

University of Galway Research Repository

The confidence cult(ure): from postfeminism to neoliberal feminism

Title	The confidence cult(ure): from postfeminism to neoliberal feminism
Author(s)	Le Goff, Damien
Publication Date	2023
Publication information	Le Goff, Damien. (2023). The confidence cult(ure): from postfeminism to neoliberal feminism. <i>Dearcadh: Graduate Journal of Gender, Globalisation and Rights</i> , 4. https://doi.org/10.13025/e2wx-5e27
Publisher	School of Political Science and Sociology, University of Galway
Link to publisher's version	https://doi.org/10.13025/e2wx-5e27
Item record	http://hdl.handle.net/10379/17865
DOI	10.13025/e2wx-5e27

The Confidence Cult(ure): from Postfeminism to Neoliberal Feminism

Le Goff, Damien

MA Graduate, Gender, Globalisation and Rights

National University of Ireland, Galway

Abstract In this article, I explore how the conflation of neoliberalism, postfeminism and selected elements of a broader feminist discourse brought forth a new type of feminism that is amenable to patriarchal neoliberalism: neoliberal feminism. I argue that this has been possible because of two main factors: the confidence cult(ure) and feminism entering the mainstream Anglo-Saxon media. Relying heavily on a postfeminist sensibility yet rebranding itself as feminism, the confidence cult(ure) fostered a new form of neoliberal affective governance directed at women. In doing so, the confidence cult(ure) achieved the tour de force of blending together neoliberalism, postfeminism and specific feminist claims. Cleansed of its radical and transformative power, this hyper-individualized form of feminism has been more easily popularized and embraced by a wider audience within mainstream Anglo-Saxon media. This made it possible to bring forth the new apolitical, patriarchy-friendly neoliberal feminist.

Key Words: Postfeminism, Neoliberalism, Neoliberal Feminism, the Confidence Cult(ure), Girl Power

Introduction

In this essay, I take a closer look at postfeminism's entanglement with the neoliberal paradigm and its later unexpected espousal of a feminist discourse. I look into how the conflation of neoliberalism, postfeminism and specific feminist claims and issues aims at crafting an apolitical, patriarchy-friendly neoliberal female subject.

In an attempt to understand how this development unfolded, I first expose the psychological life of neoliberalism and the makeover paradigm that lies at its core. I then turn to the postfeminist sensibility, as theorized by Rosalind Gill, which I analyse through its disconcerting resemblance to the neoliberal paradigm. I then explore a new form of affective governance and self-regulation aiming at reconstructing women's selves: the injunction to confidence. The confidence cult(ure) that stems from such an injunction rests upon key postfeminist elements while being enmeshed in distinctively neoliberal features. It is, however, unabashedly articulated in feminist terms and is, indeed, assumed as feminist. From there, I argue that we are witnessing the emergence of a new strand of patriarchy-friendly feminism essentially stripped of its political origin and essence: neoliberal feminism. Finally, two case studies, *Girl Power* and *Successful Girls*, are called upon to exemplify the actualization of this emerging type of feminism.

Constituting the Neoliberal Female Subject***The Psychological Life of Neoliberalism***

Extending far beyond mere economic policies, today's neoliberalism can be understood as a political rationality whose reach stretches from running the state to crafting the inner life of the subject (Banet-Weiser, Gill & Rottenberg 2019). As it recasts individuals as capital, the pervasive market rationale infiltrates every single aspect of life – including the most private ones (Banet-Weiser, Gill & Rottenberg 2019). Moving beyond personal changes in appearance, skills or sex life, contemporary neoliberalism has come to regard the self as a product of interest. Taking a psychological turn, it endeavours to inform people's inner lives through establishing 'injunctions and prohibitions on how to feel' (Gill & Kanai 2018, p.320), which is referred to as 'affective governance' (Jupp et al. 2016, cited in Gill & Orgad 2018, p.480). Indeed, the 'affective and psychic life of neoliberalism' (Gill & Kanai, 2018, p.320) sensitizes people to the right feelings and dispositions (Gill & Kanai 2018); specifically, it teaches dissatisfaction and frames the solution as one of voluntary self-transformation to be undertaken by the individual through a 'makeover paradigm' (Gill & Kanai 2018, p.4). This makeover aims at developing some key dispositions: the ruling-out and reframing of negative feelings into a constant positive and upbeat attitude upheld by inspirational discourses; the development of resilience and confidence; the brief acknowledgment of injury and vulnerability only to repudiate them; and the ability to adapt and to refigure hardships as beneficial learning experiences, if not opportunities for growth (Banet-Weiser, Gill & Rottenberg 2019; Gill &

Kanai 2018). According to this discourse, both the source of one's problems as well as their solutions are to be found within oneself, eclipsing structural inequalities and the need for social change (Gill & Orgad 2018). The essential elements enabling this makeover, needless to say, must be purchased. We are thereby witnessing the commodification of feelings in an era of emotional capitalism (Illouz 2007, cited in Gill & Kanai 2018).

More specifically, the notion of resilience has made itself astonishingly prominent across a whole range of domains such as education, employment, health and welfare (Gill & Orgad 2018). It must be understood as one of the essential qualities and dispositions needed to thrive (if not survive) in a neoliberal order fraught with pervasive inequality and injustice that a focus on hyper-individualization obliterates (Gill & Orgad 2018). Indeed, the hailing of resilience is to be appreciated against a backdrop of employment precariousness and social austerity pushed by neoliberal policies. Although the resilient subject may not be able to avoid the hardships of a tough life, they manage to make it through as they adopt the right feelings, attitudes and dispositions. Failure to do so becomes a matter of personal responsibility and insufficiency (Gill & Kanai 2018; Gill & Orgad 2018), consequently creating a dichotomy between either worthy or disposable human capital (Banet-Weiser, Gill & Rottenberg 2019). Interestingly however, Gill and Orgad (2018) point out that in a deft narrative twist relying upon the media, resilience is not merely coerced by the state upon its subjects but voluntarily taken up by people themselves, sometimes enthusiastically, as a "free" and self-determined act of empowerment, embraced for the sake of one's own pleasure and happiness.

Postfeminism's Entanglement with Neoliberalism

Postfeminism is a concept that builds on the premise that women have been empowered through the waves of feminism spurred by previous generations and that, consequently, feminism is passé (Budgeon 2011). However, there has been a lack of agreement upon what postfeminism exactly is and what it encompasses as well as regarding its contradictory use (Gill 2007). In this regard, Gill (2007) argues that the concept is best apprehended not as an epistemological perspective, a historical shift in a somewhat linear unfolding of feminism (therefore questioning the relevance of the "post") or a well-specified backlash against feminism – but rather as a 'sensibility' (Gill 2007, p.148). This notion stresses the inherent contradiction of the postfeminist discourse: its entanglement with both feminist and anti-feminist contents (Gill 2007). This postfeminist sensibility is made up of steady core features that locate a woman's power both in her (sexual) body and in her psychic life, which we will examine through its dismaying proximity to the psychological life of neoliberalism.

Postfeminism re-centres the body at the heart of women's lives with a striking obsession, becoming the defining feature of womanhood (Gill 2007). Femininity has become a bodily property where the sexy body is the most valuable source of a woman's identity and power: 'It is her asset, her product, her brand and her gateway to freedom and empowerment in a neoliberal market economy' (Gill 2017, p.616). Yet this ideal body that a woman must diligently work her way towards is presented as inherently unruly, needing to be harnessed through constant monitoring, discipline and self-surveillance in an attempt to approximate ever

narrower criteria of female attractiveness (Gill 2007). Although self-surveillance is nothing new in women's lives, for Gill (2017) it has dramatically increased in intensity as well as in extensiveness – now including peer or horizontal surveillance such as the 'girlfriend gaze' (Gill 2017, p.617) where women and girls police each other. The relocation of femininity and female power almost exclusively within the body goes hand in hand with the pervasive sexualization of contemporary cultures, achieved through the shift from objectification to subjectification (Gill 2007).

Wilkes (2015) contends that female proponents of postfeminism engage, to different extents, in the uninhibited display of hypersexualization and emancipated sexuality as a way to make themselves visible and negotiate power and privilege within the neoliberal realm – a route to power that arguably endorses, even celebrates, patriarchal norms and gender subjugation (Wilkes 2015; Bae 2011). For Gill (2007), although women are not downright sexually objectified within the postfeminist framework that she developed, they are depicted as active subjects, endeavouring towards the embodiment of the sexual subject, and internalizing the male gaze (Showden 2009). Here, women are given agency on the condition that it be used to construct themselves as resembling the epitome of the male fantasy, which 'represents a [deeper] form of exploitation than objectification' (Gill 2007, p.152). The postfeminist sensitivity seeks to instil in women that such power and emancipation are acquired through the purchase of goods – notably luxury goods – and services in the market to beautify themselves and enhance their sexual appeal (Wilkes 2015) – much so to the taste of neoliberal patriarchy. Despite being articulated around traditional, patriarchal gender power relations and forms of representation that denote the resurgence of natural sexual differences, postfeminist sexual subjectivities are presented as progressive (Showden 2009). They portray sexual differences as sexy (thereby eroticizing power relations) and potentially crystallize existing gender inequalities – depicting the latter as inevitable and, indeed, pleasurable (Gill 2007).

Yet postfeminism doesn't circumscribe itself to the policing of the body; just like neoliberalism before it, it has spread through and claimed a new realm: the self (Gill 2017). As stated by Gill (2017) and in keeping with the psychological life of neoliberalism, women's selves now need to be assessed, advised, disciplined and/or improved. Predicated on the allegation that women's inner lives are inherently flawed but are amenable to transformation – a transformation whose sole responsibility is attributed to women themselves (Gill 2017) – postfeminism offers particular forms of modern and upgraded subjectivities which are presented as the solution to women's contemporary dilemmas and issues (Gill 2007). It comes as no surprise that this upgrade occurs through purchasing necessary goods and services from the market such as self-help books/advice and therapies (Gill & Orgad 2018). These constitute the makeover paradigm the postfeminist sensibility relies upon. This thorough makeover aims at policing not only women's bodies – compelling them to approximate ever narrower criteria of female attractiveness – but also feelings, dictating which must be suppressed, which are allowed and how they should be displayed, in line with the neoliberal affective governance (Gill 2017; Gill & Orgad 2018). Most importantly, all this is couched in terms of conscious individual choice expressing or leading to empowerment through "pleasing oneself" and "taking control" (Gill

2007). There is a remarkable degree of fit here between the postfeminist and neoliberal paradigms: the core tenet of choice and autonomy lies at the heart of both, while the focus on hyper-individualism frames personal experiences of hardship or failure as a matter of personal responsibility, successfully erasing any structural need for change (Gill & Orgad 2018).

The Confidence Cult(ure)

The notion of resilience is intimately constructed around that of confidence; indeed, Gill and Orgad (2016, p.331) refer to “resilience” as the tougher sister of “confidence.” In fact, I argue that the two notions are fundamentally intertwined: while the neoliberal notion of resilience commands the appealing display of confidence in the face of hardship, confidence is built and developed through enhancing one’s resilience. In the neoliberal paradigm, however, resilience has a markedly gendered address (Gill & Orgad 2018). Thus, the almost exclusive address to female subjects in the neoliberal turn to resilience further entrenches the popular belief that women suffer from an intrinsic deficit of confidence (Gill & Kanai 2018). In a resolutely postfeminist tone, this confidence deficit is claimed to be the very cause of gender inequality (Gill & Orgad 2017). It is framed as the root of women’s ills in the world, as it holds them back in their personal and professional achievements and must be overturned through a diligent remaking of women’s subjectivities (Gill & Orgad 2017): the ‘confidence cult(ure)’ project (Gill & Orgad 2016, p.331).

In the face of this pervasive imperative to be confident across all domains in both their professional and private lives, women are enjoined to practice power poses, to lean in, “to fake it until they make it”, to love their bodies and to develop the ability to let go so as to thrive (Gill & Orgad 2017). To achieve these goals, they are offered a myriad of self-help manuals, smartphone apps, and other market services. Here, the confidence cult(ure) proves to be complicit with, rather than critical of, patriarchal neoliberalism as it obliterates both ‘the brutal effects’ (Gill & Orgad 2017, p.28) of patriarchy and institutionalized sexism in the form of violence, blame, hate speech or debasing addresses directed at women and their impact on women’s confidence (Gill & Orgad 2017), as well as their role in upholding and reproducing power imbalance and injustice (Budgeon 2011). Therefore, the confidence cult(ure) operates within, rather than against, the patriarchal structures that condition women’s minds and material realities (Gill & Orgad 2017). In fact, within the confidence cult(ure) framework, self-confidence becomes women’s best ally to navigate structural inequalities and sexism. Calling upon minor, easy and, importantly, non-disruptive personal adjustments in the face of structural problems (Gill & Orgad 2016), the confidence cult(ure) undermines the potential for collective social and political actions that presuppose an awareness of structural inequalities and oppression (Pomerantz, Raby & Stefanik 2013).

The confidence cult(ure) represents a new form of affective governance and self-regulation aiming at reconstructing women’s selves by means of ever more pervasive interventions and intrusions into their private lives (Gill & Orgad 2016). Resting upon key elements of the

psychic life of postfeminism, it stands out for the ‘intensiveness, extensiveness and coherence of its proposed interventions’ (Gill & Orgad 2017, p.34), which range from surface injunctions such as ‘love your body’ to astonishingly detailed practices demanding careful monitoring and diligent self-corrections said to bring forth the long-awaited confident woman (Gill & Orgad 2017). In doing so, the confidence cult(ure) seeks to redirect women’s attention away from politics, towards the neoliberal fantasy of success and happiness (Budgeon 2011; Gill & Orgad 2017). What makes the confidence cult(ure) remarkably distinctive, however, is its determined espousal of a feminist discourse: its postfeminist address is articulated and celebrated in feminist terms of empowerment and is unashamedly assumed to be, indeed, feminism (Gill & Orgad 2016; Gill & Orgad 2017). For Gill & Orgad (2017), this is likely due to the new visibility and embrace garnered by certain kinds of feminism through media platforms over the last decade, combined with the entanglement and overlap of feminism, postfeminism and neoliberalism in these visible strands of feminism. To this we now turn.

Feminism & Media Visibility

In the past, feminist discourses were independent, critical voices expressed through avenues external to the media (Gill 2007). Over the last decade however, feminism has made itself prominent throughout a diversity of Anglo-Saxon mainstream media such as digital media, social media (Instagram, Tumblr, Facebook, and Twitter), broadcast media (television) as well as in commercial advertising (Banet-Weiser, Gill & Rottenberg 2019). These have been instrumental in crafting new modes of affective subjectivities available to women (such as the confidence cult(ure)), presenting them as desirable to women (Gill & Kanai 2018; Gill & Orgad 2017) and disseminating them (Wilkes 2015). Yet this does not imply that the media has endorsed a comprehensive feminist perspective where the many strands of feminism (queer, decolonial, intersectional or liberal feminism, to name a few) all come to the fore to push a comprehensive agenda; rather, it entails that ‘the feminist discourse is incorporated, revised and depoliticized through the media’ (Gill 2007, p.161). In fact, the nature of the specific feminist discourse promoted in the media intermingles both feminist and anti-feminist sentiments and values, conferring a distinctly postfeminist stance upon it (Gill 2007).

Favouring wide circulation over contents, media platforms shape the feminist essence that garners visibility and, therefore, popularity (Banet-Weiser, Gill & Rottenberg 2019). However, visibility doesn’t amount to transformation: debates on rights and social justice are remarkably absent from the issues tackled while happiness, work-family balance, body-positivity, self-confidence, or gender equality expressed in capitalist terms (the gender pay gap) take centre stage (Banet-Weiser, Gill & Rottenberg 2019). Overall, the type of feminist content that has garnered the greatest attention and media visibility emphasizes ‘a strong sense of female autonomy, agency and choice’ (Banet-Weiser, Gill & Rottenberg 2019, p.5) and is about individual success and uplift, not about taking apart patriarchal structures, systemic violence or intersectional discrimination (Banet-Weiser, Gill & Rottenberg 2019). It promotes a focus on individualism and empowerment, in stark alignment with the postfeminist sensibility,

except that it carries with it an assertive, even defiant, endorsement of feminism (Banet-Weiser, Gill & Rottenberg 2019). Therefore, through increasing yet skewed media visibility, selected feminist ideas and ideals have been conflated and enmeshed into a postfeminist sensibility and the neoliberal rhetoric of choice and agency, properly entangled in discourses of individualism and consumerism (Wilkes 2015). Rendered palatable through the cleansing of its radical and transformative dimension, this hyper-individualized type of feminism that encourages women to focus on themselves and their own aspirations is more easily popularized, distributed and affectionately embraced by a wider audience (Banet-Weiser, Gill & Rottenberg 2019).

The Emergence of Neoliberal Feminism

Thanks to widespread diffusion and embrace within mainstream Anglo-Saxon media, the confidence cult(ure) achieved the tour de force which consists of blending together a postfeminist tenor with handpicked feminist claims and aspirations while steeping it all into a markedly contemporary neoliberal agenda. We are consequently witnessing the emergence of a new kind of apolitical, neoliberal feminism, stripped of any radical and transformative content and agenda, that takes its roots in a postfeminist narrative of empowerment, individualism and consumerism (Gill & Orgad 2016). Within this neoliberal feminism framework, an atmosphere of assertiveness displaces politics. A vague and diffuse boldness (Budgeon 2011), a sense of ‘hollow defiance’ (Banet-Weiser, Gill & Rottenberg 2019, p.14) and a spirit of rebellion without a cause (Gill & Kana, 2018) are enacted on media platforms through assertions of individualism such as “Love your body” or “Be who you want to be” (Gill & Orgad 2017). Yet they have no specified target nor calls for any kind of social, economic or political change (Gill & Kanai 2018). Although these acts may convey a sense of empowerment and provide an experience of resistance, they are not political in and of themselves – politics cannot be reduced to mere bold self-expression, regardless of its form or content (Budgeon 2011). This type of hollow defiance requires cheek and self-belief but indeed, not political or societal change (Gill & Kanai 2018).

In light of this, Gill & Orgad (2017 p.32) argue that the confidence cult(ure) project is ‘simultaneously political, psychological and aesthetic.’ Political because in outlawing so-called negative feelings, the confidence cult(ure) prohibits affects deemed political such as indignation, complaint and, most importantly, anger (Gill & Orgad 2018). These feelings are repudiated and must be constantly reframed in an upbeat and resilient manner through diligent self-work (Gill & Kanai 2018). Psychological because it is deeply implicated in transforming women’s subjectivities – their relationships to themselves, their minds and their emotions (Gill & Kanai 2018; Gill & Orgad 2017; Gill & Orgad 2018). Aesthetic because this new strand of neoliberal feminism must be presented not as a political movement but rather as an appealing and stylish identity (Gill & Orgad 2017); this is carried out by figuring a feminist as beautiful within and without, self-possessed, warm, successful and positive, in stark contrast with previous portrayals of feminists as either unkempt or angry – the notorious feminist killjoy (Ahmed 2010, cited in Gill & Orgad 2017). Here, the political, the psychological and the

aesthetic merge together to bring into being the patriarchy-friendly neoliberal feminist: nonthreatening, resilient, uncomplaining, and appealing (Gill & Orgad 2017).

Two Case Studies

Girl Power

Pomerantz, Raby and Stefanik (2013) and Gonick (2006) trace the origin of Girl Power back to the early 1990s, to an emerging underground feminist punk movement from the United States' punk scene: the Riot Grrrls. Originally associated with assertiveness and dynamism, Girl Power used to celebrate 'the fierce and aggressive potential of girls' (Gonick 2006, p.7). The term subsequently extended to feminist blogs, newsletters, magazines, concerts and websites determined to help young women organize to fight social injustice. However, the political and social intention behind these words began to lose its original transformative power when marketers realized that female empowerment was 'an easily digested form of pseudo-feminist branding' (Pomerantz, Raby & Stefanik 2013, p.189). From then on, Girl Power entered the American mainstream cultural arenas through an incredible array of products and services such as the music industry, the film industry, television series or products targeted at very young girls; it even infiltrated policy initiatives and education debates in the United States (Gonick 2006). The essence of Girl Power proved to be conveniently accommodating to the use and goals of whoever called upon it as it adapted (and still does) to the very contexts and objectives of its articulation (Gonick 2006). This inevitably entailed that its increasingly widespread adoption led to the dilution of its original meaning and intent (Pomerantz, Raby & Stefanik 2013).

Yet of all actors, it is most likely the Spice Girls, the British all-girl band, that took Girl Power to its climax – and with it, embedded its defining features into a resolutely postfeminist tone (Bae 2011). In the Spice Girls' care, Girl Power came to signify a female subject who is self-reliant, highly (even defiantly) confident, ambitious and independent (Pomerantz, Raby & Stefanik 2013) as well as 'assertive, dynamic and unbound from the constraint of passive femininity' (Gonick 2006, p.2) and victimhood (Pomerantz, Raby & Stefanik 2013). Portraying a female individual as empowered and as an active agent in her self-construction (Gonick 2006), Girl Power became a discourse of individualized female freedom and empowerment. However, this power was to be claimed and expressed through the demonstration of excessive femininity enacted through a hypersexualized self (Pomerantz, Raby & Stefanik 2013). Women who adhered to this Girl Power discourse were encouraged to become 'worshippers of feminine beauty' in the name of feminism (Bae 2011, p.28) and, paradoxically, to reclaim power over patriarchy by means of sexual attractiveness (Bae 2011).

How did this take hold in Western society? Unsurprisingly, through the mainstream media. While the Riot Grrrls's Girl Power was looked down upon, the Spice Girls' was celebrated – The Village Voice wrote that the Spice Girls 'have done the seemingly impossible: they have made feminism, with all its implied threat, cuddly, sexy, safe, and most importantly, sellable'

(Press & Nichols 1997, p.10, cited in Gonick 2006, p.9). The all-girl band provided the ultimate springboard that made it possible to turn Girl Power into a marketable – indeed, lucrative – concept which intermingled successful femininity with consumerism and individualism – the hallmark of neoliberalism. Besides its commercial potential, Girl Power was, at the same time, promoting and endorsing the new female ideal subject that neoliberalism demanded (Gonick 2006): resilient, confident and responsible for their individual successes and failures – an apt and convenient answer to the pervasive neoliberal injunction to succeed in the face of all adversities. Yet, most interestingly, there is a last point that explains the widespread embrace of the Spice Girls’ embodiment of Girl Power: it was, in this form, ‘the gentle, non-political, and non-threatening alternative to [radical] feminism’ (Gonick 2006, p.10). This enabled women and girls to relate to their feelings in a non-political way and to think of womanhood and girlhood as a space outside of social and political action (Pomerantz, Raby & Stefanik 2013). In a nutshell, and in Gonick’s (2006, p.10) words: ‘Girl Power’s popularity is credited to its very lack of threat to the status quo.’ Emptied out of the collective and transformative power it once had, Girl Power came to shape the essence of the neoliberal feminist.

Successful Girls

Successful Girls, for its part, is attributed to the remaking of North American girlhood since the 1970s. Feminist interventions were designed to enable girls to see themselves as winners who were proud of their being female. Because of their impressive educational and workplace successes, “girl” became synonymous with social mobility and social change (Pomerantz, Raby & Stefanik 2013). The Successful Girls narrative constructed girlhood and womanhood as beyond sexism and, in fact, portrayed girls as ‘the new dominant sex’ (Pomerantz, Raby & Stefanik 2013, p.191). Therefore, it took the postfeminist assertion that feminism is passé and no longer relevant a step further: not only are gender inequalities rendered non-existent, the playing field is now tilted in girls’ favour. Pomerantz, Raby and Stefanik (2013) describe the Successful Girls subject as follows: flexible, highly versatile and adaptable (fundamental neoliberal dispositions); independent and in charge of her own decision-making (the choice and empowerment discourse); and engaged in the process of self-transformation (the makeover paradigm). As she garners all key neoliberal dispositions and qualities, she is able to achieve everything – whether in relationships, the workplace or education – and thrives effortlessly in all circumstances, merely bouncing back when faced with setbacks, misfortune or tribulations (Pomerantz, Raby & Stefanik 2013). Successful Girls are the unqualified winners of the neoliberal order, much so to the detriment of the boys who do not even stand a chance; they have unlimited choice and live in a post-sexist, post-oppressive society because feminism has achieved its goals (Pomerantz, Raby & Stefanik 2013).

Taken together, Girl Power and Successful Girls discourses insidiously suggest that women and girls “have it all” and that the female subject is the best position to inhabit within the neoliberal order (Pomerantz, Raby & Stefanik 2013). However, according to Gonick (2006), although these narratives enable women and girls to feel strong, competent and empowered – claiming choice, autonomy and agency rather than victimhood – they also eclipse structural

inequalities and oppression and, with that, the requirement for change. Behind a pretence of self-determination and agency, female emancipation is framed by individualism and consumerism; feminine identity becomes unthinkable outside consumption; “empowerment”, which is conditional on self-confidence and sexual attractiveness, is constructed through rather than against society’s patriarchal structure; and a woman’s success signifies her embodiment of the ideal neoliberal subject: the neoliberal feminist (Bae 2011; Gonick 2006).

Conclusion

In this essay, I shed light on the emergence of a new type of feminism that is amenable to patriarchal neoliberalism: neoliberal feminism. The latter draws from postfeminism and selected elements of a broader feminist discourse – which emphasizes autonomy, choice and empowerment – properly entangled in the neoliberal paradigm of consumerism and individualism. Such unexpected conflation of seemingly contradictory sources was rendered possible through the confidence cult(ure) – which, despite its resolutely postfeminist foundation, unabashedly rebrands itself as feminist – and notably by means of its widespread diffusion and embrace within mainstream Anglo-Saxon media. Behind a facade of concern for women’s well-being, neoliberal feminism turns out to be a political, psychological and aesthetic project aiming at the crafting of the new apolitical, patriarchy-friendly neoliberal female subject: the neoliberal feminist.

References

Bae, M. S. (2011) ‘Interrogating Girl Power: Girlhood, Popular Media, and Postfeminism’, *Visual Arts Research*, 37(2), pp. 28-40.

Banet-Weiser, S., Gill, R., & Rottenberg, C. (2019) ‘Postfeminism, Popular Feminism and Neoliberal Feminism? Sarah Banet-Weiser, Rosalind Gill and Catherine Rottenberg in Conversation’ *Feminist Theory*, 21(1), pp. 3-24.

Budgeon, S. (2011) ‘The Contradictions of Successful Femininity: Third-Wave Feminism, Postfeminism and ‘New’ Femininities’ in Gill, R. & Scharff, C. (eds.) *New Femininities: Postfeminism, Neoliberalism and Subjectivity*. New-York: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 279-292.

Gill, R. (2007) ‘Postfeminist Media Culture: Elements of a Sensibility’ *European Journal of Cultural Studies*, 10(2), pp. 147-166.

Gill, R. (2017) ‘The Affective, Cultural and Psychic Life of Postfeminism: A Postfeminist Sensibility 10 Years On’, *European Journal of Cultural Studies*, 20(6), pp. 606–626.

Gill, R. & Kanai, A. (2018) ‘Mediating Neoliberal Capitalism: Affect, Subjectivity and Inequality’ *Journal of Communication*, 68(2), pp. 318-326.

Gill, R. & Orgad, S. (2016) ‘The Confidence Cult(ure)’ *Australian Feminist Studies*, 30(86), pp. 324-344.

Dearcadh: Graduate Journal of Gender, Globalisation and Rights
 Volume 4, 2023
 DOI:
 URL:

Gill, R. & Orgad, S. (2017) 'Confidence Culture and the Remaking of Feminism' *New Formations*, 91, pp. 16-34.

Gill, R. & Orgad, S. (2018) 'The Amazing Bounce-Backable Woman: Resilience and the Psychological Turn in Neoliberalism', *Sociological Research Online*, 23(2), pp. 477-495.

Gonick, M. (2006) 'Between "Girl Power" and "Reviving Ophelia": Constituting the Neoliberal Girl Subject' *National Women's Studies Association Journals*, 18(2), pp. 1-23.

Pomerantz, S., Raby, R. & Stefanik, A. (2013) 'GIRLS RUN THE WORLD? Caught Between Sexism and Postfeminism in School' *Gender and Society*, 27(2), pp. 185-207.

Showden, C. R. (2009) 'What's Political about the New Feminisms?' *Frontiers: A Journal of Women Studies*, 30(2), pp. 166-198.

Wilkes, K. (2015) 'Colluding with Neo-Liberalism: Post-Feminist Subjectivities, Whiteness and Expressions of Entitlement', *Feminist Review*, 110(1), pp. 18-33.



About the Author: Trained as an elementary teacher with experience in both French Guiana and Paris's poorest suburbs, I sought to foster gender equality, gender awareness and girls' self-confidence in my classes by giving them prominent and leading roles and responsibilities, and by including them as main participants in building class lessons. In 2021, I felt the desire to take that initiative further to learn more about what it means to be a woman or a girl in this world – I have, in this regard, a particular interest in intersectionality which emerged during my experiences in Guiana and Paris's suburbs. I therefore resumed my studies at the University of Galway with the Postgraduate Diploma in Gender, Globalization and Rights. After completing the program, I returned to the teaching field in France and I now intend to move overseas to teach French as a Second Language in Ontario, Canada, from September 2023 onward.

Author Contact Details:

Email: damien.legoff@hotmail.com