

THE IN A HURRY SERIES

Feminism *in a Hurry*

The longest revolution

Max Brocklesby

BOOKSINAHURRY.COM

Contents

The Whole Thing in One Page 4

Why You Should Care 5

The Core Ideas 7

How It Actually Works 21

What People Get Wrong 31

Use It 36

Terms 41

Go Deeper 44

Notes and Sources 46

Bibliography 53

The Whole Thing in One Page

Feminism is often told as a march from exclusion to equality. Women were denied education, property, votes and professions; campaigners demanded entry; laws changed; progress followed. The picture is comforting because it gives the struggle a direction and an ending. It is also too clean. Feminism has never been one army, equality is not one destination, and a right written into law does not tell you who can use it.

The movement began with a political discovery. Arrangements described as natural, personal or private were distributing power. Marriage decided whose legal identity survived the wedding. Property rules decided who could leave. Education decided whose judgement counted. The franchise decided who could authorise the state. Paid work decided who had an income, while unpaid care decided who had the time to earn one. Sexual rules and reproductive control shaped the risks attached to intimacy. Violence enforced boundaries that law often declined to see.

Once those arrangements were made political, they could be contested. That is feminism in its broadest defensible sense: ideas and organised action directed against durable hierarchies built around sex, and towards greater freedom and equality for women. The wording leaves room for disagreement because the movement contains a great deal of it. Liberal feminists sought equal rights and access. Socialists examined labour and property. Radicals treated male power in sexuality, family and violence as a system in its own right. Black, postcolonial, lesbian, Indigenous, disability and queer feminists showed that no woman arrives in the world carrying sex alone.

The history therefore has several fronts rather than a single line. Legal personhood had to be separated from fathers and husbands. Citizenship had to become more than a male category. Work had to include the labour hidden inside homes. Bodily freedom had to include reproductive choice, sexual consent and protection from coercion. Violence had to be recognised as public harm even when committed in private. Culture had to stop treating

male experience as the human default. The category women had to survive criticism from people it had excluded.

The victories were real. Women entered universities, professions, electorates, legislatures and institutions that had been built without them. Yet the revolution kept moving because each gain entered an existing system. A vote can coexist with poverty, intimidation and exclusion from office. A job can coexist with a second shift at home. Formal bodily autonomy can coexist with no clinic, no money or no safety. A law against violence can coexist with police, courts and services unable or unwilling to enforce it.

Juliet Mitchell called women's liberation "the longest revolution" in 1966 because women's position joined production, reproduction, sexuality and the social training of children. Her model was Marxist and contested, but the title catches the larger truth. There is no single palace to seize. Sex hierarchy is reproduced through ordinary decisions in law, markets, families, bodies, language and habit. Change one part and pressure can move to another. The revolution lasts because its object is the organisation of everyday life.

That is the book.

Why You Should Care

On 24 October 1975, women across Iceland stopped. They left offices, factories, schools, shops and homes, withdrawing paid labour and unpaid care for one day. The organisers called it a Women's Day Off rather than a strike, a compromise that helped draw support across political lines. Twenty-five thousand people gathered in central Reykjavik, in a country of about 220,000. The action made a fact visible by removing it: the country depended on work that was routinely treated as secondary, private or free.

The demonstration had an intellectual advantage over a speech. It did not have to persuade anyone that the work mattered. For a day, other people had to manage without it. The economy had not acquired a new

dependency that morning. An old dependency had become inconvenient enough to notice.

That changes what counts as infrastructure. Roads and power stations belong to the public account of how a country works. The people who get its workers fed, rested and back to work tend to disappear into the word family. Affection makes this labour meaningful; it does not make the hours limitless. A society can praise mothers while arranging its working day as though nobody has children. Once you notice that contradiction, an office timetable starts telling you something that an equality statement cannot.

Feminism is full of discoveries of this kind. What looks like a personal shortcoming may be a recurring cost allocated to the same people. What looks like protection may give someone else authority to decide. What looks like a neutral rule may have been designed around a life that another person cannot lead. None of these conclusions follows from a difference alone. The interest lies in finding out how the arrangement works.

Consider an imaginary couple deciding who will reduce paid hours to care for a child. Choosing the lower earner may make financial sense. It may also lower that person's future earnings and make the next similar decision easier to predict. Nobody needs to issue an order. A reasonable response to today's circumstances can help create tomorrow's unequal circumstances. Whether the couple regards the arrangement as fair is a further question, not something an observer can settle by inspecting their payslips.

The stakes can be much harsher than a lost promotion. The World Health Organization estimates that nearly one woman in three aged fifteen or older has experienced physical or sexual violence by an intimate partner, non-partner sexual violence, or both. Calling a relationship private does not make the danger inside it less real. Feminist campaigns changed who was expected to answer for that danger: the burden could no longer be left entirely with the person trying to avoid it.

Nor does the story divide neatly into enlightened women and obstructive men. A professional woman and the woman she employs to provide care

may need different reforms. Men can benefit from unequal arrangements while opposing them; women can defend hierarchies they have learned to survive within. These are reasons to examine power more closely, not to abandon the examination. A movement that promises freedom has to argue about whose freedom, at whose expense, and with what room to disagree.

This book follows that argument from legal dependence and the vote into work, bodily authority and the movement's own disputes. The victories matter, as do the people whom each settlement missed. You need not agree with every feminist remedy to understand what the questions reveal.

The reward is a different view of ordinary life. A right, a wage or a household arrangement is no longer the end of the explanation. It is the place to begin asking how much freedom a person can use. The Icelandic protesters made their work visible by stopping it. The rest of us need to learn to see it while it is being done.

The Core Ideas

Hierarchy Hides in Ordinary Life

Power is easiest to recognise when it wears a uniform. A law excludes a group from voting. A university refuses admission. An employer states that a profession is closed to women. Early feminist campaigns attacked such rules because the barrier and the authority maintaining it were visible.

The harder discovery was that power could operate without an official at the door. A wife might be legally free to work but expected to organise the home around her husband's job. A woman could refuse sex in theory while economic dependence, social shame or fear made refusal dangerous. A girl might be allowed to study any subject while teachers, parents, classmates and images of competence quietly narrowed what felt possible. No single decision creates the pattern. Repeated decisions make it durable.

This is what the phrase "the personal is political" was built to expose. Carol Hanisch wrote the paper that acquired that title in 1969 after women's

discussion groups were dismissed as therapy. The women were talking about housework, money, sex, appearance, children and relationships. Critics called these private problems. Hanisch's reply was that similar experiences across many lives pointed towards shared conditions and power relations, not a collection of individual failures.

The claim does not mean that government should direct every conversation, desire or household task. Political has a wider meaning: the distribution of authority, resources, risk and the capacity to choose. A private arrangement becomes politically relevant when its terms are patterned, when one party has weaker exit options, or when law and institutions help set the bargain while pretending not to.

Patriarchy is one name for this pattern. Properly used, it does not describe a secret male committee, nor does it imply that every man commands every woman. It names systems in which authority, property, status and credible public voice tend to be organised around male dominance and female dependence. The form varies. A wealthy woman may command poorer men. A mother may enforce rules that constrained her. Men can be punished for failing masculine expectations. None of that makes the distribution symmetrical or imaginary.

The pattern is learned before it is defended. Children observe who interrupts work for care, whose surname continues, who is feared on a dark street, who speaks without being challenged, who handles money and whose anger carries danger. Institutions are then built around the same expectations. The standard worker is imagined as continuously available. Parts of basic and preclinical biomedical research have relied disproportionately on male animals and cells, limiting what could safely be inferred across sexes. The standard political career assumes somebody else is handling home.

The distinction between public and private helped preserve the arrangement. Governments claimed authority over contracts, property, taxation and criminal law while treating the family as a natural zone beyond politics. Yet the state had already shaped marriage, legitimacy, custody and

inheritance. Non-intervention was never neutral. It meant leaving the existing distribution of authority in place and calling the result domestic life.

Once a pattern is named, it becomes harder to pass off as nature. That does not prove the remedy. It changes the burden of explanation. The person defending the arrangement must show why it is necessary, rather than asking the excluded person to explain why she will not adapt.

This is the first engine of feminism. It moves an arrangement from fate into argument.

Equality Starts with Personhood

Before equality can be distributed, the law has to recognise the person receiving it. Much early feminism was therefore less about identical outcomes than about legal existence.

English common law expressed the problem through coverture. On marriage, a woman's separate legal position was constrained by her husband's. The doctrine was never as absolute in practice as the slogan that husband and wife became one person suggests. Equity, custom, class and local law created exceptions, and unmarried women could hold property. The central fact remained: marriage could transfer control over earnings, property, contracts and legal action in ways that made dependence part of the institution.

That is why property reform mattered beyond wealth. Independent ownership changes the terms on which a person can refuse, leave, borrow, inherit and plan. In England and Wales, the Married Women's Property Acts of 1870 and 1882 expanded married women's control over earnings and property. Similar reforms took different paths elsewhere. They did not abolish marital hierarchy, but they altered the outside option inside a marriage. A bargain changes when both parties can survive its failure.

Education worked the same way. Mary Wollstonecraft's argument in 1792 was devastating because it turned an alleged fact about women into an artefact of training. If girls were raised for dependence, ornament and

pleasing men, their restricted judgement could not prove natural inferiority. The experiment had been designed to produce the result used to justify the experiment.

Admission to schools and universities therefore carried more than a certificate. It gave women recognised knowledge, professional credentials, networks and the authority to interpret their own condition. Entry into medicine, law, science and public administration challenged the claim that women needed protection from demanding work. It also revealed that access could be formal while institutions remained organised around male careers, bodies and biographies.

Legal personhood includes the body. A person who cannot consent to marriage, refuse sex, retain nationality, pass citizenship to children, decide where to live or obtain a divorce on workable terms possesses rights with a large hole in the middle. Feminist legal campaigns therefore spread across family law, nationality, guardianship, inheritance, employment, violence and reproductive decision-making. These issues are often taught separately. They all ask whether a woman is treated as an independent bearer of interests or as a function inside somebody else's household.

Nationality law made the dependency unusually plain. Under the United States' Expatriation Act of 1907, an American woman who married a foreigner lost her US citizenship. Marriage could change her relationship with the state without her leaving the country. Independent nationality campaigns challenged the assumption that a husband should determine his wife's political membership. The passport became a test of whether she belonged to the nation in her own right.

Personhood is not the same as individualism. Some feminist traditions place greater weight on community, care and interdependence than on the self-sufficient rights holder. The correction is that interdependence should not mean one person's needs becoming another person's unchosen duty. People depend on one another. The political question is who decides the terms, who carries the risk and whose dependence is honoured.

Legal equality then creates a second question: whether one rule applied to everyone is enough. A workplace designed around uninterrupted full-time service may state the same conditions for men and women while producing different burdens because pregnancy and care are not evenly distributed. Substantive equality asks whether institutions should adjust for relevant differences or inherited disadvantage. That can require accommodation, public provision or targeted measures, and it raises legitimate disputes about cost, evidence and fairness. The distinction matters because identical wording can preserve an unequal starting design.

The deepest legal shift is therefore easy to miss. The old arrangement asked what status a woman occupied in relation to a father, husband or family. The feminist question asks what independent authority she retains as herself.

Citizenship Is More Than a Ballot

The vote is the cleanest feminist victory because the before and after can be dated. New Zealand's Electoral Act of 1893 made it the first self-governing country in which women had the right to vote in parliamentary elections. Britain extended the parliamentary franchise to some women in 1918 and placed women and men on equal terms in 1928. The United States ratified the Nineteenth Amendment in 1920, barring denial of the vote on account of sex.

The victories did not open every door together. New Zealand women could vote before they could stand for Parliament. Britain's 1918 settlement used age and property restrictions that excluded many women and treated them differently from men. The American amendment did not remove racial terror, registration rules, citizenship exclusions and other barriers that kept many Black, Indigenous, Asian American and Latina women from the polls. Formal enfranchisement opened a gate whose path remained unequal.

Why did the vote matter so much? Because it altered who counted as part of the public. A voter could be courted, blamed and organised. Parties had to consider women as an electorate, even when they misunderstood them as a

single bloc. A demand that could previously be dismissed as the concern of somebody's wife now came from a constituent. Winning the franchise changed the standing from which later demands could be made.

Yet citizenship is wider than voting. It includes standing for office, speaking with authority, serving on juries, controlling public money, shaping parties, entering the civil service and being treated as someone whose interests need no male translator. A legislature can contain female members while remaining dependent on hours, harassment, networks and selection procedures that filter who reaches it. On 1 January 2026, women occupied 27.5 per cent of all seats across the world's national parliaments. That figure measures presence, not influence, ideology or which women's interests they represent.

The methods used to win suffrage also matter. Petitioners gathered signatures door to door, built local associations, published newspapers, held mass meetings, lobbied legislators, endured ridicule and, in some campaigns, used civil disobedience, hunger strikes or attacks on property. Tactics differed and provoked bitter disputes. The shared achievement was organisational: women created political machinery before the state accepted them as political actors.

Representation creates its own argument. One view holds that justice requires institutions to resemble the population because exclusion wastes experience and signals that authority has a sex. Another warns against assuming a woman in office will pursue feminist policy, or that shared sex erases conflicts of class, race, religion and party. The claims need not contradict each other. Descriptive representation can change legitimacy, priorities and the pool of experience without guaranteeing any particular decision.

Public authority also depends on how an audience hears a speaker. Confidence can be praised in one person and punished in another; expertise can be presumed or repeatedly tested. The pattern varies by setting and does not explain every encounter. Its significance is that permission to speak cannot guarantee the authority to be heard.

Feminist citizenship therefore has two tasks. It removes explicit exclusion, then examines the machinery that converts presence into power. The ballot is indispensable because it recognises membership. It is insufficient because membership has to operate through parties, institutions, resources and belief.

The Economy Has an Unpaid Floor

Every paid economy rests on work for which no wage appears. Children are fed, clothes washed, homes cleaned, relatives cared for, appointments arranged, meals planned and workers restored enough to return the next morning. Some of this labour is affectionate, shared and freely chosen. It is still labour in the plain sense that time and effort are used to meet needs.

Feminist economics made that floor visible. Conventional national accounts record a meal bought from a restaurant as economic output. A similar meal cooked at home usually disappears from measured production. Most unpaid household services fall outside the production boundary used for GDP; they can instead be estimated in separate household accounts. That boundary also shapes perception. What is omitted from the account can look as though it costs nothing.

The distribution is not even. Time-use research repeatedly finds women performing more unpaid domestic and care work than men, although the size and form of the gap vary greatly across countries, income groups and households. Using data from 125 countries, the International Labour Organization estimated that 708 million women worldwide were outside the labour force in 2023 with care responsibilities cited as the reason. That is not a count of women making one identical choice. It combines constraints involving childcare, elder care, services, norms, household bargaining, job quality and income.

Paid work changed women's position because an income can widen exit, credit, status and future security. It did not remove the unpaid floor. When women entered employment while care changed less, many acquired a second shift. Others purchased help, often from poorer, migrant or racialised

women. The work moved between women rather than disappearing. A professional success story can therefore rest on somebody else's low-paid care labour.

This is why the raw gender pay gap needs care. It is a descriptive difference in average or median earnings under a stated measure. It is not a direct meter of discrimination. Hours, occupation, seniority, experience, sector, geography, parenthood, bargaining, sorting and discrimination all contribute, and the variables affect one another. Controlling for occupation can clarify one comparison while removing a channel through which discrimination or care constraints operate. "Explained" does not mean fair, and "unexplained" does not prove bias.

Imagine a promotion decision in a workplace that prizes availability. A worker who refuses overtime because a nursery closes at six may look less committed than a colleague whose care has been absorbed by a partner. The employer sees two individual choices; the household system has delivered two different supplies of time. Promotion criteria can therefore reward access to unpaid support without naming it.

A reform must reach the mechanism creating the disadvantage. Equal-pay rules address unequal reward for equal work or work of equal value. They do not by themselves provide childcare or make a shift predictable. Leave and childcare provision can make employment possible, while collective bargaining can change who has leverage over its terms. Policies also interact: leave available only to mothers may protect an income while reinforcing the expectation that mothers will interrupt their careers. The useful question is not which measure sounds most supportive, but which constraint it changes and what new incentives it creates.

The economic question is broader than getting women into existing jobs. It asks how work was designed, which worker it assumes and who supplies the time that makes that worker possible. A system can welcome women at the office door while leaving the old household contract untouched.

Feminism did not discover that care matters. It discovered that calling care

love does not settle who must provide it.

Bodily Authority Sets the Terms of Freedom

Pregnancy is biological. Who controls its consequences is political.

A person who can become pregnant faces consequences that a partner may share but cannot physically divide: gestation, birth, health risk and often a larger interruption to paid work. Laws, medicine, family expectations and access to contraception determine how far those consequences can be planned. Reproductive control therefore changes education, employment, marriage, sexuality and the timing of an entire life.

Contraception expanded the ability to separate sex from childbirth, but access has never been a neutral technical story. Price, prescription rules, age, marital status, medical gatekeeping, religion and geography have shaped who could use it. So have coercive programmes. States have sterilised, pressured or targeted women they judged poor, disabled, Indigenous, racially undesirable or too fertile. Reproductive freedom cannot mean access to birth control alone. It must include the right to have children, not have children and raise them in safe conditions.

That broader frame became known as reproductive justice, developed by Black women activists in the United States in the 1990s. It corrected a politics built around individual choice by asking what makes a choice usable. A legal abortion right has little practical force without a provider, transport, money, time and protection from intimidation. A formal right to continue a pregnancy is hollow if housing, healthcare or disability support make survival impossible. Capacity completes the right.

Sexual authority raises the same question in another form. Older legal and social orders often treated marriage as permanent consent and male access as part of the contract. Feminist campaigns against marital rape and sexual harassment challenged the assumption that relationship or workplace status could cancel bodily personhood. Consent marks a necessary boundary. Power shapes the conditions around it. Economic dependence, fear, age, professional authority, immigration status and social punishment can make

refusal costly without making every unequal relationship non-consensual.

Violence is not merely one issue on feminism's list. It can enforce the rest of the hierarchy. The threat of assault or retaliation changes where a person goes, what she says, which job she takes, whether she reports abuse and how expensive leaving becomes. Much of that control operates before violence is carried out. It survives through anticipation.

Feminist organising changed the public meaning of this harm. Refuges, rape crisis centres, legal campaigns and survivor organisations challenged institutions that treated abuse inside relationships as less serious than violence between strangers. They also exposed how disbelief, economic dependence and official inaction can turn a nominal right to safety into a private burden of avoidance. Men and boys also experience domestic and sexual violence, and no single theory explains every assault. The feminist contribution was to show that patterns of victimisation, fear and institutional response can be organised by sex and gender rather than occurring as isolated misfortune.

Bodily autonomy does not settle every dispute. Feminists divide over abortion, surrogacy, sex work, pornography, medical risk and the boundary between choice and exploitation. One tradition emphasises freedom from state, religious or male control. Another stresses how markets, violence and unequal resources can manufacture consent. The relevant trade-offs differ by activity and institution. A label cannot decide them.

The durable insight is that authority over the body changes bargaining power far beyond the body. It affects who can study, earn, leave, lead and imagine a future not organised around an imposed risk. A society may declare women equal while making sex, pregnancy or safety subject to somebody else's veto. Feminism treats that contradiction as structural, not private misfortune.

Women Is a Coalition, Not One Position

Every mass movement needs a name for the people on whose behalf it speaks. Feminism chose women. The category was politically powerful because sex-based rules were explicit and widespread. It was also unstable because women never occupied one social position.

A property-owning woman demanding access to a profession and a domestic worker demanding decent pay could confront the same hierarchy from opposite sides of an employment contract. A white suffragist might condemn sex exclusion while accepting racial rule. A nationalist movement might mobilise women as symbols of the nation, then return authority to men after independence. A reform that helps married citizens may miss migrants, unmarried women, lesbians, disabled women or people working outside formal law.

Black feminist thought forced this problem into the centre. The Combahee River Collective argued in 1977 that racial, sexual, heterosexual and class oppression were interlocking, and that Black women could not treat any one as a detachable extra. Kimberlé Crenshaw's 1989 legal critique gave the problem a now famous name: intersectionality.

One of her examples was *DeGraffenreid v. General Motors*. In 1976, Black women challenged a seniority system that, they argued, carried earlier hiring discrimination into layoffs. The court pointed to GM's previous employment of women when rejecting the sex-discrimination claim. It directed the racial claim towards a separate lawsuit, refusing to treat discrimination against Black women as a combined category. A remedy was available in principle, but the categories used to recognise the injury pulled the claim apart.

Intersectionality is often flattened into a list of identities or a competition in disadvantage. Crenshaw's question was more exacting: whose experience has been allowed to define the category? A rule that recognises women through the experience of white women can overlook a harm specific to Black women. Adding another identity label will not repair that failure unless the institution changes what it looks for. The same discipline applies

elsewhere: name the decision, trace the disadvantage, and ask why the existing test cannot see it.

Global feminism made a related correction. Women elsewhere were not waiting to receive politics from Europe or North America. They developed arguments through local struggles over education, labour, colonial rule and family law. Ideas crossed borders, but international organisations and donors sometimes translated different problems into categories designed elsewhere. Solidarity could bring resources while erasing the context in which they were needed.

Coalition problems do not disappear when difference is acknowledged. A movement still has to choose demands, language, leadership and scarce resources. Total agreement would make collective action impossible; false unity makes it brittle. Strong coalitions identify a shared target while leaving room to argue about what members do not share. They are political constructions, not discoveries of a hidden common essence.

The category is now contested through disputes over sex and gender. Feminist traditions differ over how woman should be understood as a biological class, social position, legal category, identity or combination of these. Several realities are easy to blur: sex-linked reproductive biology has material consequences, gendered roles are socially organised, legal classifications distribute rights and services, and gender identity shapes many people's social lives. The live dispute is which category is relevant to which decision and how competing risks or rights should be weighed. Clinical research, civil status, competitive sport, prisons, shelters and statistical recording have different purposes. One rule cannot be carried across them by slogan.

A coalition survives through specification. It asks who is affected, by which rule, through what mechanism and with what remedy. Unity remains useful, but it cannot be purchased by making the least convenient women invisible.

Victory Moves the Battlefield

A political movement wants law because law can alter incentives, create remedies, fund services and announce a public standard. Feminist history supplies strong evidence that legal change matters. Property rights changed marital bargaining. Voting rights changed citizenship. Anti-discrimination rules gave excluded workers claims against employers. Laws on violence made conduct visible to police, courts and services that had treated it as private.

Law also produces a common illusion: the belief that a problem has ended because its prohibition can be quoted.

The World Bank's *Women, Business and the Law 2026* makes part of that gap measurable. Covering 190 economies, it gives average scores out of 100 of 67 for legal frameworks and 47 for supporting policies and institutions. Its enforcement-perceptions score is 53, based on experts' assessments, not direct observation of every law in action. These are different indices of women's economic opportunity, not percentages of all freedom enjoyed. Their separation is useful: passing a law, supplying the means to use it and enforcing it are different achievements.

Implementation can fail through absence. A right exists, but no office has responsibility. A protection exists, but no budget supports shelters, inspectors, childcare places or legal aid. A complaint procedure exists, but the cost, delay or risk of retaliation makes it unusable. Data may not reveal who is missing. Informal work and family arrangements may sit beyond the institution built to enforce the rule.

Implementation can succeed as well. Once women can own property, enter professions or bring legal claims, expectations and investments may change across generations. Parents educate daughters differently. Employers build a larger pool of trained workers. Courts and administrators learn new standards. Formal reform can alter the conduct that later makes the law look obvious. The warning about implementation is not an argument against law. It is an argument for following law into the institutions that give it force.

Success also prompts adaptation. An employer barred from excluding women openly may rely on a career pattern built around uninterrupted availability. A party required to select female candidates may place them in unwinnable seats. A household may accept equal paid work while care remains allocated by habit. None of these responses proves that reform was useless. It shows that power can migrate from an explicit rule into selection, timing, resources and norms.

Then comes backlash. Change can threaten identity, status, material advantage, religious authority or confidence in a familiar order. Opponents may describe equality as privilege, present restored hierarchy as protection, or use genuine policy tensions to discredit a wider settlement. Backlash is not automatic and not every objection is reactionary. It becomes politically important when gains are framed as illegitimate and institutions are organised to reverse them. Afghanistan under Taliban rule is an extreme current case: restrictions across education, work, movement and public life show how quickly formal and practical capacity can be dismantled when coercive authority changes hands.

The old division of authority can therefore survive inside an institution whose formal rules have changed. A legal victory removes one means of exclusion; budgets, recruitment or private bargaining may still preserve another. But reform also changes expectations and creates people with an interest in defending the gain. Neither persistence nor progress happens by magic. Both are carried by institutions and by what people do within them.

That is why feminism can win without finishing. Its history is neither a straight ascent nor a circle in which nothing changes. It is a sequence of altered baselines. A gain can remove one defence of hierarchy, reveal another and give later campaigners more room from which to act. The battlefield moves because the world has changed.

How It Actually Works

Before feminism had a name

In about 1405, Christine de Pizan finished *The Book of the City of Ladies*. She imagined a city built to defend women against a literary tradition that treated them as vain, weak and morally suspect. Her method was to collect counterexamples: rulers, warriors, scholars, saints and inventors whose lives made the general accusation look lazy. She did not propose a modern movement, and the social order she defended remained hierarchical. She had made a durable move: compare what authorities say women are with evidence of what women have done.

Arguments of this kind appeared in many settings without forming one lineage. Women petitioned rulers, founded religious communities, defended property, wrote poetry and philosophy, joined rebellions and used family status to exercise influence. Some argued for women as a group. Others sought exceptions for talented, noble, religious or respectable women. Their words mattered, but a history of feminism cannot be made by retroactively enrolling every woman who resisted a man.

In the preface added to *Some Reflections upon Marriage* in 1706, Mary Astell asked why absolute authority was condemned in the state but tolerated in marriage. Her proposed answer emphasised women's education and religious independence rather than democratic equality. The importance lies in the comparison. Once arbitrary government was objectionable in public, the household could no longer be exempt from the same question.

The modern movement required a broader claim. Women's subordination was not a collection of local abuses. It was a social arrangement that could be described, challenged and changed through collective action. That claim became easier to make when revolutions announced universal rights and then revealed how small their universe was.

Rights expose their missing half

The French Revolution declared the rights of man and of the citizen in 1789. Olympe de Gouges replied in 1791 with a declaration written for woman and the female citizen. She restated revolutionary principles with women placed inside them, including equal participation in law and public office. Two years later she was guillotined amid the Revolution's political repression. Her death should not be reduced to punishment for one feminist text, but the regime's hostility to politically active women was plain.

Mary Wollstonecraft's *A Vindication of the Rights of Woman* followed in 1792. Education was its means of turning a claim about rational capacity into a different social order. Girls should not be trained merely to secure a husband and then blamed for dependence. Women needed the judgement to act as citizens and companions, rather than the accomplishments required to please. The argument reached past the schoolroom into the kind of marriage an educated woman could expect.

These writers exposed a contradiction inside liberalism. If authority needed justification, inherited sex hierarchy needed it too. If rational adults possessed rights, women could not be excluded by declaring them permanently childlike. The same logic entered arguments over marriage, property, schooling and work.

The revolutionary settlement often moved the other way. The Napoleonic Civil Code strengthened a husband's legal authority within marriage and influenced legal systems far beyond France. Political revolutions could abolish inherited privilege among men while rebuilding sex hierarchy inside the family. Universal language did not carry women automatically. It gave them a standard against which exclusion could be exposed.

The claim remained limited: domestic servants, enslaved and colonised women, and poor wives faced powers that formal citizenship alone could not dissolve. Yet universal rights supplied a portable weapon. A declared principle could be tested against the people it omitted.

Organisation becomes a movement

The nineteenth century turned scattered argument into organisations, conventions, newspapers, petitions and campaigns. In Britain and the United States, abolitionism supplied important skills and conflicts. Women raised funds, circulated petitions, spoke publicly and encountered men who welcomed their labour while disputing their authority. The experience linked slavery, marriage and legal dependence in some activists' thinking, while racial division repeatedly exposed the limits of the comparison.

The Seneca Falls convention of 1848 became a landmark in the United States. Its Declaration of Sentiments adapted the language of American independence to list women's legal, educational, religious, economic and political grievances. The demand for suffrage was the most controversial resolution, not the whole programme. Coverture, custody, wages, professions and moral double standards were already on the table.

Legal reform accumulated through pressure rather than one breakthrough. Married women sought control of earnings and inherited property. Women's colleges and medical schools tested claims about intellectual incapacity. Campaigners fought for custody, divorce and access to professions. Each reform created new organisers and new evidence: once women performed work successfully, the old prediction of failure became harder to repeat unchanged.

Campaigns grew through distinct social worlds. Middle-class reformers often organised through churches, temperance associations and philanthropic networks. Working women organised around hours, wages, safety and union recognition. Socialists argued that legal equality would leave economic dependence intact. Some conservative women used maternal duty rather than individual rights to justify public action. The movement expanded by using arguments that did not fit one philosophy.

Outside Europe and North America, women's politics developed through education, anti-colonial struggle, labour, religious reform and nationalism. Qiu Jin in China attacked footbinding and female dependence while joining

revolutionary politics before her execution in 1907. In Bengal, Begum Rokeya pursued girls' education and used satire to make seclusion look strange.

Her *Sultana's Dream*, published in English in 1905, imagines Ladyland, where women run the country and pursue science while men remain indoors. Its female universities develop solar technology; the people supposedly unfit for public life have become its inventors. The reversal makes an apparently natural division of roles look distinctly convenient to those on the outside. It is an imagined society, not a report of one, and its wit belongs to a Bengali argument about education and power, not a delayed imitation of an Atlantic script.

Suffrage becomes political schooling

Voting campaigns supplied the movement with a measurable objective and a vast organising machine. New Zealand campaigners gathered mass petitions; the best-known 1893 petition carried more than 25,000 signatures. The Electoral Act signed that September made the country the first self-governing state to give women the parliamentary vote. The victory depended on years of temperance, church and political organising, and it did not grant women every political right at once.

Finland adopted full parliamentary rights for women in 1906 while still an autonomous grand duchy within the Russian Empire; nineteen women entered Parliament the following year. Britain's campaign ranged from constitutional lobbying to the militant tactics of the Women's Social and Political Union, whose members broke windows, endured prison and hunger strikes, and divided opinion inside the movement. Some women gained the vote in 1918. Equal franchise terms arrived in 1928.

In the United States, a long campaign ended with the Nineteenth Amendment in 1920. Its operative rule prohibited the federal government and the states from withholding the franchise because of sex. It did not remove other exclusions. Black women in the South still faced the machinery of Jim Crow. Native women's access depended partly on

citizenship status and state law. Asian immigrants faced racial restrictions on naturalisation. A victory described as women winning the vote therefore concealed which women already stood closer to the polling place.

The route looked different in colonised societies. In India, women organised within constitutional reform, social-reform associations and the independence movement. Limited franchises expanded unevenly under colonial rule; universal adult suffrage arrived with the Constitution in 1950. National liberation could give women public roles and postpone their demands at the same time, on the promise that equality would follow independence.

Suffrage campaigns also became entangled with empire and race. Some campaigners defended women's rights through claims of white or national superiority. Others joined anti-imperial, labour or racial-justice movements. The franchise did not purify the coalition. It made the dispute over who represented women more consequential.

After the first suffrage victories

Enfranchisement changed politics without dissolving the structures around it. Women entered parties, legislatures and professions, while movements pursued nationality, family law, maternity protection, wages, welfare and peace. The interwar period does not fit the later story of a quiet gap between feminist waves. Organisations continued, though their language, visibility and priorities shifted.

In south-eastern Nigeria in 1929, women mobilised against fears of a colonial tax on women and against the warrant-chief system. British administrators had built the warrant-chief system around male office-holders while discounting women's political institutions and market networks. Protesters targeted chiefs and Native Courts through forms of collective action drawn from those institutions. Colonial records called the uprising the Aba riots. Later historians' term Women's War restores both its organisation and its political target. The case reverses a simple modernisation story: colonial rule could reduce women's public authority by recognising male

institutions as the only politics that counted.

Political regimes offered sharply different bargains. Liberal states widened some civil rights while preserving household dependence. Fascist governments celebrated motherhood and national reproduction while restricting women's autonomy. Communist states often expanded female education and paid employment, legalised aspects of equality and provided services, yet retained authoritarian power and a heavily gendered domestic burden. None can be reduced to a score on one scale.

Welfare policy became another site of conflict. Maternity benefits, family allowances and protective labour law could recognise women's needs and reduce hardship. They could also define women primarily as mothers, bar them from jobs deemed dangerous and channel public money through male breadwinners. Protection and restriction often arrived in the same statute, which is why formal policy labels reveal less than their operating rules.

The Second World War moved millions of women into jobs and public roles created by mobilisation. Post-war governments sometimes treated this as temporary and rebuilt policy around the male breadwinner and female carer. The contradiction became harder to defend after women had performed work previously declared unsuitable.

International institutions gave equality a new language. The United Nations Charter of 1945 affirmed equal rights of men and women, and the Commission on the Status of Women began work in 1946. International agreements could establish standards and provide campaigners with leverage, but governments retained wide control over implementation.

In 1949, Simone de Beauvoir's *The Second Sex* examined woman as a social position produced in relation to man as the default subject. The work joined philosophy, history, biology, literature and lived experience, and its famous account of becoming a woman helped later feminists separate bodily facts from the social meanings built around them.

Liberation enters the household

In the United States, Betty Friedan's *The Feminine Mystique* in 1963 challenged the promise that fulfilment as a wife and mother should be enough. It gave public language to dissatisfaction among women whose material comfort was supposed to make dissatisfaction unthinkable. Its largely white, middle-class frame also left other women asking whose life was being described.

From the 1960s, women's liberation movements widened the scope of politics. Equal pay, employment discrimination and education remained central. So did contraception, abortion, childcare, housework, sexual pleasure and violence. The shift was not from serious public issues to lifestyle. It was a claim that power operated through both.

Consciousness-raising groups supplied the method. Women described experiences that had been interpreted as personal failure and compared them. Repetition turned isolation into pattern. A husband refusing childcare, an employer treating pregnancy as disloyalty, a doctor dismissing pain and a police officer dismissing domestic abuse as a private matter were not one problem, but they shared an institutional habit of treating women's account as less authoritative.

The new politics produced institutions from below. A refuge needed a building, staff, money and rules for safety. A women's health collective needed clinical knowledge and a challenge to professional authority. A campaign against rape needed changes in law, evidence, policing and public belief. The movement's practical work showed that recognition was only the first stage of making a private harm actionable.

The movement divided over explanation and remedy. Liberal feminists pressed law and institutions to provide equal treatment and opportunity. Socialist feminists linked women's dependence to capitalism, class and the organisation of labour. Radical feminists identified male dominance in sexuality, violence and family as a system not reducible to class. Lesbian feminists challenged heterosexuality as both expectation and institution. The

labels contained arguments within them and travelled unevenly outside their original settings.

Law followed activism at different speeds. Britain passed the Equal Pay Act in 1970 and the Sex Discrimination Act in 1975. The United States prohibited sex discrimination in employment through Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and in federally funded education through Title IX in 1972. Feminists founded refuges, rape crisis centres, health collectives and legal campaigns because formal prohibition did not create support by itself.

Juliet Mitchell's 1966 essay supplied this book's subtitle. She argued that women's condition joined production, reproduction, sexuality and the socialisation of children. The framework was disputed, but it captured why one reform could not finish a system operating on several fronts.

The category is challenged from within

The movements gaining attention as women's liberation often presented white, middle-class or heterosexual experience as general. Critics did more than request inclusion. They changed the model.

Angela Davis traced how slavery, paid labour, domestic service and reproductive control complicated claims made in the name of women. The Combahee River Collective's 1977 statement described racial, sexual, heterosexual and class oppression as interlocking. Its authors rejected the idea that Black women should choose between antiracist movements that marginalised sexism and feminist movements that marginalised racism.

Crenshaw's intervention in 1989 carried this criticism into the design of legal remedies. It asked institutions to recognise the people who disappeared between their categories, rather than asking those people to split their lives into administratively convenient pieces.

Postcolonial feminists challenged accounts in which Western women appeared as liberated agents rescuing a single, passive figure called the Third World woman. They did not deny sex hierarchy. They asked how colonial rule, global labour, war, development policy, religion and national

politics shaped both the problem and the proposed cure. A ban, a dress code, a family-law reform or an employment programme could have different meanings under different authorities.

Lesbian feminists challenged movements that treated heterosexual marriage as every woman's expected future. Disability feminists criticised models of independence that devalued care or treated disabled bodies as problems to be prevented. Indigenous feminists connected sex hierarchy with land, state power and collective survival. These interventions changed what counted as autonomy by showing that freedom can require support, community and control over institutions, not isolation from other people.

Reproductive justice made a similar correction to choice. Black women activists in the United States argued that freedom required the ability to avoid pregnancy, to have children and to raise them in safe communities. The framework joined abortion and contraception to coerced sterilisation, healthcare, poverty, disability, environmental harm and state removal of children.

These critiques did not fragment a previously united movement. They revealed conflicts that unity had hidden.

A global language, a networked movement

The Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women was adopted by the United Nations in 1979 and entered into force in 1981. It gave campaigners an international legal framework across political, economic, social and family life, although reservations, weak enforcement and non-ratification limited its reach. The 1995 Beijing Platform for Action organised a broad programme across twelve critical areas, from poverty and education to violence, media and decision-making.

Transnational networks helped activists compare law, fund services and pressure governments. They could also reward organisations fluent in donor priorities and English-language categories, amplifying some voices while filtering others.

Beneath the international conferences, local organisations still had to secure a shelter, negotiate with officials or persuade a legislature to change a family code. A declaration could strengthen their claim without supplying the money or political room to act on it. Networks helped when they transmitted resources and useful comparisons; they failed when fluency in an international vocabulary displaced knowledge of the problem at home.

Digital media altered mobilisation again. Testimony could move across borders before an organisation had time to control it. Tarana Burke began the Me Too movement in 2006 through work with survivors, especially Black girls and women. Argentina's Ni Una Menos emerged in 2015 from a longer feminist history and mass protest against femicide and gender-based violence. It spread across Latin America and helped renew women's strikes and campaigns connecting violence with work, debt, reproduction and state responsibility.

In 2017, Me Too became a global social-media surge after allegations against powerful men in entertainment. The viral moment expanded recognition of harassment and assault, while exposing the distance between public disclosure, due process, workplace reform and support for less visible workers. These movements travelled across borders without sharing one origin. Networks transmit language in several directions.

Women now occupy institutions from which they were formally barred. In Afghanistan, Taliban rule has shown how education, work, movement and public presence can be restricted through coordinated state power within a few years. Gains and reversals coexist; they are not points on a single global timetable.

The longest revolution is not longest because nothing changes. It is longest because every change has to be made operational, defended and extended to people whom the first settlement missed.

How we know

Feminist history leaves an uneven archive. Literate campaigners, formal organisations, court cases, legislation and international conferences produce documents, so they can dominate the story. Domestic workers, rural organisers, women acting through oral cultures and people who avoided the label feminism are harder to recover. A surviving manifesto proves that an argument existed, not how widely it was shared.

Milestones are easier to date than causation. A law has a signature; the pressure behind it may include decades of organising, party competition, war, economic change, court action and shifts in public belief. This account therefore treats famous campaigns as part of a mechanism rather than sole causes.

The word feminism also changes across language and time. Historians disagree about when to apply it to people who challenged women's subordination without using the modern term or accepting the movement's later assumptions. The book uses the label narrowly for explicit ideas and collective action against sex-based hierarchy, while including earlier arguments as prehistory. The evidence is strongest for movements that kept records and weakest where power left little reason to preserve the opposition.

What People Get Wrong

“Feminism is one doctrine”

The singular noun causes trouble. It makes feminism sound like a programme with an authorised definition, a leader and a settled list of policies. No such object has existed.

The movement contains a family resemblance: resistance to durable hierarchy organised around sex and a demand for greater freedom or equality for women. Almost everything after that can divide it. Is the main mechanism discriminatory law, economic dependence, male violence,

reproductive control, cultural meaning, colonial rule or the gender system itself? Should the remedy be equal treatment, public provision, redistribution, separation, transformed sexuality or the abolition of gendered roles? Answers conflict because diagnosis controls remedy.

Disagreement can reach first principles. Equality may mean sex-blind rules to one tradition and sex-conscious provision to another. One group may see paid work as the route to independence while another asks why freedom is measured by success in institutions built around male careers. Such disputes are not evidence that the movement means nothing. They are arguments over which forms of power matter and what a fair settlement requires.

The fiction of unity is persuasive to both supporters and opponents. Supporters gain the moral force of a common cause. Opponents can take the least defensible statement made by one feminist and attribute it to all. Criticism should therefore land on a claim, organisation or tradition rather than a word containing two centuries of dispute. Asking “what does feminism believe?” is like asking what politics believes. The label tells you the arena. It does not tell you which account of power or freedom is being defended. Name the argument.

“Women became equal when they got the vote”

Suffrage gives history a date and a photograph, so it attracts the weight of an ending. A woman enters a polling booth; citizenship is complete.

The vote was a structural victory. It removed explicit sex exclusion from the electorate, made women a constituency and widened the pool from which political authority could be claimed. It did not itself change property, pay, divorce, care, violence, reproductive control, party selection or access to office. Nor did the formal franchise reach all women equally. In the United States, the Nineteenth Amendment removed sex as a lawful ground for denial while racial, citizenship and administrative barriers remained. Britain’s 1918 franchise covered only some women before equal terms arrived in 1928.

The mistaken model survives because law is easier to record than capacity. The vote was neither symbolic nor unimportant. The missing distinction is that citizenship has layers. Entry to the electorate is one. Converting that membership into safety, resources, representation and effective voice requires institutions that a ballot paper does not supply.

“The movement came in three neat waves”

The standard story assigns suffrage to a first wave, liberation to a second, diversity and identity to a third, and sometimes digital activism to a fourth. It is memorable, teachable and wrong at exactly the points where history becomes interesting.

The model was built mainly from the United States and western Europe. It turns low media visibility into political inactivity, even though women organised between the supposed peaks and elsewhere in the world. It makes each generation appear to replace the last, when campaigns over labour, peace, race, reproduction, family and violence overlapped. It also suggests a single tide moving in one direction, while gains and reversals occurred at different times by country and issue.

Waves can still mark bursts of mobilisation, shifts in language or changes in public attention. They should not be mistaken for the movement's natural chronology. Period labels decide whose work counts. A history organised around publicity peaks will repeatedly discover that activists outside its chosen countries were busy during the alleged silence.

“Feminism is a Western export”

This claim notices a real problem and draws the wrong conclusion. European and North American institutions have exported legal categories, development programmes and political priorities. Colonial governments sometimes used the treatment of women to present domination as rescue. Later organisations could repeat the pattern by treating one model of liberation as universal.

It does not follow that opposition to sex hierarchy arrived from the West.

Across Africa, Asia, the Middle East and Latin America, women and men built arguments out of disputes over education, land, labour, religion, marriage, colonial rule and national independence. Begum Rokeya's schools and writing in Bengal, Qiu Jin's revolutionary feminism in China and women's anti-tax organising in Nigeria did not require instruction that restricted authority was political.

Ideas also travelled through translation, missions, empires, conferences, socialist networks, anti-colonial movements and international law. There was exchange, appropriation and conflict rather than sealed civilisations. Two opposite evasions follow: calling feminism foreign can protect local hierarchy, while calling one imported programme universal can erase local women. Origin does not settle validity. Mechanism and consent do.

“Feminists think men are the enemy”

Some feminists have described men as a political class benefiting from women's subordination, and some have advocated female separation in particular settings. That is not the same as a doctrine of individual hatred, and it does not describe the full movement.

The strongest feminist analysis distinguishes people from positions and institutions. Men may gain from women performing more care, accepting lower authority or bearing sexual risk. They can also oppose those arrangements, lose from rigid masculinity and depend on changes feminism helped secure. Women can enforce sex hierarchy, punish other women and benefit from class or racial power. None of this makes the structure disappear.

The enemy story is persuasive because politics is easier to narrate as one group versus another, and hostile examples circulate well. It also lets critics replace a claim about patterned advantage with a test of personal niceness. Reform needs a causal target. If the mechanism is a law, workplace design, violent norm or household bargain, condemning a sex is analytically weak. So is denying that unequal systems can give one group average advantages without making every member guilty of conscious intent.

“Any choice made by a woman is feminist”

Feminism helped defend women’s capacity to choose work, partners, clothes, sex, motherhood, childlessness and public life. Consumer culture then performed a useful trick: it detached choice from power and sold the label back.

A choice is evidence of agency. It is not automatically a political challenge to hierarchy. A woman can freely choose an arrangement that feminists criticise, act against other women’s interests or profit from an unequal system. Conversely, a constrained choice may be sensible under the available options. Calling it false consciousness can become a way of refusing to hear the person making it.

The relevant questions concern conditions and consequences. What options existed? Who bore the cost? Could the person refuse or leave? Did the choice widen freedom for others, narrow it, or do neither? These questions do not yield a purity test for daily life. They prevent autonomy from becoming a magic word that ends analysis.

Movements concern collective rules as well as personal permission. A female chief executive may break a barrier. Whether her company treats workers fairly is a separate question.

“Progress only moves forwards”

A timeline of landmark reforms encourages the belief that equality accumulates like technology. Once a restriction is removed, later generations inherit the gain.

Some gains do become difficult to reverse because institutions, expectations and interests grow around them. Girls’ education produces trained workers and voters who can defend it. Property rights alter household assets. Political participation builds organisations. History contains ratchets as well as cycles.

It also contains organised reversal. Governments can restrict education, work, reproductive care, public presence and civil society. Courts can

narrow rights. Budgets can empty services while statutes remain. Economic crises and war can shift care back into households. Political movements can recast hierarchy as tradition, safety or rebellion against an elite. Afghanistan under Taliban rule is the stark current example, not a universal model of backlash.

The myth persists because published histories know their endpoint and select steps leading towards it. Rights require maintenance. Feminist victories change the baseline, but no baseline enforces itself. Progress is an institutional achievement, not a law of motion.

Use It

Ask what has been declared private

When an issue is dismissed as personal, identify which institution has already shaped it. Marriage, inheritance, custody, working hours, healthcare, housing and criminal law reach deep into private life. The absence of intervention may leave an existing rule or power imbalance untouched.

This does not make every disagreement a public question. Two people can divide chores badly without proving a national system. The lens becomes useful when the pattern repeats, exit is costly, one side controls resources, or public rules structure the choice. Domestic violence was long treated as a family matter despite involving conduct that would have been criminal between strangers. Childcare is organised within households, but school hours, leave rights, service costs and job schedules help decide which household solution is possible.

Ask three questions: who has authority, who bears the risk, and what makes refusal costly? The answers tell you whether privacy protects freedom or conceals power.

Separate a right from the capacity to use it

Read every equality claim in layers. First, is the right stated? Second, are the services, procedures and resources needed to exercise it present? Third, will institutions enforce it when doing so is inconvenient?

A formal right to work may coexist with no safe transport, childcare, documentation or protection from dismissal. A right to report harassment may coexist with a process controlled by the employer, a long delay and a career penalty for using it. A right to reproductive care may depend on distance, money and clinical capacity. The legal text matters because it creates a claim. The operating system decides whether the claim changes a life.

Do not collapse these layers into cynicism. Weak implementation does not mean law is theatre. It identifies the next mechanism. Ask which office acts, who pays, what evidence is required, how long the remedy takes and what happens to the complainant meanwhile. Permission becomes power only through a route.

Follow the unpaid work

When a policy, organisation or household appears efficient, look for labour missing from the price. Who schedules, cleans, cooks, remembers, comforts, supervises and remains available when the formal system stops?

This lens changes economic analysis. A long-hours workplace may be productive because workers have partners carrying care. A hospital discharge plan may save public money by transferring nursing tasks to relatives. A school closure may look temporary in an administrative calendar while removing paid hours from parents. The cost has not vanished. It has crossed an accounting boundary.

Do not assume the person supplying care is exploited or that paid provision is always better. Care can carry love, identity and mutual obligation. The feminist question concerns distribution and choice. Can the carer share the work, receive support, keep an income, rest and leave the role without

catastrophe? Follow the time as carefully as the money. Many apparently individual outcomes begin with unequal access to an uninterrupted day.

Change the reference person

Institutions often appear neutral because one type of person has been mistaken for the standard human. Test the design by changing the body and biography at its centre.

A job built around continuous full-time availability may fit a worker without pregnancy or primary care responsibilities. Biomedical evidence can be less reliable across sexes when basic or preclinical research relies heavily on male animals and cells. Public transport designed around a direct peak-hour commute may serve paid workers better than people making chained trips between school, shops, care and work.

Do not replace one universal person with a universal woman. Women differ in body, disability, age, income and responsibility. The method is to identify whose pattern trained the rule, then test performance across relevant groups. Equal treatment is valuable when people are alike in the respect that matters. Where the design is fitted to one group, identical treatment can preserve the fit.

Ask which women, in which position

Whenever a proposal claims to help women, make the category operational. Which women face the problem, through which mechanism, and who might carry the cost of the remedy?

A promotion programme for professional women may widen leadership while doing little for cleaners, carers or informal workers. Subsidised childcare can expand employment, but its quality and the pay of childcare workers remain separate questions. A dress rule may be defended as liberation by some women and experienced as coercion by others. An anti-trafficking measure may protect people in one setting and increase police danger for sex workers in another.

Difference does not forbid collective action. It prevents the most visible

members of a coalition from presenting their position as the whole. Look for class, race, caste, disability, migration status, sexuality, religion, age and geography only where they alter the mechanism. An endless identity inventory explains nothing. The useful question is which decision changes at the intersection and why the existing rule misses it.

Find the veto after the victory

After a reform passes, identify who can prevent it from operating. The veto may rest with a minister who controls regulations, an employer who controls evidence, a local authority with no budget, a court that narrows the rule, a party selector, a clinic, a family member or a social penalty strong enough to deter use.

This lens guards against ceremonial success. A quota can change candidate lists while parties place women in unwinnable seats. Equal-pay law can exist while workers cannot see comparable salaries or afford a claim. A school may admit girls while toilets, safety or family demands drive them out. The question is not whether the reform is perfect. It is where the chain can still break.

Then look for adaptation. Power often moves from a prohibited rule into timing, discretion, informal criteria or control of resources. Follow outcomes, but do not assume every remaining gap proves evasion. Compare mechanisms, inspect implementation and ask what evidence would distinguish resistance from another cause.

The limits

Feminism supplies a lens on sex-based hierarchy. It does not supply a complete theory of every institution or a moral answer to every conflict. A policy can help women on average and harm a particular group. Policies advanced in the name of equality can conflict with privacy, religious freedom, safety, competitive fairness, family autonomy or other legitimate interests. Naming patriarchy does not calculate the trade-off.

The movement can also reproduce the habits it criticises. Leaders may

speak for people they have not heard, convert disagreement into betrayal, use weak evidence because the cause feels urgent or treat women as morally purer than men. Female agency includes selfishness, cruelty and political error. A politics that denies this has replaced equality with flattering mythology.

Sex and gender disputes expose the limit sharply. Bodies, social roles, legal categories and identities matter differently across medicine, sport, statistics, prisons, shelters and ordinary civil life. A principle suited to one domain may fail in another. Dignity and safety are necessary constraints, not a complete policy. Define the objective, relevant category, mechanism and evidence before announcing a universal answer.

Feminism is strongest when it makes power visible and then submits its own remedy to the same scrutiny.

The one thing to keep

Keep the missing contract.

When an arrangement looks natural, ask who could refuse or renegotiate its terms. A marriage that transfers one person's property and legal identity to another is not made equal by calling it a partnership. A job may depend on somebody else's unwaged labour; the relevant question is whether that person has a say, support and a way out. Neither affection nor a signature makes every term fair.

History makes these arrangements look absurd because feminism forced their terms into public view. The present is harder. Its contracts are rarely written. They appear as expectations about who notices, yields, cares, risks, interrupts a career, tolerates fear or proves competence twice. Nobody may have designed the whole pattern. That does not mean nobody pays for it.

The question is not whether men and women are identical, whether every difference is oppression, or whether choice can be purified of influence. It is whether difference has been converted into authority for one person and obligation for another without a defensible reason, workable consent or fair

exit.

The next time an arrangement is defended as the way things are, look for the people required to make it work. Who gets the uninterrupted day? Who can say no? The answers may vindicate the arrangement or expose a cost its defenders have left out. Either way, something once treated as fate has become open to judgement.

The longest revolution continues wherever an inherited arrangement is made to state its terms.

Terms

Feminism. Ideas and organised action opposing durable hierarchy built around sex and seeking greater freedom or equality for women across law and everyday life. The term covers competing traditions rather than one authorised programme.

Sex. Classification linked to reproductive biology, including anatomy, chromosomes, hormones and gametes. These features do not always align neatly, and their relevance depends on the question being asked.

Gender. Social meanings, roles, expectations and identities organised around sex. The word can describe a social structure, personal identity or analytical category, so arguments require a stated use.

Patriarchy. A social order that patterns formal authority, assets, standing and trusted public speech around male dominance and female dependence. It describes institutions and recurring relations, not universal male command or identical outcomes.

Misogyny. Hostility towards women or the policing and punishment of women who breach expected roles. Sexism supplies beliefs about hierarchy; misogyny often enforces the boundary.

Coverture. Common-law doctrine under which a married woman's legal position was constrained by her husband's. Its operation varied, but it shaped property, contracts, earnings and legal action.

Suffrage. The right to vote in political elections. Women's suffrage campaigns made citizenship measurable, built mass organisations and revealed how formal votes could coexist with other exclusions.

Franchise. The body of people legally entitled to vote, or the right itself. Franchise rules can turn a universal claim into a restricted electorate through age, property, citizenship or registration.

Emancipation. Release from legal or social subordination. Feminists have used it for civil equality and independence, while critics ask whether entry into existing institutions is enough.

Formal equality. The same rule or legal status applied to comparable people. It removes explicit discrimination but may leave unequal starting conditions, institutional design and practical capacity untouched.

Substantive equality. Equality judged through operation and effect rather than identical wording alone. It may require accommodation, services or targeted measures where relevant differences create unequal access.

Liberal feminism. A tradition centred on individual rights, equal citizenship, education and access to institutions. Its strength is legal clarity; its critics question whether equal entry transforms underlying power.

Socialist feminism. Analysis joining sex hierarchy to class, labour, property and the organisation of care. It asks how capitalism and gender relations support and sometimes contradict one another.

Marxist feminism. Feminist work using Marxist concepts such as class, production, exploitation and reproduction. It debates whether women's subordination is driven by capitalism or has partly independent mechanisms.

Radical feminism. A tradition treating male dominance, sexuality, reproduction and violence as a political system in its own right. Radical feminists disagree sharply over sex, pornography, prostitution and strategy.

Black feminism. Thought and organising developed from Black women's

experiences of racism, sexism, class and sexuality. It challenged movements that treated white women or Black men as universal subjects.

Intersectionality. Kimberlé Crenshaw's term for how institutions and law can miss harms formed at intersecting positions, such as race and sex. It is a method for analysing mechanisms, not an identity tally.

Postcolonial feminism. Work examining how colonial power, nationalism, development and global inequality shape women's lives and feminist claims. It resists treating Western experience as the universal route to freedom.

Queer feminism. Feminist analysis challenging fixed assumptions about sex, gender, sexuality and normal family life. It examines how categories are made and policed, while containing disputes over material sex.

Reproductive rights. Legal rights concerning contraception, pregnancy, abortion, birth and fertility treatment. Their practical value depends on healthcare, money, information, safety and freedom from coercion.

Reproductive justice. Framework developed by Black women activists linking the right not to have children with rights to have children and raise them safely. It places choice inside material conditions.

Bodily autonomy. Authority to make informed decisions about one's own body, including sex, healthcare and reproduction. It is constrained where consent, capacity, safety or other people's rights are involved.

Consciousness-raising. Small-group method in which women compared personal experiences to identify shared patterns of power. It converted isolation into analysis, though experience alone could not establish every cause.

The personal is political. Claim that private life can contain patterned power shaped by public institutions. It does not mean government should control every personal decision or relationship.

Sexual division of labour. Allocation of paid and unpaid tasks by sex. It shapes skills, income, time, status and dependence even where no rule

explicitly assigns the work.

Unpaid care work. Childcare, elder care, cooking, cleaning and related labour performed without direct wages. It sustains households and paid economies while often disappearing from national accounts.

Social reproduction. The work and institutions that maintain people and reproduce society across generations, including care, education, health and households. The concept links domestic life to economic systems.

Gender-based violence. Harm directed at someone because of sex or gender, or harm that disproportionately affects a sex or gender. The term covers distinct acts and mechanisms, so prevalence claims must state exactly which forms were measured.

Gender mainstreaming. Assessing how policies across all areas affect women and men rather than confining equality to a specialist office. It can change routine decisions or become a procedural box-tick.

CEDAW. The principal United Nations treaty on discrimination against women, adopted in 1979. It covers political, economic, social and family life, while reservations, weak enforcement and uneven state compliance limit what ratification achieves.

Go Deeper

The global overview

Estelle B. Freedman, *No Turning Back: The History of Feminism and the Future of Women* (Ballantine Books, 2002). This is the best next book for a reader who wants the history widened without losing a clear line. Freedman moves across work, family, sexuality, politics and movements in several regions, treating feminism as both a Western tradition and a set of global exchanges. It is accessible, generous and broad enough to correct the Atlantic bias of many shorter accounts. Its evidence and framing now predate two decades of digital mobilisation, legal change and backlash, so read the ending as a historical position rather than a current report.

The primary argument

Mary Wollstonecraft, *A Vindication of the Rights of Woman*, in *A Vindication of the Rights of Men; A Vindication of the Rights of Woman; An Historical and Moral View of the French Revolution*, edited by Janet Todd (Oxford University Press, 2008). Read the *Rights of Woman* for the argument that dependence and bad education manufacture the traits later used to justify women's dependence. Todd's selection places her argument beside her wider revolutionary writing, which makes her a political thinker rather than the author of one famous demand. The eighteenth-century prose takes concentration, and some assumptions about class, virtue and family are plainly of their time.

The inviting statement

bell hooks, *Feminism Is for Everybody: Passionate Politics*, 2nd edition (Routledge, 2015). Short, direct and written to pull feminism out of academic and media caricature, this is the easiest route into a movement defined as opposition to sexism, exploitation and oppression rather than hostility to men. hooks connects love, education, work, violence, race and class while criticising elite versions of liberation. It is a manifesto, not a neutral survey, and some claims are asserted more strongly than they are evidenced. That is part of its value: it gives you a coherent position to test against the conflicts in this book.

The contrasting view

Chandra Talpade Mohanty, *Feminism Without Borders: Decolonizing Theory, Practicing Solidarity* (Duke University Press, 2003). Mohanty's essays show why global feminism cannot begin by turning women outside the West into one passive group. She examines labour, knowledge, colonial inheritance, capitalism and coalition, including her influential critique "Under Western Eyes" and a later reconsideration of it. This is the most demanding recommendation here because it assumes some familiarity with feminist and postcolonial theory. Read it closely for the discipline of building solidarity across unequal positions without pretending those positions are the same.

Notes and Sources

Scope, definition and subtitle. The book uses feminism for explicit ideas and collective action directed against durable hierarchy organised around sex. This is narrower than treating every exceptional or resistant woman as a feminist and broader than any one doctrinal school. Estelle B. Freedman, Karen Offen, Nancy F. Cott and Leila J. Rupp provide complementary histories of the term, organisations and transnational movement. "The longest revolution" refers to Juliet Mitchell's essay "Women: The Longest Revolution", published in *New Left Review* 1/40 in November-December 1966. Mitchell organised women's condition around production, reproduction, sexuality and the socialisation of children. This book borrows the title while using a broader institutional model.

Iceland's Women's Day Off. The action occurred on 24 October 1975. The University of Iceland's research account records that women withdrew work across the country, the Icelandic Redstockings initiated the strike idea, organisers chose "day off" to widen participation, and 25,000 people gathered in central Reykjavik from a national population of about 220,000. Direct causal claims about later legal and political outcomes remain disputed, so the book uses the event to reveal dependence on paid and unpaid work rather than as a single cause of Icelandic equality.

Current legal and implementation measures. The World Bank's *Women, Business and the Law 2026* covers 190 economies and ten areas of women's economic opportunity. The cited averages, on separate scales out of 100, are 67 for legal frameworks, 47 for supportive frameworks and 53 for enforcement perceptions. The last measure records expert assessments, not observed compliance or a percentage of laws enforced. The indices are not a census of all rights or women's general welfare. Data were current to 1 October 2025; the report was released on 24 February 2026. Its methodological assumptions include a lawful adult citizen in the main business city, so the results should not be silently extended to every woman's circumstances.

Current care and violence estimates. The ILO estimate, based on data from 125 countries, places 708 million women aged fifteen or older outside the labour force in 2023 with care cited as the reason. It was released in October 2024 and is not a causal estimate from an experiment. The World Health Organization's *Violence against Women Prevalence Estimates, 2023*, released on 19 November 2025, draws on surveys and studies conducted from 2000 to 2023. The lifetime estimate covers physical or sexual intimate-partner violence, non-partner sexual violence, or both, among women aged fifteen or older; it is not a measure of all gender-based harm or of one year's incidents. Global estimates conceal substantial geographical variation. The imagined couple and workplace promotion decision are illustrative mechanisms, not reported case studies.

Political representation. The Inter-Parliamentary Union's *Women in Parliament in 2025: The Year in Review* reports that women held 27.5 per cent of seats in national parliaments worldwide on 1 January 2026, up from 27.2 per cent one year earlier. The book uses the level, not the annual change. The figure measures descriptive representation in national legislatures. It does not measure cabinet power, local government, policy influence, party ideology or the distribution among groups of women.

The personal and the political. Carol Hanisch wrote the memo later titled "The Personal Is Political" in February 1969; it was published in *Notes from*

the Second Year in 1970. Hanisch states that editors Shulamith Firestone and Anne Koedt supplied the title and that political referred to power relations rather than electoral politics alone. The book preserves that distinction and rejects the claim that every private choice should become an object of state control.

Patriarchy and institutions. Sylvia Walby's *Theorizing Patriarchy* is used for the idea that male dominance can operate through several institutional sites rather than one command structure. Judith M. Bennett's *History Matters* supports the emphasis on continuity through ordinary arrangements. The account is deliberately bounded: it describes patterned authority and dependence, not a claim that every man dominates every woman or that hierarchy takes the same form everywhere.

Coverture and property. Coverture constrained a married woman's separate legal capacity in English common law, but its practical reach varied through equity, custom, class and jurisdiction. The book avoids the false claim that all women were wholly unable to own property before 1882. The 1870 Act expanded control over earnings and some property; the 1882 Act widened separate ownership and legal capacity. The narrative specifies England and Wales. The 1882 Act did not extend to Scotland, where reform followed separate legislation.

Nationality and marriage. Section 3 of the US Expatriation Act of 2 March 1907 removed an American woman's US nationality upon marriage to a foreigner. The National Archives documents the rule and its later, uneven reversal. The text makes no claim that US legislation could guarantee the wife citizenship under the husband's national law. Freedman and Rupp place independent-nationality campaigns in the wider history of international women's organisations.

Suffrage milestones. New Zealand's Electoral Act was signed on 19 September 1893, making it the first self-governing country to grant women the parliamentary vote. Finland adopted equal parliamentary rights in 1906 and elected nineteen women in 1907. Britain's Representation of the People Act 1918 enfranchised women over thirty who met stated qualifications; the

Equal Franchise Act 1928 established equal voting terms at twenty-one. The United States ratified the Nineteenth Amendment in 1920. The National Archives stresses that it prohibited denial on account of sex while racial discrimination, intimidation, citizenship exclusions and other barriers remained.

Parliamentary voice and authority. The distinction between voting, candidacy, selection and effective authority draws on suffrage history and contemporary representation research. The book does not infer that female representatives share one ideology or that a change in descriptive representation causes a particular policy outcome.

Unpaid care and pay gaps. The Office for National Statistics' household satellite accounts explain the exclusion of most unpaid household services from GDP and their estimation in a separate account. The 2015 and 2016 publication is used for this accounting distinction, not as current evidence of the amount of care. Time-use research supports the broad finding that women perform more unpaid domestic and care work globally, with large variation by country and household. The pay-gap discussion follows standard labour-economics caution: a raw mean or median earnings gap is descriptive and cannot by itself isolate discrimination. Occupation, hours, experience, parenthood, sector, sorting, bargaining and bias are interacting mechanisms. Detailed measurement belongs to *Inequality in a Hurry* and *Work in a Hurry*.

Reproductive rights and justice. The reproductive-justice framework was developed by Black women activists in the United States in 1994 and later institutionalised through organisations including SisterSong. Loretta Ross and Rickie Solinger provide the principal synthesis used here. The framework joins the right not to have children with rights to have children and raise them in safe conditions. Historical references to coercive sterilisation and population control are supported by Dorothy Roberts and by the wider reproductive-justice literature. The book makes no current cross-country claim about abortion law.

Violence, marriage and consent. Laws on domestic violence, marital rape,

harassment and coercive control changed at different dates and through different doctrines. The text avoids a universal milestone. The conceptual claim is narrower: feminist campaigns challenged legal and social assumptions that intimate relationships reduced public responsibility for coercion and harm. Current prevalence estimates are used only at global level with the limits stated above. The conditional warning in Use It about anti-trafficking enforcement draws on Platt and colleagues' 2018 systematic review. Qualitative evidence from Cambodia links police crackdowns to displacement and greater vulnerability to violence. This is a documented risk in a particular setting, not a verdict on every anti-trafficking measure.

Women as a coalition. The Combahee River Collective's 1977 statement describes racial, sexual, heterosexual and class oppression as interlocking. Crenshaw's 1989 critique examines the institutional failure of single-axis categories. The account of *DeGraffenreid v. General Motors*, 413 F. Supp. 142 (E.D. Mo. 1976), follows the district court's memorandum: it rejected the sex-discrimination claim and dismissed the racial claim without prejudice, suggesting consolidation or intervention in another suit. The text does not claim that the court rejected a race claim because GM employed Black men. The case illustrates Crenshaw's diagnosis, not the present law of every jurisdiction.

Reference persons in biomedical research. The claim about male defaults is deliberately conditional. The United States National Institutes of Health developed its Sex as a Biological Variable policy in response partly to historical over-reliance on male animals and cells in basic and preclinical research. The book does not claim that women are now generally absent from clinical trials, that all medicine uses a male standard or that every diagnostic gap has one cause.

Sex and gender. The book distinguishes four matters that public argument often compresses: reproductive sex, socially organised gender roles, legal classification and gender identity. It records a live feminist dispute over which category should govern which decision, rather than declaring one settlement for medicine, data, civil status, sport, prisons and shelters. Any

policy claim requires a domain, objective, evidence base and account of competing rights or risks. The wording does not deny either bodily materiality or the social reality of identity.

Early texts. Christine de Pizan completed *The Book of the City of Ladies* around 1405. Mary Astell's *Some Reflections upon Marriage* first appeared in 1700; the comparison of domestic and political absolute authority cited here belongs to the preface added in 1706. Olympe de Gouges published the *Declaration of the Rights of Woman and the Female Citizen* in 1791, and Mary Wollstonecraft published *A Vindication of the Rights of Woman* in 1792. De Gouges was executed in 1793 amid revolutionary political repression; the text does not claim that the declaration alone caused her death.

Nineteenth-century organisation. The Seneca Falls convention of 1848 and its Declaration of Sentiments are treated as a landmark US convention rather than the universal beginning of women's rights. The abolitionist connection produced organising skills and deep racial conflicts. Ellen Carol DuBois, Angela Y. Davis, Freedman and Offen support this account.

Friedan and the household. Betty Friedan's *The Feminine Mystique* was published by W. W. Norton in 1963. The book challenged the expectation that domestic fulfilment should exhaust women's ambitions; its social frame was substantially narrower than the category women. The Smithsonian collection record confirms the date; the histories used throughout this book establish the limits of its social frame concerning working-class women and women of colour. It is one influential intervention, not the sole origin of women's liberation.

Global cases. Qiu Jin was executed in 1907 after revolutionary activity in China and wrote against women's dependence and footbinding. Begum Rokeya Sakhawat Hossain published *Sultana's Dream* in English in *The Indian Ladies' Magazine* in 1905 and promoted girls' education in Bengal. Ladyland and its female universities are features of that fiction, not reconstructed history. The account of the 1929 Women's War in south-eastern Nigeria follows Judith Van Allen and Nina Mba: colonial rule

privileged male warrant chiefs, discounted women's political institutions and encountered organised resistance when taxation was feared. Kumari Jayawardena is the principal source for linking women's movements with nationalism, reform and anti-colonial politics across Asia and the Middle East. Elisabeth Jay Friedman and Ana Laura Rodríguez Gustá support the account of Argentina's Ni Una Menos as a mass, intergenerational movement against femicide and gender-based violence beginning in 2015. These cases establish distinct local histories, not one non-Western feminist tradition.

Post-war institutions and liberation. The United Nations Charter of 1945 affirmed equal rights of men and women, and the Commission on the Status of Women was established in 1946. Simone de Beauvoir's *The Second Sex* appeared in French in 1949. The British Equal Pay Act 1970 and Sex Discrimination Act 1975, US Civil Rights Act 1964 and Education Amendments 1972 are used as examples of law following organised pressure, not as proof of one direct causal chain. Alice Echols and Freedman support the account of US women's liberation; comparable movements differed across countries.

International law and digital mobilisation. CEDAW was adopted in 1979 and entered into force in 1981. The Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action was adopted in 1995 and organised work across twelve critical areas. Tarana Burke began the Me Too movement in 2006; the phrase's global viral expansion came in 2017. The book distinguishes the movement's origin from the later hashtag.

Reversal. The Afghanistan example is supported by Human Rights Watch's 3 August 2026 account of restrictions on women and girls under Taliban rule. It documents barriers to education, work, movement and public presence. The book uses this as an extreme example of deliberate dismantling, not a proxy for Muslim societies, ordinary policy disagreement or every form of backlash.

How we know. The discussion of archival bias follows the historiography of women's and feminist movements. Organised, literate and legally visible

actors leave denser records than informal, rural, poor or oral communities. Milestones date legal change but rarely isolate causation. The label feminism is therefore applied cautiously to earlier resistance and to movements using different local vocabularies.

Bibliography

Primary texts and original documents

Astell, Mary. *Reflections upon Marriage*. 3rd ed. London: R. Wilkin, 1706. First published as *Some Reflections upon Marriage* in 1700.

Beauvoir, Simone de. *The Second Sex*. 1949. Translated by Constance Borde and Sheila Malovany-Chevallier. London: Vintage, 2011.

Combahee River Collective. "A Black Feminist Statement." 1977.

Crenshaw, Kimberlé. "Demarginalizing the Intersection of Race and Sex: A Black Feminist Critique of Antidiscrimination Doctrine, Feminist Theory and Antiracist Politics." *University of Chicago Legal Forum* 1989, article 8.

de Gouges, Olympe. *Declaration of the Rights of Woman and the Female Citizen*. 1791.

DeGraffenreid v. General Motors Assembly Division, 413 F. Supp. 142 (E.D. Mo. 1976). District court memorandum of 4 May 1976.

Hanisch, Carol. "The Personal Is Political." Written 1969. Published in *Notes from the Second Year: Women's Liberation*, 1970.

Hossain, Rokeya Sakhawat. "Sultana's Dream." *The Indian Ladies' Magazine*, 1905. Digital text in Amardeep Singh's *Literature of Colonial South Asia*, Lehigh University.

Mitchell, Juliet. "Women: The Longest Revolution." *New Left Review* 1/40, November-December 1966.

Stanton, Elizabeth Cady, Lucretia Mott and others. *Declaration of Sentiments*. Seneca Falls, 1848.

United Nations. *Charter of the United Nations*. 1945.

United Nations. *Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women*. 1979.

United Nations. *Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action*. 1995.

Wollstonecraft, Mary. *A Vindication of the Rights of Men; A Vindication of the Rights of Woman; An Historical and Moral View of the French Revolution*. Edited by Janet Todd. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.

Data, law and institutional sources

Inter-Parliamentary Union. *Women in Parliament in 2025: The Year in Review*. Geneva: Inter-Parliamentary Union, 2026.

Manatū Taonga, New Zealand Ministry for Culture and Heritage. “New Zealand Women and the Vote.” Updated 19 September 2024.

International Labour Organization. “Unpaid Care Work Prevents 708 Million Women from Participating in the Labour Market.” 29 October 2024.

National Institutes of Health, Office of Research on Women's Health. “Sex as a Biological Variable.” Updated 17 October 2025. Accessed 5 September 2026.

Human Rights Watch. “Afghanistan: Taliban Assault on Rights Deepens 5 Years on.” 3 August 2026.

Office for National Statistics. *Household Satellite Account, UK: 2015 and 2016*. 2 October 2018.

Parliament of Finland. “Brief History of Parliament.” Accessed 3 September 2026.

Parliament of the United Kingdom. *Representation of the People Act 1918 and Equal Franchise Act 1928*.

The National Archives, United States. “19th Amendment to the U.S. Constitution: Women's Right to Vote (1920).” Milestone Documents.

Hacker, Meg. “When Saying ‘I Do’ Meant Giving Up Your Citizenship.” *Prologue*, Spring 2014. The National Archives, United States.

Smithsonian Institution, National Museum of American History. *The Feminine Mystique by Betty Friedan*. Collection record nmah_1453058, identifying the 1963 edition.

W. W. Norton. *The Feminine Mystique*. Norton Critical Edition, edited by Kirsten Fermaglich and Lisa Fine, 2013. Publisher’s account of the original 1963 work and its reception.

United Kingdom. *Married Women’s Property Act 1870 and Married Women’s Property Act 1882*.

University of Iceland. “Legacy and International Impact of the 1975 Icelandic Women’s Day Off.” 9 January 2023.

World Health Organization. *Violence against Women Prevalence Estimates, 2023: Global, Regional and National Prevalence Estimates for Intimate Partner Violence against Women and Non-partner Sexual Violence against Women*. Geneva: World Health Organization, 2025.

World Bank. *Women, Business and the Law 2026: Benchmarking Laws for Jobs*. Washington, DC: World Bank, 2026.

Platt, Lucy, et al. “Associations between Sex Work Laws and Sex Workers’ Health: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis of Quantitative and Qualitative Studies.” *PLOS Medicine* (2018): e1002680.
doi:10.1371/journal.pmed.1002680.

Modern works

Bennett, Judith M. *History Matters: Patriarchy and the Challenge of Feminism*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2006.

Cott, Nancy F. *The Grounding of Modern Feminism*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1987.

Davis, Angela Y. *Women, Race & Class*. New York: Random House, 1981.

DuBois, Ellen Carol. *Suffrage: Women's Long Battle for the Vote*. New York: Simon & Schuster, 2020.

Echols, Alice. *Daring to Be Bad: Radical Feminism in America, 1967-1975*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1989.

Freedman, Estelle B. *No Turning Back: The History of Feminism and the Future of Women*. New York: Ballantine Books, 2002.

Friedman, Elisabeth Jay, and Ana Laura Rodríguez Gustá. "Welcome to the Revolution': Promoting Generational Renewal in Argentina's Ni Una Menos." *Qualitative Sociology* 46 (2023): 245-277.

hooks, bell. *Feminism Is for Everybody: Passionate Politics*. 2nd ed. Abingdon: Routledge, 2015.

Jayawardena, Kumari. *Feminism and Nationalism in the Third World*. London: Zed Books, 1986.

Mohanty, Chandra Talpade. *Feminism Without Borders: Decolonizing Theory, Practicing Solidarity*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2003.

Offen, Karen. *European Feminisms, 1700-1950: A Political History*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2000.

Mba, Nina Emma. *Nigerian Women Mobilized: Women's Political Activity in Southern Nigeria, 1900-1965*. Berkeley: Institute of International Studies, University of California, 1982.

Roberts, Dorothy. *Killing the Black Body: Race, Reproduction, and the Meaning of Liberty*. New York: Pantheon Books, 1997.

Ross, Loretta J., and Rickie Solinger. *Reproductive Justice: An Introduction*. Oakland: University of California Press, 2017.

Rupp, Leila J. *Worlds of Women: The Making of an International Women's Movement*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1997.

Van Allen, Judith. "Sitting on a Man': Colonialism and the Lost Political Institutions of Igbo Women." *Canadian Journal of African Studies* 6, no. 2

(1972): 165-181.

Walby, Sylvia. *Theorizing Patriarchy*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1990.