist manifesto, in which she positioned digitalization and networks as a tools "that will eventually overturn the phallogocentric hegemony" (Paasonen 2011, 338; Plant 1996). From these origins, cyberfeminism spread rapidly, but the term was always slippery. As Kate Reynolds writes, many cyberfeminists were brought together at the First Cyberfeminist International at the Documenta X conference in Germany:

During the conference, the women collaboratively constructed a definition of Cyberfeminism called the “100 Anti-Theses“. This document lists one hundred things that cyberfeminism is not, and is composed of statements in four separate languages. The decision not to [define] Cyberfeminism has allowed the term a versatility that many previous types of feminism lacked, though it is perhaps this lack of solidity that allowed the Cyberfeminist movement to drift into obscurity (Reynolds 2013).

Over the years, cyberfeminism came to mean, variously:

- Feminist analysis of relationships between humans and machines
- Drawing from Donna Haraway (1985), critical interrogation of technologies and practices
- Research on gendered online cultures and technology uses, and how technology reinforces hierarchies and divisions (Paasonen 2011, 340)

Often playful, satirical, and ironic, cyberfeminism sometimes veered into an essentialist view of male and female capabilities. Most cyberfeminists maintained that technology was not intrinsically masculine, and that in theory, computer networks ought to be consistent with the democratic, decentralized, participatory structures of women's organizations dedicated to feminist social change (Balka 1993; Wajcman 2007), but others portrayed women as inherently good at such community-building and nurturing (Van Zoonen 2001). For instance, Susan Hawthorne and Renate Klein explained that cyberfeminism aimed not only to counter the power differentials between men and women online, but in a way coherent with the essentialist philosophy that was present in one faction of second wave feminism:

Connectivity is at the heart of feminism. In the 1970s we rallied around the concept of sisterhood, and challenged the patriarchal ideology of women as enemies of each other. We connected the personal to the political. We talked in consciousness-raising (CR) groups, connecting through understanding our similarities and our differences. And despite the fragmenting forces of postmodernism, economic rationalism and globalization, women around the world have continued to explore those issues which we have in common, while recognizing our diversity. As we have come to understand, focusing on difference

alone, fragments us, separates us and disenfranchises us politically. (Hawthorne and Klein 1999, 5–6).

As this quote’s admonition to avoid “focusing on difference” illustrates, however, cyberfeminism in the 1990s remained the realm of elite white women, with most of its participants being academics, artists, and the highly-educated— because the internet at that time was largely populated by such people. Radhika Gajjala and Annapurna Mamidipudi explained that “cyberfeminists share the belief that women should take control of and appropriate the use of Internet technologies in an attempt to empower themselves” (1999, 8) which ignored the fact that it may not be possible for women in the Global South—or even Western minority women—to use Western technologies in an authentically “empowering” way. Gajjala and Mamidipudi also voiced suspicion of cyberfeminism’s frame of the internet as intrinsically democratic, which implied that solving the “digital divide,” or the difference in access amongst different populations (women/men, rural/urban, global North/global South) would increase democracy, rather than potentially re-creating colonial power dynamics (1999).

A significant amount of empirical work demonstrating the falsity of the disembodiment hypothesis affirmed this critique (Bury 2005). Women’s personal experiences online showed that gender did not disappear in “virtual” spaces, and critical feminist and cyberculture scholars pointed out that anonymity and persistent pseudonymity established a white, male, able-bodied, straight, English-speaking, educated subject as normative (Stone 1996; Kramarae and Taylor 1993).<sup>4</sup> When someone marked themselves as varying from this subject position—perhaps by stating their race, or by using non-American forms of English, for instance—they were often subject to harassment and racism, or accused of “playing the race card” (Gajjala 2000; Nakamura 1999; Kolko 2000). Cyberfeminism, for many women of color and non-Western women, provided a critique of male dominance, but did not sufficiently address intersectional issues.

*Personal Homepages, Ezines, and Cybergrrrls*

In 1993, the National Center for Supercomputing Applications at the University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign released a free graphical web browser called Mosaic. While clunky and limited by today's standards, Mosaic made it easy for people with internet access to browse through pages created by others. While the number of web users was still very small, many users' imaginations were sparked by the ability to make webpages that anyone else with web access could see. Personal homepages might consist of a dry CV and headshot, a webcam monitoring a department's coffee maker, a rant about President Clinton, a list of the owner's CD collection, bad adolescent poetry, a fan page for the X-Files, or virtually anything else the proprietor could think of. Gradually, personal homepages became a genre unto themselves, following a fairly well-trodden rhetorical path of self-presentation: first-person voice, links representing interests (hobbies, musical taste), direct expression of personality traits, and affiliation with online web communities (Papacharissi 2002; Dominick 1999). These pages increased in popularity with the advent of free hosting services such as Geocities, which provided would-be homepagers with tools for easier page creation and editing.

While women's online participation grew rapidly during this time, from 15% in 1995 to 38.5% in 1997 (Warnick 1999), homepages were still primarily the domain of men, with a 1999 study estimating that 87% of homepage authors were male (Dominick 1999, 650).<sup>5</sup> Despite this, feminist personal homepagers did exist and frequently found each other, forging online communities and connections. Some of these pages were feminist in the "personal as political" sense, drawing from zine culture, Riot Grrrl, and the clip-art ethos of punk rock and Do It

Yourself culture to focus on self-expression and first-person narrative (Comstock 2001; Scott 1998).

Zines, or home-made magazines created using paper, ink, tape and copy machines and traded through the mail, were a significant site of young feminist activism and identity during the 1990s (Piepmeier 2009; Radway 2016). Zines were a truly participatory media, encouraging even young women with limited resources to create and spread ideas using low-budget, accessible technologies (Duncombe 1997). Young women shared deeply personal experiences in their zines, using zine trading, letters, conventions, and rock shows to knit together communities of support and affiliation (Comstock 2001; Radway 2011). While many zine writers, or zinesters, were early adopters of the web, many more were suspicious of the increasing commercialization of these new technologies as the dot.com boom loomed large (Marwick 2013a). Some zinesters used the web to promote, distribute, or even reproduce their paper zines—popular blog *BoingBoing* began as a paper zine—but even for those who did not, their influence was such that “e-zine” became a catch-all term for an online magazine, co-authored website, or even a large personal homepage. The ethos of “Riot Grrrl,” a movement countering sexism in the punk rock scene<sup>6</sup> with a significant zine component, was depoliticized as webmistresses and commercial organizations refashioned “grrrl” into a marker of postfeminist cyber-edginess (Comstock 2001). Barbara Warnick explains that the authors of many of the grrrl e-zines and sites “emphasized artistic expression (in writing and graphics), social support relevant to concerns of site visitors, music and film reviews, and gripes about coverage of women's issues in the popular press” rather than explicit activist or social justice politics (1999, 14).

Some of the most successful grrrl homepages and ezines joined webring, or linked collections of websites organized around a particular theme. While most webring were purely

amateur, the two best known grrrl networks functioned as startups, or as they were known at the time, “dot-coms”: Chickclick and Estronet (the two merged in 1999). While each member site was independently published, often by individual women, these networks attempted to create revenue sharing and business models so that creators could profit from their work (Swanson n.d.). Typically shying away from explicit feminist identification, grrrl networks framed themselves primarily as alternatives to the limited content for women found in the mainstream media (Marwick 2013a; Warnick 1999). The founder of ChickClick, Heidi Swanson, explained:

Most women's on-line sites assume women just want their horoscopes, recipes and tips on losing weight and getting a boyfriend. But that's not reality. Women between 13 and 35 are hungry for information about what really impacts their lives--getting jobs, music, dating, even snowboarding (Ganahl 1998).

Many of the more radical homepages by, for example, women of color, queer women, and self-identified feminists were absent from these networks in favor of those closer to Swanson’s idea of what we might call a postfeminist ezine (see

Figure 1: ChickClick Homepage, 1999).

Personal homepages were social media in the sense that the individual creating them was creating and broadcasting content via the Web, but they generally lacked the ability for the audience to participate beyond signing a guestbook or emailing the owner. Swanson explains that ChickClick attempted to scaffold levels of participation for young women who, unlike the early adopter creators of ChickClick’s sites, might be reluctant to fully embrace technology:

If we could get a visitor to the front door of ChickClick we would then provide different layers of involvement. Let people test the waters and whatnot, and ease into whatever they were comfortable with. You could just read the articles, sister sites, other member posts if you wanted. On the more active side, we rolled out ChickPages, and bulletin boards. Thousands of homepages were built, and millions of thoughts and opinions were logged on the bulletin boards--which in turn was inspirational to all the new users who were/are just stumbling onto ChickClick that day for the first time (Swanson n.d.).

ChickClick's homepage hosting and bulletin boards allowed young women to participate not only by consuming content but by creating and contributing their own.

Explicitly feminist activist sites existed during this time period, but not all of them were what we might consider *social*. Ms. Magazine's website included a lively bulletin board. The "Pro-Choice Webring" brought together women actively working on expanding reproductive rights (Arreola 2013; Ladd 2001). A 2001 survey of 50 different U.S.-based feminist activist organizations showed that they used web pages and email to disseminate information, lobby politicians, and organize local events, but found that these tools did not support interpersonal interaction or strengthen personal relationships, and might exclude economically underprivileged women (Vogt and Chen 2001). A different survey of global feminist organizations found widespread support for using listservs and the web to mobilize other women and gather information cheaply and easily, but these uses were limited to the elite, educated populations in most countries (Harcourt 2000). For the most part, these were professional activists using the internet as a new way to disseminate information, rather than the participatory ideal of social media.

Internet use increased somewhat in diversity by the late 1990s; 44.4% of all Americans, 16.1% of Hispanics and 18.9% of African-Americans had home internet access as of August 2000 (Rohde and Shapiro 2000). While many online communities of color existed, the media (and academia) paid scant attention to them, preferring instead to focus on digital divide rhetoric (Everett 2002). Dara N. Byrne argues that, given the importance of Black social networks to racial identity and community development, African-Americans were more likely to participate in black-centered online communities such as BlackPlanet, The Drum, or NetNoir than predominantly white networks (2007). Many of these ethnic online communities, however,

including MiGente and AsianAvenue, focused on “general cultural information,” market segmentation, and profit rather than facilitating feminist or activist work (McLaine 2003). Of course, women did use the internet for such purposes. For instance, black women activists used the internet to spread information throughout their communities during the 1997 Million Women March (MWM) by printing out MWM web sites, photocopying them, and disseminating them throughout their neighborhoods (Everett 2002). Such creative appropriation of internet technology used pre-existing social networks to combine “traditional” activist techniques like newsletters and protest marches with the increased scale of information dissemination brought about by the internet.

Both traditional feminist activism and the experiences of women of color were largely absent from the popular grrrl networks. One of Estronet’s member sites was HUES magazine (Hear Us Emerging Sisters), a magazine for multicultural women. While not explicitly feminist, founder Ophira Edut explains that HUES allowed for a range of identifications: “Since some women of color have historically felt excluded by the label, we let each writer define herself: womynist, womanist, feminist, girl-powered, humanist, unlabeled – whatever allowed her most authentic self-expression” (Jewish Women’s Archive 2015). Also left out was much of the critical element of riot grrrl culture found in zines like *Slant*, *Evolution of a Race Riot*, and *Bamboo Girl*, which critiqued the predominantly white riot grrrl narrative as well as punk masculinity (Piano 2002). Doreen Piano argues that it was in compilation zines written by “women of color, transgender, queer, working-class women, and race-conscious anglos” that “critical feminist interventions take place and where the work of second wave women of color such as bell hooks, Cherrie Moraga, Chela Sandoval, and Patricia Hill Collins is being

continued” (2002, P20). These interventions did not necessarily extend to the Hello Kitty, pin-up girl aesthetic of feminist ezines and online networks.<sup>7</sup>

### *Feminist Blogging*

The dot-com bust had vast effects on the commercial development of the web, but did not stop independent web publishing. In fact, the early 2000s saw a rise in easy-to-use tools like Geocities, Blogger, and LiveJournal which made it possible for people to create homepages, blogs, and online journals without advanced technical knowledge (Nardi, Schiano, and Gumbrecht 2004; Rettberg 2013). Blogs are frequently-updated personal publications, which range in format from lists of links with minimal description, to collections of long essays, to diaries, to blogs that post photographs or songs, to group blogs run by multiple people first-person style, to sites containing breaking news and political commentary. Blogs became immensely popular in the early 21<sup>st</sup> century, to the point that “blog” was Merriam-Webster’s word of the year in 2004 (Rettberg 2013). Much was written about the political significance of blogs, especially those about the Iraq war or mainstream politics. But, to a certain extent, blogging was simply an extension of the earlier personal homepages and journals that proliferated online.

This distinction was gendered. Blog stereotypes of the mid-2000s fell into two categories: the highly-professionalized pundit blog written by an adult man, or the angsty teenage girl writing a digital diary on LiveJournal (Gregg 2006). Susan Herring argues that many of the pioneers of personal web publishing were women and girls, but online journals and personal homepages were considered insignificant by the mainstream media and tech press when compared to political blogs or tech blogs, which were primarily written by men (Herring et al.

2004). Studies focusing on political blogs found that most bloggers were men, while those examining personal blogs found the opposite (Harp and Tremayne 2006; Nowson and Oberlander 2006). This dichotomy reified a particular sense of politics which excluded the personal-as-political perspective taken up by feminists since the second wave (Gregg 2006). But women were very active in the blogosphere, not only writing personal essays about their experiences, but writing explicitly about a wide range of public issues, including feminism.

The feminist blogosphere is and was large and sprawling, and can roughly be divided into two types of blogs. The first is the highly professionalized, popular feminist blog such as *Feministing*, *Racialicious*, *Pandagon*, *Feministe*, and *Jezebel*. While most of these started as volunteer efforts, in their heyday each was known for frequent updates, audiences in the hundreds of thousands, and quick responses to developments in political news and popular culture. *Feministing*, at its peak, was the most popular feminist publication in the world, with half a million hits per month (Solomon 2009). Several of these blogs have shut down or are shadows of their former selves, due primarily to the enormous amount of labor required, lack of funding, or blogger burnout (Martin and Valenti 2013), but others are still thriving and popular today. For instance, Amanda Marcotte's *Pandagon* shut down in 2015, and Amanda became a full-time political writer for *Salon*. Jessica Valenti left *Feministing* to write a number of best-selling books on feminism (the site still exists, and is maintained by a rotating collective of young feminists). *Jezebel* is still very active, but has shifted its focus somewhat to popular culture and mainstream politics.

The second type consists of personal blogs written by feminist women and girls focused on their individual thoughts and experiences. Jessalyn Keller interviewed a number of feminist girl bloggers, who stated that their blogs existed to expose and educate their peers about

feminism, as a form of activism in themselves, and as community participation (Keller 2016a; Keller 2016b). Girls framed blogging as a way to contribute to a cause they deeply believed in, since they were often cut off from adult forms of feminist activism like protest marches and events due to lack of financial resources or geographic isolation. Crucially, interacting with readers and other bloggers was a key part of feminist blogging—the most popular blogs had extensive comment sections and often forums and opportunities for readers to publish on the site. For many young bloggers, reading other women’s blogs, responding to comments, and guest blogging was a core part of their blogging practice. Moreover, personal blogs provided important spaces “to reflect experiences that have been trivialized, denigrated or ignored in the past, particularly the views of women and younger members of society” (Gregg 2006). Anita Harris frames these sites as counter-publics and points out that while they may be less focused on political outcomes than “traditional,” adult-centric activism, their importance is in their existence as forums and places for debate. Young women’s blogs and, today, social media presences focus more on individual strategies and tactics for dealing with everyday sexism, media representation, and the culture industry. She argues that for many young people, the media, rather than the government, is the site of power (2008). Young feminist blogs allow girls to participate in ways appropriate to their circumstances rather than following a model set by adults or political elites. For instance, *FBomb*, which describes itself as “a blog/community created for teenage girls who care about their rights as women and want to be heard,” had, on the day I visited, front page articles on Gamergate, intergenerational activism, inequality in mental health care, the burkini ban, and indie rock feminism (Zeilinger 2016).

To some extent, blogs have been superseded by social media like Twitter, Tumblr and Instagram, which allow for personal publishing with even less overhead. But while blogs are not

as popular as they were, many still exist as important sites for identity development and information dissemination. Professionally-run blogs abound, but personal blogs still remain influential in many areas, such as fashion (*Fashiontoast*, *The Blonde Salad*), parenting (*A Cup of Jo*, *the Bloggess*), food (*Smitten Kitchen*, *the Pioneer Woman*), and personal finance (*Mr. Money Mustache*, *Money Saving Mom*), to name but a few.

### Contemporary Social Media: Tweets and Tumblrs

Before moving on to present-day social media, I must acknowledge the vastness of the contemporary feminist internet. Women all over the world, in a variety of contexts, harness the power of digital participatory technologies from SMS messages to YouTube vlogs to Twitter memes to spread feminist ideals and create community. Rather than singling out a particular technology, Keller et. al argue that “digital feminist activism” as a networked whole enables *affective solidarity*, Clare Hemmings’ theory that emotional connections and shared anger are a necessary precursor to feminist activism (Keller, Mendes, and Ringrose 2016; Hemmings 2012). Rather than solidifying around any single site or grouping of sites, feminist affect exists within a network of digital connections that enable women to share their experiences and co-experience rage, frustration, and anger with sexism and intersectional oppression. Social media resembles an overlapping ecosystem more than a series of individual spaces, which is reflected in the way that users create, disseminate, and comment on content. The technologies that facilitate this change rapidly; today’s Instagram and Snapchat are tomorrow’s obsolete MySpace and LiveJournal.

The dynamics found on feminist girl blogs described in the last section resemble those on contemporary social media platforms like Tumblr, Twitter and Facebook. Feminist participation in these spaces often resembles a series of elaborate in-jokes, with memes, nuggets of news,

cultural criticism, pop culture and hashtags spreading rapidly and seamlessly throughout online communities and across websites. Notably, much of this content is graphical, in contrast to the lengthy text posts found on blogs. Tumblr, a micro-blogging platform which affords light-weight “reblogging” and “liking” other users’ posts, has become a significant community of practice for young feminist world-building (Connelly 2015; Thelandersson 2013). A visitor to the Daily Feminist on Tumblr (<http://the-daily-feminist.tumblr.com/>), for instance, is greeted with dozens of overlapping animated gifs, graphics, and text posts, which, on a random day, included:

- The text “REBLOG IF YOU THINK TRANS WOMEN BELONG IN FEMALE AND LESBIAN SPACES”
- A list of victims of the anti-LGBTQ Orlando shooting
- A gif of Trevor Noah of the Daily Show criticizing media portrayals of Hillary Clinton and Elizabeth Warren
- Graphic reading “I support people who have abortions”
- Screenshots of Twitter posts discussing rape culture
- An orange graphic reading “Virginity is a Social Construct”
- A cartoon about the validity of women dressing in different ways (Figure 2)
- A comic about Native American women and sexual assault (Figure 3)
- A graphic about sexual assault (Figure 4)

Such images, ideas, and snippets circulate and disseminate across platforms and places. A young woman uses a graphics app on her smartphone to add a feminist tagline to an animated gif of a Disney princess she found via Google Images and posts it to her Tumblr; the gif might be reblogged by fifteen other feminist Tumblrs, posted on Facebook, tweeted, and posted to a feminist forum on Reddit, where it receives an additional fifty comments. In her undergraduate thesis on feminist social media, Scripps student Taryn Riera describes part of her morning routine checking Reddit, Facebook, and Tumblr:

I stop to reblog another photo on Tumblr, this one of a ballet dancer who wrote that she was always told her “black girl hips” would keep her from ever being successful in ballet, before returning to Facebook to like my friend’s link and comment on how insightful the article was. I yawn, frowning at the sunlight

pouring through my window and directly into my eyes, then get out of bed to start my day. Already, in the half hour it takes me to check my feeds and interact across various platforms, I have been validated in my anger to a sexist joke, educated about a topic I might not have encountered, and visited spaces that make intersectional feminist ideas the norm (Riera 2015, 5).

The proliferation of such feminist spaces online normalizes a feminist gaze on the world, and allows young women to participate in ways appropriate to their comfort level, access, and technical knowledge. Of course, not only young feminists use social media. But social media has indubitably contributed to the grassroots resurgence of interest in feminism among young women.

Contemporary feminist social media practice is so diverse that it is impossible to describe in a single chapter. To provide another example, I will briefly discuss “hashtag feminism,” and how its use of both humor and critique contributes to building affective ties and what Carrie Rentschler calls “a culture of support and response” (2014, 76). “Hashtag feminism” is the use of hashtags on Twitter to create participatory commentary on current events or controversial issues, often hilarious, pointed, or absurd. For instance, #safetytipsforladies satirized anti-rape strategies presented to women (watch your drink, don’t walk by yourself after dark) with such gems as:

@CaptKimothy: Most rapists are people, so consider only befriending animals and ghosts #safetytipsforladies

@hilaryjfb: If you hide your forearms in your sleeves, the rapist will mistake you for a T-Rex and carry on his way #safetytipsforladies

@gimmepanda - The majority of rapists are known to the victim. Consider not knowing any men. #safetytipsforladies

Hashtags allow dozens, hundreds, or thousands of people to participate in a group conversation and see what others have written. While they have a myriad of uses, hashtag feminism frequently uses humor or irony to create affective responses (Rentschler 2015). Carrie Rentschler argues:

The humor of #safetytipsforladies explains both its spread and the memetic remaking of feminist jokes that respond to victim blaming attitudes and slut shaming rhetoric. In the process, #safetytipsforladies helped change the terms of feminist debate about sexual violence, drawing broader media attention to feminist rape prevention discourse through the derisive laughter that energizes current feminisms. The hashtag activism of #safetytipsforladies illustrates how humor nurtures a politics of joy and resilience in the face of rape culture and its apologists (2015, 355).

Shared humor can create a feeling of intimate community and belonging. Hashtag feminism can also be a way for women to see that experiences they thought of as individual are universal. For example, the #everydaysexism hashtag brought together thousands of women across the world sharing experiences of street harassment. Ryan Bowles Eagle writes, “The effect of reading so many similar stories in such sheer numbers, different voices testifying to similar experiences from diverse places, serves as powerful evidence for the pervasiveness of violence against women—evidence that cannot be easily silenced” (2015, 352)

However, hashtag feminism is often limited in its ability to address complexity. Shenila Khoja-Moolji discusses the #bringbackourgirls hashtag, designed to bring attention to the kidnapping of hundreds of Nigerian schoolgirls by radical group Boko Haram, and Lauren Berlandt’s concept of *intimate publics* (2015). Khoja-Moolji demonstrates how the widespread use of the hashtag created affective bonds between strangers, but that the ability to form these bonds depends on a shared history or sensibility. She points out that #bringbackourgirls fits into a Western narrative of Islam as an oppressive threat to women, and flattens many of the complex

histories and differences in the news story. Hashtag feminism, then, can be a simplistic answer to complicated problems.

### None of this is New: Feminisms in Conflict

Despite the positive possibilities of social media, social media's affordances illuminate two ongoing problems with feminist activism. The first is male harassment of feminist women, which is more prevalent than ever, in part due to the same technical functionality that feminists take advantage of to build online community. Social features like forums, Twitter, hashtags, digital video and the like are used by individuals and a variety of groups (including the alt-right, Men's Rights activists and GamerGate supporters) to systemically shut down feminist discourse online, as are tactics like "doxing," or publicizing personal, private information; "dogpiling," or coordinating attacks, and social shaming. The second involves the continued presence of white normativity in feminist spaces online. When women of color criticize racist comments or point out absence, they are frequently accused of "toxic feminism" and of creating division where there need be none, a long-standing tactic to privilege white, middle-class voices. In this section, I use two case studies to demonstrate how social media makes these conflicts visible far beyond individual participants.

#### *Harassment and GamerGate*

The long-documented harassment of women online has increased in both frequency and severity in the last few years as feminist activism has flourished online (Citron 2014). Caroline Criado-Perez campaigned to add a woman to the British banknote and was subject to threats of death and sexual abuse on Twitter (Hattenstone 2013). Developer Adria Richards complained about conference attendees making sexual jokes and was met with a barrage of threatening messages,

including a photoshopped picture of a naked, bound, decapitated woman (Marwick 2013b). *Jezebel* writer Lindy West wrote about rape jokes in comedy; in addition to threats of rape and violence, a reader created a Twitter account in the name of her deceased father and tweeted that he was disappointed in her (West 2015). The frequency of such attacks on platforms like Twitter—and the lack of built-in tools to deal with them—as well as the frequency of sexist speech on communities like Reddit, raises questions around the limits of online free speech and why, exactly, such racist and misogynist speech has become so common (Citron 2014; O’Leary 2012). Speaking out about sexism comes with a price. Many successful and visible online feminists, like Amanda Marcotte of *Pandagon*, Jamia Wilson of Women, Action and the Media, and Jill Filipovic, former editor of *Feministe*, have either pulled back from the public eye or ponder quitting. Jessica Valenti says that it’s “not just the physical safety concerns but the emotional ramifications” of constant, daily threats and abuse (Goldberg 2015). The possible effects of harassment include a chilling effect on women’s online participation; long-term emotional and professional difficulty for the women harassed; and an increase in sexual stereotyping and discrimination both off and online.

The online harassment of women is both individual and systemic. While a variety of people with a spectrum of political positions engage in harassing behavior, feminists (especially women of color and queer women) are often targeted for harassment which is coordinated through chat rooms, image boards, and subreddits. While those involved in such attacks may be self-identified trolls, members of the alt-right, white nationalists, anti-Semites, etc, it is “Men’s Rights” groups who have been targeting feminists online for years (Dragiewicz 2011). Founded in the 1970s to lobby against domestic violence and child custody laws, modern men’s rights groups focus on a host of issues under a general umbrella of anti-feminism. Reddit has become

notorious as a clearinghouse for men's rights activists (MRA). The two best-known MRA subreddits are /r/MensRights and r/TheRedPill, the latter a reference to Neo finding enlightenment in the film *The Matrix*. As Adrienne Massanari writes, while the most virulent anti-feminism is found in these two communities, “the misogynistic views of TRP and MR do not simply stay put in those subreddits; they become part of the larger Reddit culture—informing the ways in which women are discussed and treated on the rest of the site (2015, 138). The vocabulary and beliefs of men's rights activists, such as “misandry” (hatred of men by women) and “SJWs” (social justice warriors, a pejorative term), have infiltrated many internet spaces, especially those seen as key to geek masculinity. Geek masculinity is a type of middle-class, white masculinity that privileges technical expertise and command of pop-cultural knowledge, while narrowly circumscribing proper “geek” identity within a raced and gendered framework (Massanari 2015, 128–29).

The best known, best-coordinated attack against feminists of the last few years is GamerGate, a movement purporting to be about “ethics in game journalism” which was strategically planned and executed by members of the anonymous bulletin board 4chan, a notorious hub of troll culture. GamerGate began as an organized brigade on independent game developer Zoe Quinn, who was accused by an ex-boyfriend of sleeping with a reviewer to garner positive coverage of her game *Depression Quest*. Ms. Quinn was inundated with thousands of hateful messages. Her attackers disseminated nude photos of her, as well as personal information including her address and social security number,—which she was accused of fabricating. GamerGaters called her parents, called her phone at all hours of the night, and openly discussed raping her, her weight, and the smell of her vagina. As the harassment escalated, Anita Sarkeesian, a feminist media critic and favorite target of anti-feminist gamers for several years,

was doxed and forced to cancel an appearance at the University of Utah due to a death threat. Another game developer, Brianna Wu, posted anti-GamerGate memes on Tumblr and Twitter and received death threats. Actress Felicia Day, a long-time gaming advocate, wrote an emotional blog post about the effects that GamerGate was having on her ability to trust male gamers and was promptly doxed for her trouble. What Quinn, Sarkeesian, Wu, and Day had in common was a feminist sensibility and the audacity to criticize video game culture. While Sarkeesian's videos cataloging tropes of women in video games might seem mild to feminist media studies scholars, they represent an attack on a popular culture dominated by masculine gender norms and thus threaten the hegemony of geek masculinity.

Whitney Philips, who studies trolling, or the act of trying to “disrupt or upset as many people as possible, using whatever linguistic or behavioral tools are available,” (2015, 2) writes that trolling rhetoric “is predicated on highly-gendered notions of victory and domination, and... is used to silence, punish, and correct ‘soft’ or otherwise feminized speech” (2015, 167). While there is a clear difference between subcultural trolling, online harassment, and the actions of ‘haters’ or cyberbullies, there are commonalities as well. Internet communities like 4Chan and Reddit share a strong belief in “free speech” and regulation of online participation as censorship (Reagle 2015). These classic liberal values of the internet often, in practice, privilege combative or openly biased community members over the comfort of female members, leading to male domination even in high-minded online communities like Wikipedia (Reagle 2012). Members of online communities, particularly those framed as *open* or *participatory*, often explain gender gaps in membership as a matter of individual choice, rather than systemic bias. Thus, aggressive online speech, whether practiced in the profanity and pornography-laced environment of 4Chan

or the loftier venues of newspaper comments sections, often frames sexism as an issue of freedom of expression and normalizes sexist, anti-feminist language.

### *Intersectionality and “Toxic Feminism”*

In her review of 2013 feminist activism, Kira Cochrane writes that the feminists she spoke with primarily defined themselves as *intersectional feminists*, who view oppression as multiple and overlapping rather than simply about gender. She writes:

Today's feminists generally seem to see it as an attempt to elevate and make space for the voices and issues of those who are marginalized, and a framework for recognizing how class, race, age, ability, sexuality, gender and other issues combine to affect women's experience of discrimination (2013).

Indeed, feminist social media includes the voices of women of color, queer women, transgender people, working-class women, and women with disabilities. However, the ideal of intersectionality is often overshadowed in practice by the concerns of what disability blogger Rachel Cohen-Rottenberg calls “cis-gendered, able-bodied, normatively sized, middle-class, white Anglo-Saxon Protestant women” (Cohen-Rottenberg 2013). Indeed, Jessie Daniels points out that “what remains unquestioned... is the dominance of white women as architects and defenders of a framework of feminism in the digital era” (2016). She cites Sheryl Sandberg’s *Lean In* and #banbossy campaign as examples of mainstream feminist activism which primarily address the need to increase female leadership in corporate America, which concerns a very small number of privileged women. Similarly, a *Feministing* essay by Syreeta McFadden criticizes media discussions of stay-at-home-moms vs. working moms for excluding the voices of working-class women, who are most affected by the lack of child care and labor protections in the U.S. (McFadden 2013). As feminist discussions move beyond individual blogs or Twitter into the mainstream, they are often stripped of this type of nuance and reframed as issues of most

interest to wealthy target markets. Moreover, the media often points to white female bloggers as the visible figureheads of “digital feminism” while ignoring their more diverse counterparts.

These conflicts came into stark relief with the release of the #femfuture report in 2013, authored by Feministing bloggers Courtney Martin and Vanessa Valenti. In this report, a sort of “State of the Union” of feminist blogging, Martin and Valenti argued that blogging was crucial to sustaining feminist activism, but that a lack of financial support for feminist blogs and affective support for bloggers risked “blogger burnout.” The report was based on a 2012 meeting of a diverse community of feminist bloggers, but both Martin and Valenti fit the mold of the professional white middle-class feminist. They were immediately criticized for focusing on solutions most appropriate for professional non-profit organizations, for releasing the report without asking for community input, and ignoring the contributions of radical women of color (Risam 2015). These critiques were compounded by a 2014 article by *Nation* writer Michelle Goldberg, who labeled the Twitter debate around #femfuture as “toxic” and created largely by women of color. As Roopika Risam writes, “in doing so, she [instantiated] a notion of toxic femininity, positioning women of color feminists as the disruptive bodies that transgress fictive, ideal feminist spaces on Twitter” (2015). In other words, “toxic feminism” idealizes a homogenous, civil, pleasant feminist space which is normatively white and middle-class, and further marginalizes the voices of feminists who do not fit this model (Daniels 2016; Risam 2015).

The “toxic feminism” discourse also marginalizes the very real concerns of women of color and other excluded groups. In 2013, Mikki Kendall started the #solidarityisforwhitewomen to highlight the marginalization of women of color in white feminist movements. The tipping point for Kendall was Hugo Schwyzer, a professor with a long history of drug abuse, sleeping

with students, and intimate partner violence, who was consistently given a platform on sites like *Feministe* and *Jezebel* as a sort of celebrity male feminist (Gable 2014). Schwyzer was also known to frequently argue with feminists of color. Tope Fadiran writes:

[Schwyzer's whiteness] points to broader issues with racism and white privilege in mainstream feminism that women of color have spoken to for decades. In Schwyzer's case, women of color have been raising objections about his history, and his dismissive and hostile behavior towards women of color, for many years, with little success in getting white feminists in his circle to hold him, or themselves, accountable (Fadiran 2012).

Frustrated with what she saw as a lack of accountability on the part of mainstream digital feminists, Kendall began a series of historically-informed tweets:

#SolidarityIsForWhiteWomen when you ignore the culpability of white women in lynching, Jim Crow, & in modern day racism

#SolidarityIsForWhiteWomen when you idolize Susan B. Anthony & claim her racism didn't matter

#SolidarityIsForWhiteWomen when feminist discussions of misogyny in music ignore the lyrics of [the Rolling Stones song] Brown Sugar

The hashtag quickly caught on and feminists of color added their own contributions:

@RBraceySherman: #SolidarityIsForWhiteWomen = fighting for #reprorights but saying nothing ab shackling of pregnant & forced sterilization incarcerated WOC

@zblay: #solidarityisforwhitewomen when pink hair, tattoos, and piercings are "quirky" or "alt" on a white woman but "ghetto" on a black one.

@Blackamazon: #SolidarityIsForWhiteWomen calls Hillary the first viable women's candidate even though Shirley was the first and only nominee

These tweets, and thousands of others, point to significant conflicts between the ideal of intersectional feminism versus the material, oppressive histories of white-normative feminism.

These concerns have not disappeared in the digital age; indeed, technologies like Twitter make them more visible. Roopika Risam writes, “online feminists fearing toxicity are struggling with the argument that intersectional feminists have been making all along: there isn’t a single, common cause within feminist movements. Indeed, the proliferation of intersectional feminist hashtags, demonstrates that online feminism is labyrinthine” (2015). Ideally, the ability of different feminisms to interact online would lead to greater understanding and a displacement of the white-normative narrative. Despite the “toxic” backlash described above, the ability to quickly and actively call out racism, classism, transphobia, or ableism (etc.) within feminist movements and find solidarity with others is a strength of today’s fast-moving social media landscape...

Indeed, much online feminist activism is intersectional and inclusive. In 2014, for instance, the Association for Progressive Communications organized a Gender, Sexuality and the Internet Meeting in Malaysia, where 50 attendees—gender and women’s rights activists, queer organizations, human rights advocates and technology activists—collectively created a document outlining the “Feminist Principles of the Internet” (revised in 2015) (Association for Progressive Communications 2015). The 17 principles, which include statements on access, resistance, movement building, privacy, and violence, aim to challenge not only sexism, but to recognize the full realities of women, girls, and queer people’s lives:

A feminist internet works towards empowering more women and queer persons – in all our diversities – to fully enjoy our rights, engage in pleasure and play, and dismantle patriarchy. This integrates our different realities, contexts and specificities – including age, disabilities, sexualities, gender identities and expressions, socioeconomic locations, political and religious beliefs, ethnic origins, and racial markers (Association for Progressive Communications 2016) .

The #ImagineAFeministInternet movement involves women from all over the world; it incorporates a sophisticated critique of neoliberal techno-capitalism and global surveillance; it acknowledges the severity of online harassment and positions it within a larger context of violence toward women and girls; and involves a range of other issues that affect women globally (Nagarajan 2016). The activists working towards making this feminist internet possible demonstrate the potential of the internet—especially when combined with face-to-face meetings and on-the-ground coordination—to address both the diversity of women’s lives and the power of collective organizing.

### Conclusion

The affordances and dynamics of social media, and internet technologies more generally, both allow for feminists to connect and form communities while simultaneously opening them to both internal and external criticism. After years in which feminism was largely absent from youth and popular culture, the strong resurgence in grassroots feminist activism, art, politics, and culture, especially among young women, is, frankly, quite heartening to this middle-aged feminist. Social media allows feminists of all ages to tell personal stories, affectively engage with the experiences of others, collectively organize, and mobilize politically. However, social technologies—both in terms of functionality and cultural discourses and narratives—are not intrinsically feminist.

While they might facilitate certain types of feminist community-building, they also lack tools for combating harassment and backlash. These platforms on which young feminist activists depend are also firmly situated in a Silicon Valley geek culture itself plagued by sexism, causing intrinsic conflicts between the ideals of feminism and those who would seek to combat it.

Ultimately, the strengths and possibilities of feminism flourish online, but online feminists—especially young women, women of color, queer women, and women in the global south—are

often subject to the worst abuses of technology. Rather than presuming that we can fiat technical solutions to such problems, feminist social media participation requires support and community from feminists of all ages, nationalities, and political orientations.

### Endnotes

<sup>1</sup> A mid-1980s effort to create a CompuServe-like service for professional women, the Amazon Line, failed partially because the creators “found that many of the women they had hoped to attract did not do their own typing, but rather had secretaries who typed for them” (Balka 1993)

<sup>2</sup> It was shut down in 1990 after the building that hosted it was struck by lightning.

<sup>3</sup> Cunt art, which originated with feminist artist Judy Chicago and a group of women at the Fresno State College Feminist Art Program, explicitly references vaginal imagery and takes “female sexuality as a vital and multivalent aspect of female experience” (Meyer 2006, 322; Meyer and Wilding 2010). The VNS Matrix manifesto read, in part, “We are the modern cunt... we are the virus of the new world disorder/rupturing the symbolic from within/saboteurs of the big daddy mainframe/the clitoris is a direct line to the matrix” (VNS Matrix 1991).

<sup>4</sup> Lisa Nakamura points out that the fantasy of the disembodied subject who sidesteps discrimination coincides with the neoliberal ideal of colorblindness and “fair competition” in the market, both prominent in the 1990s (2008, 5).

<sup>5</sup> Dominick summarizes “In sum, the typical author of a personal page is a young, single male who is either a student or has a white-collar job that is associated with computer technology” (1999, 650).

<sup>6</sup> The relationship between riot grrrl and race is very complicated. From its origins, riot grrrl was criticized not only because it was primarily composed of white women, but because many of these white women reproduced racist discourses and attitudes. There is a parallel history of extensive creative expression by young people of color during this time period, particularly in zines. Therefore, to tell the history of zine-related feminism and activism as that of riot grrrl makes invisible the contributions of women of color—and queer women (Radway 2016; Nguyen 2012).

<sup>7</sup> This ethos was often at explicit odds with cyberfeminism. Faith Wilding, one of the Fresno State College feminist artists, wrote in a 1998 essay that so-called “cybergrrls” “often uncritically recirculate and re-present sexist and stereotyped images of women from popular media--the buxom gun moll; the supersexed cyborg femme; the 50's tupperware cartoon women, are favorites--without any analysis or critical recontextualization” (1998, 8). She instead called for women on the web to create and circulate female imagery which did not rely on gender binaries.

## References

- Arreola, Veronica. 2013. "Back to the #FemFuture." *Viva La Feminista*. April 16. <http://www.vivalafeminista.com/2013/04/back-to-femfuture.html>.
- Association for Progressive Communications. 2015. "Feminist Principles of the Internet." *Imagine a Feminist Internet*, July 22-24, Port Dickson, Malaysia. [http://feministinternet.net/sites/default/files/FeministPrinciplesoftheInternetv2.0\\_0.pdf](http://feministinternet.net/sites/default/files/FeministPrinciplesoftheInternetv2.0_0.pdf).
- . 2016. "Feminist Principles of the Internet." *Feminist Principles of the Internet*. August. <http://feministinternet.net/>.
- Balka, Ellen. 1993. "Women's Access to On-Line Discussions about Feminism." *The Electronic Journal of Communication / La Revue Electronique de Communication* 3 (1). <http://www.cios.org/EJCPUBLIC/003/1/00311.HTML>.
- Baym, N. K. 2000. *Tune In, Log on: Soaps, Fandom, and Online Community*. London: Sage.
- . 2015. "Social Media and the Struggle for Society." *Social Media + Society* 1 (1): 1–2.
- boyd, d. 2010. "Social Network Sites as Networked Publics: Affordances, Dynamics, and Implications." In *A Networked Self: Identity, Community, and Culture on Social Network Sites*, edited by Z. Papacharissi, 39–58. New York: Routledge.
- Bury, Rhiannon. 2005. *Cyberspaces of Their Own: Female Fandoms Online*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Butler, Judith. 1990. *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. New York: Routledge.
- Byrne, Dara N. 2007. "Public Discourse, Community Concerns, and Civic Engagement: Exploring Black Social Networking Traditions on BlackPlanet. Com." *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication* 13 (1): 319–340.
- Citron, Danielle. 2014. *Hate Crimes in Cyberspace*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Cochrane, Kira. 2013. "The Fourth Wave of Feminism: Meet the Rebel Women." *The Guardian*, December 10. <http://www.theguardian.com/world/2013/dec/10/fourth-wave-feminism-rebel-women>.
- Cohen-Rottenberg, Rachel. 2013. "Why This Disabled Woman No Longer Identifies as a Feminist." / *Disability and Representation | Changing the Cultural Conversation*. July 30. <http://www.disabilityandrepresentation.com/2013/07/30/why-this-disabled-woman/>.
- Comstock, M. 2001. "Grrrl Zine Networks: Re-Composing Spaces of Authority, Gender, and Culture." *Journal of Advanced Composition* 21 (2): 383–410.

- Connelly, Sarah M. 2015. “Welcome to the FEMINIST CULT’: Building a Feminist Community of Practice on Tumblr.” Undergraduate Senior Thesis, Gettysburg, PA: Gettysburg College. [http://cupola.gettysburg.edu/student\\_scholarship/328/](http://cupola.gettysburg.edu/student_scholarship/328/).
- Daniels, Jessie. 2016. “The Trouble with White Feminism: Whiteness, Digital Feminism and the Intersectional Internet.” In *The Intersectional Internet: Race, Sex, Class, and Culture Online*, edited by S.U. Noble and B. M. Tynes, 40-60. New York: Peter Lang.
- Dominick, Joseph R. 1999. “Who Do You Think You Are? Personal Home Pages and Self-Presentation on the World Wide Web.” *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly* 76 (4): 646–658.
- Dragiewicz, Molly. 2011. *Equality with a Vengeance: Men’s Rights Groups, Battered Women, and Antifeminist Backlash*. Lebanon, NH: Northeastern University Press.
- Duncombe, S. 1997. *Notes from Underground: Zines and the Politics of Alternative Culture*. New York: Verso Books.
- Eagle, Ryan Bowles. 2015. “Loitering, Lingerin, Hashtagging: Women Reclaiming Public Space Via #BoardtheBus, #StopStreetHarassment, and the #EverydaySexism Project.” *Feminist Media Studies* 15 (2): 350–53.
- Evans, Elizabeth. 2014. *The Politics of Third Wave Feminisms*. New York: Springer.
- Everett, Anna. 2002. “The Revolution Will Be Digitized: Afrocentricity and the Digital Public Sphere.” *Social Text* 20 (2): 125–46.
- Fadiran, Tope. 2012. “Why Do Some Feminist Spaces Tolerate Male Abusers?” *GlobalComment*. January 25. <http://globalcomment.com/why-do-some-feminist-spaces-tolerate-male-abusers/>.
- Gable, Mona. 2014. “The Hugo Problem.” *Los Angeles Magazine*, March 26. <http://www.lamag.com/longform/the-hugo-problem/>.
- Gajjala, Radhika. 2000. “Internet Constructs of Identity and ignorance: ‘Third-World’ Contexts and Cyberfeminism.” *The Future of Narrative Discourse: Internet Constructs of Literacy and Identity*, 33–36.
- Gajjala, Radhika, and Annapurna Mamidipudi. 1999. “Cyberfeminism, Technology, and International ‘Development.’” *Gender and Development* 7 (2): 8–16.
- Ganahl, Jane. 1998. “The Chief Chick of ChickClick: Spinning a Web for the Anti-Cosmo-Girl.” *San Francisco Chronicle*, December 24. <http://www.sfgate.com/cgi-bin/article.cgi?f=/e/a/1998/12/24/STYLE8833.dtl>.
- Goldberg, Michelle. 2015. “Feminist Writers Are so Besieged by Online Abuse That Some Have Begun to Retire.” *The Washington Post*, February 19. <http://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/online-feminists-increasingly-ask-are-the->

psychic-costs-too-much-to-bear/2015/02/19/3dc4ca6c-b7dd-11e4-a200-c008a01a6692\_story.html.

- Gregg, M.C. 2006. "Posting with Passion: Blogs and the Politics of Gender." In *Uses of Blogs*, A. Bruns and J. Jacobs (Ed.), 151–60. New York: Peter Lang.  
<http://espace.library.uq.edu.au/view/UQ:72839>.
- Haraway, D. 1985. "A Manifesto for Cyborgs: Science, Technology, and Socialist Feminism in the 1980's." *Socialist Review* 80: 65–108.
- Harcourt, Wendy. 2000. "The Personal and the Political: Women Using the Internet." *CyberPsychology & Behavior* 3 (5): 693–697.
- Harp, Dustin, and Mark Tremayne. 2006. "The Gendered Blogosphere: Examining Inequality Using Network and Feminist Theory." *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly* 83 (2): 247–264.
- Harris, Anita. 2008. "Young Women, Late Modern Politics, and the Participatory Possibilities of Online Cultures." *Journal of Youth Studies* 11 (5): 481–495.
- Hattenstone, Simon. 2013. "Caroline Criado-Perez: 'Twitter Has Enabled People to Behave in a Way They Wouldn't Face to Face'." *The Guardian*, August 23.  
<http://www.theguardian.com/lifeandstyle/2013/aug/04/caroline-criado-perez-twitter-rape-threats>.
- Hawthorne, Susan, and Renate Klein. 1999. *Cyberfeminism: Connectivity, Critique and Creativity*. North Melbourne, Australia: Spinifex Press.
- Hemmings, Clare. 2012. "Affective Solidarity: Feminist Reflexivity and Political Transformation." *Feminist Theory* 13 (2): 147–161.
- Herring, S. C. 1993. "Men's Language: A Study of the Discourse of the LINGUIST List." In *Proceedings of the XVth International Congress of Linguists*, 3:347–350.
- . 2003. "Gender and Power in Online Communication." In *The Handbook of Language and Gender*, edited by Janet Holmes and Miriam Meyerhoff, 202–28. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Herring, S. C., I. Kouper, L. A. Scheidt, and E. L. Wright. 2004. "Women and Children Last: The Discursive Construction of Weblogs." In *Into the Blogosphere: Rhetoric, Community, and Culture of Weblogs*, edited by L.J. Gurak, S. Antonijevic, L. Johnson, C. Ratliff, and J. Reyman. [http://blog.lib.umn.edu/blogosphere/women\\_and\\_children.html](http://blog.lib.umn.edu/blogosphere/women_and_children.html).
- Jenkins, H. 2006. *Fans, Bloggers, and Gamers: Exploring Participatory Culture*. New York: NYU Press.
- Jewish Women's Archive. 2015. "Ophira Edut." *Jewish Women's Archive*. Accessed July 5.  
<http://jwa.org/feminism/edut-ophira>.

- Keller, Jessalynn. 2016a. *Girls' Feminist Blogging in a Postfeminist Age*. New York: Routledge.
- . 2016b. "Making Activism Accessible: Exploring Girls' Blogs as Sites of Contemporary Feminist Activism." In *Girlhood Studies and the Politics of Place: Contemporary Paradigms for Research*, edited by C. Mitchell and Carrie Rentschler. New York: Berghahn Books.
- Keller, Jessalynn, Kaitlynn D. Mendes, and Jessica Ringrose. 2016. "Speaking 'Unspeakable Things': Documenting Digital Feminist Responses to Rape Culture." *Journal of Gender Studies*..
- Khoja-Moolji, Shenila. 2015. "Becoming an 'Intimate Publics': Exploring the Affective Intensities of Hashtag Feminism." *Feminist Media Studies* 15 (2): 347–50.
- Kolko, B. E. 2000. "Erasing@ Race: Going White in the (Inter) Face." In *Race in Cyberspace*, edited by B.E. Kolko, L. Nakamura, and G.B. Rodman, 213–32. London: Routledge.
- Kramarae, Cherie, and H. Jeannie Taylor. 1993. "Men and Women on Electronic Networks: A Conversation or a Monologue?" In *Women, Information Technology, and Scholarship*, edited by H. Jeannie Taylor, Cherie Kramarae, and Maureen Ebben. Urbana: University of Illinois, Center for Advanced Study.
- Ladd, Donna. 2001. "Click for Choice." *The Village Voice*, February 6.
- Martin, C., and V. Valenti. 2013. "#FemFuture: Online Revolution." 8. New Feminist Solutions. New York, NY: Barnard Center for Research on Women.
- Marwick, A. 2013a. *Status Update: Celebrity, Publicity, and Branding in the Social Media Age*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- . 2013b. "Donglegate: Why the Tech Community Hates Feminists." *Wired Opinion*. March 29. <http://www.wired.com/opinion/2013/03/richards-affair-and-misogyny-in-tech/>.
- Marwick, A., and Nicole B. Ellison. 2012. "'There Isn't Wifi in Heaven!' Negotiating Visibility on Facebook Memorial Pages." *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media* 56 (3): 378–400.
- Massanari, Adrienne Lynne. 2015. *Participatory Culture, Community, and Play: Learning from Reddit*. New York: Peter Lang Publishing.
- McFadden, Syreeta. 2013. "What We Don't Talk about When We Talk about Mommy Wars." *Feministing*. July 11. <http://feministing.com/2013/07/11/what-we-dont-talk-about-when-we-talk-about-mommy-wars/>.
- McLaine, S. 2003. "Ethnic Online Communities: Between Profit and Purpose." In *Cyberactivism: Online Activism in Theory and Practice*, edited by Martha McCaughey and Michael D. Ayers. New York: Routledge.

- Meyer, Laura. 2006. "Power and Pleasure: Feminist Art Practice and Theory in the United States and Britain." In *A Companion to Contemporary Art since 1945*, edited by Amelia Jones, 317–342. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Meyer, Laura, and Faith Wilding. 2010. "Collaboration and Conflict in the Fresno Feminist Art Program: An Experiment in Feminist Pedagogy." *N. Paradoxa: International Feminist Art Journal* 26 (July): 40–51.
- Nagarajan, Chitra. 2016. "What Does a Feminist Internet Look Like?" *The Guardian*, September 12, sec. Opinion. <https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2016/sep/12/feminist-internet-empowering-online-harassment>.
- Nakamura, L. 1999. "Race In/For Cyberspace: Identity Tourism and Racial Passing on the Internet." In *Cyberreader*, edited by Victor Vitanza. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- . 2008. *Digitizing Race: Visual Cultures of the Internet*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Nardi, Bonnie A., Diane J. Schiano, and Michelle Gumbrecht. 2004. "Blogging as Social Activity, Or, Would You Let 900 Million People Read Your Diary?" In *Proceedings of the 2004 ACM Conference on Computer Supported Cooperative Work*, 222–231. ACM. <http://dl.acm.org/citation.cfm?id=1031643>.
- Nguyen, Mimi Thi. 2012. "Riot Grrrl, Race, and Revival." *Women & Performance: A Journal of Feminist Theory* 22 (2–3): 173–96.
- Nowson, Scott, and Jon Oberlander. 2006. "The Identity of Bloggers: Openness and Gender in Personal Weblogs." In *AAAI Spring Symposium: Computational Approaches to Analyzing Weblogs*, 163–167. <http://www.aaai.org/Papers/Symposia/Spring/2006/SS-06-03/SS06-03-032.pdf>.
- O'Leary, Amy. 2012. "Sexual Harassment in Online Gaming Stirs Anger." *The New York Times*, August 1, sec. U.S. <http://www.nytimes.com/2012/08/02/us/sexual-harassment-in-online-gaming-stirs-anger.html>.
- Paasonen, Susanna. 2011. "Revisiting Cyberfeminism." *Communications* 36 (3): 335–352.
- Papacharissi, Z. 2002. "The Presentation of Self in Virtual Life: Characteristics of Personal Home Pages." *Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly* 79 (3): 643–660.
- Phillips, Whitney. 2015. *This Is Why We Can't Have Nice Things: Mapping the Relationship Between Online Trolling and Mainstream Culture*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Piano, Doreen. 2002. "Congregating Women: Reading 3rd Wave Feminist Practices in Subcultural Production." *Rhizomes* 4. <http://www.rhizomes.net/issue4/piano.html>.
- Piepmeyer, Alison. 2009. *Girl Zines: Making Media, Doing Feminism*. First Edition. NYU Press.

- Plant, Sadie. 1996. "On the Matrix: Cyberfeminist Simulations." In *Cultures of Internet: Virtual Spaces, Real Histories, Living Bodies*, edited by R. Shields, 170–83. London: Sage.
- Radway, Janice. 2011. "Zines, Half-Lives, and Afterlives: On the Temporalities of Social and Political Change." *PMLA* 126 (1): 140–50.
- . 2016. "Girl Zine Networks, Underground Itineraries, and Riot Grrrl History: Making Sense of the Struggle for New Social Forms in the 1990s and Beyond." *Journal of American Studies* 50 (1): 1–31.
- Reagle, Joseph M. 2012. "'Free as in Sexist?' Free Culture and the Gender Gap." *First Monday* 18 (1). <http://journals.uic.edu/ojs/index.php/fm/article/view/4291>.
- . 2015. *Reading the Comments: Likers, Haters, and Manipulators at the Bottom of the Web*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Rentschler, Carrie. 2014. "Rape Culture and the Feminist Politics of Social Media." *Girlhood Studies* 7 (1): 65–82.
- . 2015. "#Safetytipsforladies: Feminist Twitter Takedowns of Victim Blaming." *Feminist Media Studies* 15 (2): 353–56.
- Rettberg, Jill Walker. 2013. *Bloggng*. New York: Polity.
- Reynolds, Kate. 2013. "History of Cyberfeminism." Electronic document. *History of Cyberfeminism*. April 15. <https://historyofcyberfeminism.wordpress.com/history-of-cyberfeminism/>.
- Rheingold, Howard. 2000. *The Virtual Community: Homesteading on the Electronic Frontier*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Riera, Taryn. 2015. "Online Feminisms: Feminist Community Building and Activism in a Digital Age." Senior Thesis, Claremont, CA: Scripps College. [http://scholarship.claremont.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1699&context=scripps\\_theses](http://scholarship.claremont.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1699&context=scripps_theses).
- Risam, Roopika. 2015. "Toxic Femininity 4.0." *First Monday* 20 (4). <http://www.firstmonday.dk/ojs/index.php/fm/article/view/5896>.
- Rohde, Gregory L., and Robert Shapiro. 2000. "Falling through the Net: Toward Digital Inclusion." Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Commerce, Economics and Statistics Administration, National Telecommunications and Information Administration. <http://www.ntia.doc.gov/legacy/ntiahome/fttn00/falling.htm>.
- Scott, Krista. 1998. "'Girls Need Modems!' Cyberculture and Women's Ezines." Master of Arts, Women's Studies, Toronto, Canada: York University. <http://www.stumptuous.com/mrp.html>.

- Shade, Leslie Regan. 2002. *Gender and Community in the Social Construction of the Internet*. P. Lang.
- Solomon, Deborah. 2009. "Fourth-Wave Feminism." *The New York Times*, November 15, sec. Magazine. <http://www.nytimes.com/2009/11/15/magazine/15fob-q4-t.html>.
- Stone, A. R. 1996. *The War of Desire and Technology at the Close of the Mechanical Age*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Sutton, L. A. 1994. "Using Usenet: Gender, Power, and Silence in Electronic Discourse." In *Proceedings of the 20th Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*, 506–20. Berkeley, CA: Berkeley Linguistics Society.
- Swanson, Heidi. n.d. "Project : ChickClick." *101cookbooks.com*. <http://www.101cookbooks.com/heidiswanson/html/ccframeset.html>.
- Thelandersson, Fredrika. 2013. "Tumblr Feminism: Third-Wave Subjectivities in Practice." MA Thesis, Department of Media, Culture & Communication, New York: New York University.
- Turkle, Sherry. 1995. *Life on the Screen: Identity in the Age of the Internet*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Uncapher, Willard. 1999. "Electronic Homesteading on the Rural Frontier." In *Communities in Cyberspace*, edited by Marc A. Smith and Peter Kollock, 264–89.
- Van Zoonen, Liesbet. 2001. "Feminist Internet Studies." *Feminist Media Studies* 1 (1): 67–72.
- VNS Matrix. 1991. "Cyberfeminist Manifesto for the 21st Century." [http://obn.org/reading\\_room/manifestos/html/cyberfeminist.html](http://obn.org/reading_room/manifestos/html/cyberfeminist.html).
- Vogt, Christina, and Peiyong Chen. 2001. "Feminisms and the Internet." *Peace Review* 13 (3): 371–374.
- Wajcman, J. 2007. "From Women and Technology to Gendered Technoscience." *Information, Communication & Society* 10 (3): 287–98.
- Warnick, Barbara. 1999. "Masculinizing the Feminine: Inviting Women on Line." *Critical Studies in Mass Communication* 16 (1): 1–19.
- West, Lindy. 2015. "What Happened When I Confronted My Cruellest Troll." *The Guardian*, February 2. <http://www.theguardian.com/society/2015/feb/02/what-happened-confronted-cruellest-troll-lindy-west>.
- Wilding, Faith. 1998. "Where Is Feminism in Cyberfeminism?" *N. Paradoxa: International Feminist Art Journal* 1 (2): 6–13.

Wynn, E., and J. E. Katz. 1997. "Hyperbole over Cyberspace: Self-Presentation and Social Boundaries in Internet Home Pages and Discourse." *The Information Society* 13 (4): 297–327.

Zeilinger, Julie. 2016. "Feminist Blog about Womens Rights for Teenage Girls | Fbomb." Blog. *Thebomb.org*. <http://thefbomb.org/>.

**\*\*\* send this page to a friend \*\*\***

hissyfit | riotgrl | bust | teengrl | bohos | wired woman | hellfire | mousy | fametracker  
maxi | wench | grfgamer | hipmama | girlie style | dawson's wrap | fashion icon  
smile and act nice | razzberry | disgruntled housewife | greasergirls | breakupgirl | lookenpeepers  
out of order | pop!sicle | beatboxbetty | squiffy ether jag | rockgrl | spacegirl | swanky | cherrysucker



# chickclick

girl sites that don't fake it

[free homepages](#) -----> 

[free e-mail](#) -----> 

[free postcards](#) -----> 

fresh content | updated at 12 PST | \* some sites contain racy content



fresh **today**-fresher tomorrow, check in daily.

[Maxi](#)-Uh, nice melons? British women, melons and breasts?

[Pop!sicle](#)-Grace lets her secret out of the bag. Her mothers favorite pastime is participating as a professional spectator in the debauchery known as pro wrestling.

[hipMama](#)-cheapMama is hooking us up with info on how to make impossible trips, possible!

[Breakup Girl](#)-No diets, new rides, Peet's Coffee, and cool women ... including your mother, in this weeks BG Superlist.

jump in on one of **today's** discussions!

[Fast Forward](#)-In five years do you see yourself living in a small town or big city?

[High School Reunions](#)-Are you going to make it?

[Deodorant](#)-Gotta have it or a waste of cash?

[Showing it All](#)-Would you pose for Playboy?

[Dinner Parties](#)-Love to go to them or love to throw them?

[The Sleep Thing](#)-Is it cruel to let your baby cry?

[Maxi poll](#)-Whatcha reading? And what do you wanna be when you grow up?

[Looking Forward](#)-If you are in college, how do you plan on benefiting from you college education?

[Credit Cards](#)-What road are you



teen scene

- community
- who we are
- ad info
- recent press
- jobs
- become an affiliate

Join the ChickClick Mailing List!

your@email.cc

yay!

illustrations by [tiffany spencer](#)

Figure 1: ChickClick Homepage, 1999



Figure 2: Cartoon by Moga reblogged 4,200 times on Tumblr (<http://artbymoga.tumblr.com/>)



Figure 3: Part of a comic by AngelMilk09 (Angel Smith). Reblogged 4,500 times on Tumblr



Figure 4: Graphic reblogged 664 times on Tumblr (author unknown)