

In Conversation with Pauline Maclaran, Catherine Rottenberg and Lynne Segal

Interviewed by Andreas Chatzidakis¹

¹ Royal Holloway University London, UK

I am a senior lecturer in marketing at Royal Holloway University of London. My research deals with the broader intersection of consumer culture with ethics and politics. More recently, this has included the ethics and politics of gender and I have been lucky to be friends with some of the best possible mentors. Prof Pauline Maclaran, a world expert on gendering marketing, has inspired me over most of my time at Royal Holloway. Dr Catherine Rottenberg is a younger feminist scholar that has already established a solid reputation, particularly for her acute and nuanced observations on neoliberal feminism. Finally, Prof Lynne Segal should need no introduction as one of the emblematic figures in socialist feminism, who has written extensively on a variety of issues, including more recent contributions on the politics of ageing and those cherished moments of “radical happiness”. More extensive biographies are included as an endnote.

Inspired by JCE’s special issue, I met with Catherine, Lynne and Pauline on 28th Apr 2017 to discuss the connections between gender politics and ethical consumption. Conscious of our distinct disciplinary backgrounds and experiences, we were not quite sure what to aim for or what was realistically achievable. We therefore experimented with an open-ended format where each of the interviewees had to explain what “gender and ethical consumption” may mean from within their own vernaculars, biographies and political struggles. This enabled us to outline some common themes in our emerging understanding(s). Below are some excerpts from our conversation. These are intentionally left in a somewhat raw format to reflect the unscripted nature of the interview, free from any predetermined agendas. However, we hope this will inspire further contemplation as different moments of gender analysis engage with recent understandings of ethical consumption.

Andreas: Lynne, do you want to start with some thoughts on socialist feminism and its relationship with ethical consumption?

Lynne: Where to start? When feminism finally bursts onto the scene in the 1970s, we—the so-called lucky generation of baby boomers—were eager to run away as fast as we could from that decade in which we had grown up, the 1950s, the decade of hyper-domesticity, of what we saw as the acquisitive, consumerist, conformist way of life in those households many of us had been born into. Instead, we expressed a passionate desire for equality and engagement in the world at large. Unlike our parents, and certainly mine, the last thing we ever wanted was any display of status, privilege or wealth, if we had any.

Quite the opposite, coming out of grass-roots Sixties’ New Left politics, women embracing feminism wanted to identify with ‘the people’, and in particular, with women everywhere, many of whom we knew had little to call their own. We were all too aware of the many ways women had been targeted as consumers in those post-war years, but also of the actual negativity we felt fashion often expressed towards women – as though a woman’s life was always one designed only to please others, and in particular to please men, wearing our high heels that could cripple us, and clothes that were rarely comfortable.

We would not be the type of women who dressed simply for their man. We listened to songs like those of the American folk singers, 'Hazel & Alice', I recall especially one called "Custom Made Woman Blues", which went like this: "Well I tried to be the kind of woman you wanted me to be ... Made to please and not to tease, The custom made woman blues".

What I recall is that in my feminist milieu, we bought most of our clothes second-hand, we preferred everything to be recycled. Our consumer patterns were part of the broader left scene, not just one involving women, but an aspect of an alternative politics where we were trying to live collectively, trying to cooperate and create new ways of caring and sharing all our skills and resources. These were absolutely the values of the moment, almost unrecognizable to many today.

What that means is that, I think, nowadays we would be described as ethical consumers [laughs], but we didn't describe ourselves as ethical consumers, we just saw ourselves as not wanting to play the capitalist game, and not wanting to play the patriarchal game. As I said, the concern with equality meant that the last thing you wanted to do was buy things to show off your status – which didn't mean that we were necessarily anti-consumption. We were certainly interested in sex, for the most part, although the '60s sex and drugs and rock'n'roll, for us, would connect more with alternative music, alternative cultural productions: women's theatre, women's art; women were trying to do everything for themselves; and in my house, which was a collective household, we would even cut each other's hair rather than [laughs]... You know, everything we did we tried to attempt it ourselves, rather than rely on a market, you could say that it was explicitly utopian...

Andreas: So Lynne, do you understand that as different from earlier feminist movements and their engagement with consumption?

Lynne: No, not entirely. It took us a while to discover, with people like Sheila Rowbotham digging away, into all that had been 'hidden from history', women's history, but actually what we did find is that what we were often trying to do had been done before. It wasn't just women leading bread riots, or working class women marching in the streets against their wages being cut, as in the USA during the Lawrence textile strike in 1912, demanding not just bread but roses too. Other women, usually middle-class women, such as the Charlotte Perkins Gilman in the USA in the 1920s, worked with other radical women on transforming domestic lives, via what they named 'household science'. They called for public provision for housing that would enable forms of co-operative living and home-crafts, in large apartments with swimming pools, tennis courts and dance halls. These women also admired free-flowing dress, like that worn by the dancer, Isadora Duncan.

Similar schemes were thought up in the UK, where some women, for example, the Scottish journalist Jane Clapperton, wrote of the need for collective housing, and the sorts of housing where it would be easier to share housework. Such ideas were sometimes quite developed, and indeed fed into ideas for municipal socialism...But of course, you know, with the coming of the Depression in the 1930s, this sort of more utopian thinking gets completely smashed, and not only smashed, but forgotten really. Forgotten. And so, when we second wave feminists emerge, we think we're brand new in terms of thinking about living more cooperatively and collectively...

Andreas: And how about contemporary forms of ethical consumption? How do you think your critique of consumer culture differed?

Lynne: Well, as I said, it was so much about creating an alternative culture, and an alternative world, and also you know, actually fighting the state, and fighting for different working conditions. It was absolutely broadly political, rather than simply based around consumption. This changed again, when the '80s and '90s came along, and particularly people

who'd done cultural studies were now critical of all those '50s and '60s sociologists and political theorists we had often read, such as Wright Mills, Reisman, Marcuse, Kenneth Galbraith and above all, the Frankfurt School, who had been critical of consumerism – ridiculing the 'cheerful robots' or 'one-dimensional man' seen as manipulated by the advertising industries into endless buying of goods.

Consumption was rethought in cultural studies, looking especially at class fractions, and suggesting that actually people can consume 'subversively', in order to create their subcultures, and so on... in the Birmingham Centre, where Cultural Studies was founded, it became important to study, for instance the Mods or the Rockers, and other sorts of more dissident styles in subcultures consuming in order to create their own identities. The whole issue of identity production became important, as in Dick Hebdige's classic *Subculture: The Meaning of Style* (1979)

And soon some younger feminists were writing about consumption and identities in the '80s and '90s, in a way that I was at first finding quite weird, seeing it as too detached from a more general socialist-feminist politics. However, Elizabeth Wilson, who was very much a Marxist-feminist from the socialist-feminist background I was describing earlier, wrote in her book *Adorned in Dreams: Fashion and Modernity* (1985), that feminists can't just reject fashion, as many of us had wanted to. In fact, of course, we never did reject fashion, we developed our own sorts of fashion that perhaps other people might have felt excluded by – those who weren't wearing their dungarees, or flowing smocks and so on. And so Wilson was talking about the pleasures of fashion, and that actually women often dress for themselves, not just for men, and so on; feminists needed to take account of that, and how good it was, or could be, to be dressing up and presenting yourself to the public. But, you know, being very class-conscious, and in fact in the Communist Party at the time, Elizabeth was also very concerned with who was excluded from being able to consume very much at all....

However, the notion of ethical consumption seems to take us back to the individual in a way in which I think we weren't thinking... we weren't thinking about it all in those individual terms, because feminism for us was all a part of the struggle for social transformation.

Andreas: Talking about the struggles for social transformation and the increasingly individualised times that we live in - over to you Catherine!

Catherine: OK, I will try and sort of lay out first why perhaps the notion of ethical consumption may be problematic for the moment that we are living in. Let me explain by drawing on an article that I happened to read last Monday entitled "The New Status Symbol". There Ben Tarnoff argues that the US has moved from the society in which conspicuous consumption is one of the key modes for understanding the dynamics of class dominance (which, of course, is always inflected by race and gender and sexuality) to a society in which conspicuous productivity is now just as vital to the public display of class power. But what is also interesting about the article is that Tarnoff's understanding of productivity has little to do with common sense "understandings" or even Marxist conceptions or even Fordist conceptions of production. It's no longer about the extraction of surplus value or the creation of commodities. In his words, "It's about how hard you work", it is about sheer time investment. And then he gives these great examples I think, reporting on Apple CEO Tim Cook, who told Time that he begins his day at 3.45 a.m., and CEO Marissa Mayer who told Bloomberg News that she used to work 130 hours per week. The article reminds us that Cook is practically 500,000 times richer than the average American – but he still wakes up at 3.45 am. This, Tarnoff suggests, is the hallmark of conspicuous production: it helps to justify the existence of an imperial class by

showcasing their superhuman levels of industry. In an era of extreme inequality, elites need to demonstrate to themselves and others that they *deserve* of this wealth. And the reason that I open with Tarnoff, why I thought he was so interesting as I was thinking about this conversation with you guys, is because I wonder whether ethical consumption is an adequate term, when trying to make sense of our current moment.... We may need to move from an emphasis on consumption to notions of productivity. Not only are we constantly incited to invest more time, more energy in our places of work (and now they're all conceived as firms, whether it's a university or a business) in order to enhance potential returns, but we are also exhorted to work on ourselves endlessly. We even conceive of ourselves as mini-firms. So we invest in ourselves to improve ourselves, to develop our abilities, to appreciate our value over time. And leisure, Lynne, as you were talking about before, which was once protected time has become for urban professionals and aspirational classes about endless self-improvement. So, the reason I use Tarnoff is basically because, I read him as describing the neoliberal subject. This subject is individuated, entrepreneurial and responsabilised, meaning that this subject is totally responsible for her own self-care and is also completely informed by a cost-benefit calculus. Now I would even go further, and here I'm drawing on the work of Wendy Brown and Michel Fehrer, and I would say that under neoliberalism –and neoliberal rationality– human beings are being converted into specks of capital. What that means is that the self is basically converted into a resource in which all activities are construed as potential strategic assets for enhancing the self's future value. Our being becomes a resource that through investment –or what Tarnoff calls productivity– we accrue value. All we have to think about is the way that we are constantly branding ourselves or attempting to appreciate the value of different bits of ourselves – how to get more likes on Facebook, how to get re-retweeted or more followers on Instagram, or how to get more people to download our papers from academia.edu. Wendy Brown has a great quote, I think, where she says that under neoliberal rationality, as human subjects are increasingly being converted into specks of human capital: “the emphasis on entrepreneurship and productivity replaces an emphasis on commodities and consumption.” ...So, my sense is that there is a radical shift in frame, emphasis and value and that this has been happening for a while. My question then would take this form: Can consumption retain any of its explanatory power--and thus can ethical consumption retain its contested moral dimension --if we are interested in understanding our particular neoliberal moment...

Andreas: OK, We will return to this, but what about gender? what's the gendered dimension of these profound transformations – how does neoliberal feminism enter the picture?

Catherine: Here I would say there are two important factors that need to be taken into consideration when speaking about this mutual entanglement of feminism and neoliberalism. One is this really interesting phenomenon of the recent surge in feminist discourse in popular mainstream venues. Really what happens is that we've gone from what has been termed a postfeminist period, in which feminism was reputed in the media, to an era in which feminism is everywhere and everyone is claiming feminism, from Clinton to Ivanka! So, not surprisingly, once feminism is mainstreamed and popularised, feminism gets defanged of its oppositional and emancipatory potential – that would be part of my claim. More than just simply being popularised, though, feminism increasingly dovetails and converges with dominant ideologies and conservative forces across the globe. We see this with Le Pen and the National Front and Geert Wilders's Party For Freedom, where they use gender parity in order to further a racist, anti-immigrant agenda. And of course, in the US, there's a whole history of using gender oppression to justify interventions in countries with majority Muslim populations. And more recently we have the famous

feminist manifesto by Sheryl Sandberg, where she publicly endorses a feminism that is informed by market rationality.

This new variant of feminism has produced a new feminist ideal – certainly an Anglo-American one but also a European one – and she is a professional woman able to balance a successful career with a satisfying home life. A “happy work-family balance,” in other words, is currently being (re)presented as a progressive feminist ideal – and that’s striking, I think. And insofar as this is the case, then this new feminist ideal must not only be understood as helping to shape women’s desires, and behaviour, but, crucially, as producing a feminist subject informed through and through by a cost-benefit calculus. This is precisely neoliberal feminism, a feminism that’s unmoored from the key terms Lynne was talking about—equality, justice, emancipation— which have informed women’s movements, however problematically in the different streams, since their inception. So this variant of feminism disavows the socio-economic and cultural structures shaping our lives. And this neoliberal feminism spawns a feminist subject who accepts full responsibility for her own well-being and self-care, which is predicated precisely on crafting a work-family balance, which is itself based on the idea of cost-benefit... Given my analysis, I totally agree with Lynne that ethical consumption not only abets the intensified process of individuation, but I am worried that it fails to take into account the neoliberalization of our world.

Andreas: That makes sense Catherine, thank you. What would consumer researchers think I wonder...Pauline?!

Pauline: So, I think first of all, you know, from a consumer culture studies point of view, I thought what you both said was great and it really resonates with us, but I’ll be speaking, I suppose, a slightly different language.... What Lynne has given a real background to, the kind of rebellion that set the scene for the baby boomers, but that also set the scene for the co-option of rebellion by the market place, by capitalism really. And so what you see in the period that Lynne’s talking about, where the youth subcultures were hugely rebellious and it was all about the brave new world we were going to create and, you know, dropping out and tuning in, and really concerning ourselves with trying to change wider social structures. But in the ’70s, or rather the end of the ’60s and early ’70s, what you see is the start of what I would call the “ethical brands” coming in and the start of brands trying to coopt this rebellion by attaching themselves to social agendas. So you’ve got all these big brands of the ’60s that are now looked back with nostalgia, like the Mini, Harley Davidson, Benetton, the Body Shop, of course – I think the Body Shop would be the first in fact, and it’s certainly one of the really big ethical brands. So that was the start of tying brands and capitalism into social and moral agendas. And, for me, that whole movement is very significant, especially if we want to link it with ethical consumerism and feminism. For example, if we go back to the example of the Body Shop and Anita Roddick, that whole movement wasn’t just about sustainable consumption and fair trade - linking with producers in developing countries – and the whole recycling image it had. For example, you brought your bottles to be refilled, it offered all natural ingredients and the producers got a fair reward supposedly. So here we see not only the start of aligning production aspects with consumption and consumer choice, but also the emergence of a feminist agenda, because the Body Shop also challenged beauty ideals and women’s conformity to them. The Body Shop would often promote pictures of, curvaceous woman, and even naked woman and that was all seen as part of what we call the “rebel sell” in consumer culture studies. The rebel sell is what many brands used at that time (Harley Davidson, the MINI and, of course, Apple are all good examples). And still today the most popular brands usually have a rebel image if we think of brands like Innocent, Ben & Jerry’s, Virgin, and so forth. There’s usually a whole myth that goes with this type of image - how the entrepreneurs built themselves up from nothing, challenged the mainstream, conquered adversity and so on... And this, in turn, I think

now, if we fast-forward through the decades a little bit, ties into the whole neoliberal agenda, and its increasing emphasis on the successful entrepreneurial individual. And so, as rebellion is more and more something you can buy in the market place –because it resonates with your identity and your moral values,– we see the emergence of what is sometimes referred to as “a moralised brandscape”. Increasingly we see new companies attaching themselves to some kind of moral purpose or higher-order value. And so then people believe they have agency in creating their own identities through consumption, rather than being misled and manipulated (which is the more critically orientated sociological viewpoint). Because people feel that they are doing something positive at an individual level, they are less sensitive to the constraints of wider social structures. Hence the emergence of the neoliberal subjectivity and that’s really exactly what I would argue has happened to feminism. You see it really dwindling away as more and more feminism ideals are coopted by marketers and advertisers in what you call femvertising. I think this is an awful name, but, you know, you are an empowered woman if you are trampling over a man on the way to unlock your new car or whatever. This sort of female empowerment is very much the current marketing zeitgeist. So then the emphasis on productivity that you’ve talked about, Catherine, I think is really astute and I think that is exactly what is happening; that we have the enterprising self and feminism becomes part of that. But I would argue that putting the emphasis on productivity, we have to be careful that we don’t lose the consumption side as well...

Andreas: So Pauline, If I understand your point correctly we can have (neoliberal) “productivity” in work or production but we should not forget we also have productivity in consumption?

Pauline: Yes, exactly - you have both sides. You have the traditional production side, where producers have to prove that they share the passion with consumers, to prove themselves and their company authentic, and of course not be seen to be trying to make money – at the end, most narratives (or brand myths) are in this vein. It’s the capital that’s masked by these narratives, generally speaking. And then, on the consumption side, you have consumers becoming productive and doing the work for capital, as you said, so that much of consumerism, including consumers’ identity projects, rests on the work in material labour, where consumers are forming social relationships, emotional relationships, that actually give the value to the brand in the end..And for ethical consumption, I think it’s exactly that, that ethical consumption is now all part of this identity seeking, rebellion, in the market place and so the idea of ethical consumerism as actually having any real power I think is really questionable. And as you said, the bigger picture is this neoliberal lens and what it has meant for this relationship between consumption and production, and the whole masking of capital. And so it’s the workings of capitalism that are actually being hidden, particularly with the moralised brandscape. More and more brands are tying themselves to some sort of moral– I mean, you even have Coca-Cola! Before it used to be just specifically “ethical” brands, but now you have almost every brand climbing on the bandwagon. So you have Coca-Cola recently trying to solve the Pakistani-Indian conflict by setting up vending machines where the consumers in both sides could see themselves in links on screens and they could play games with each other; and Coca-Cola branded this “The Happiness Machine”. This is part of Coke’s agenda to save the world! So I think feminism very much falls into this co-optation narrative where it is used to sell more products...

Andreas: Lynne, is it fair to say that there is a key difference between what you defined as the market back then and what the market is now? For example, some collective arrangements around education, health care and other public infrastructures were not the market. Now they are the market. So what was the welfare state, you know, had a completely different role to play, so the claims, any claims to the welfare state, were of a different kind and nature to begin with...

Lynne: That's why Thatcher knew that what she had to do, her project, wasn't even primarily to change things economically but, as she said, 'to change hearts and minds,' so that everybody would begin to see themselves as little entrepreneurs, rather than people connecting to other people and wanting to look after each other. And so that is what the selling off, or privatization, of the public sector is all about: to put it in the hands of global corporations. So, you know, as James Meek in his book *Private Island* and others have written about, you know, the selling of the public sector is not even, primarily, an effort to save money, as we are told. We are still probably paying out more money to these private corporations who now run our services, and which own what were our resources., But ideologically it is to get rid of the sense of there being a caring, welfare state, that we can expect to depend upon. The whole idea of welfare entitlements was undermined, and everybody was to be a 'consumer', and soon enough in neoliberal rhetoric, an 'undeserving' consumer, or 'scrounger', though people might be trying to secure benefits for essential needs that they might formally have been seen as entitled to.

Andreas: So is there any space for progressive feminism via the market and ethical consumption more broadly?...

Lynne: You can't easily reconcile feminism with the market – you have to challenge it, given the structured inequality we live with, and given that many of the basic concerns of feminism, around care, commitment, interdependence and solidarity have nothing to do with markets. For me, the problem is that consumption is almost always individual. I always have to relate feminism to issues of equality, to connect it with those groups of people who are most marginalised: today, for instance, the asylum seekers. Or, rather differently, to those who are really struggling and having to work these long, ridiculous hours not because they are making five hundred thousand million – or whatever the super-rich are making, but because they are working almost all their waking hours and for pitiful wages in order to consume anything at all. There is no place here for that transformed world of care and commitment and community life that feminists once dreamed of, and even tried to create, when we were less disciplined by market forces...

Catherine: I am also sceptical. I think that we have to think about how a world in which consumption and the market place are conceived in such radically different terms, where there can be totally different kinds of distribution, egalitarian distributions of vulnerability, of precarity, in ways that make life sustainable and liveable for the vast majority of people on this planet, and I don't see how this can come about if we don't make a radical shift...

Lynne: I just want to say first that structural inequalities never simply eliminate themselves. I mean power never undermines itself. It always shifts only due to resistance, from the outside, always. However, the neoliberal agenda and rationality has resulted in the undermining of so many democratic spaces where that resistance could come from... So what I want to say is, no, I don't have any total objection to markets, but what people like Colin Crouch, in his book *Post Democracy*, and others have argued is that it is the obeisance to global market forces which has actually wiped out the capacity any real notion of free markets, especially for local markets, or markets where there is more possibilities for local producers and local consumers to come together in open collaboration, for consumers to have any genuine agency. This is because smaller markets are so easily wiped out by the ever-invasive corporations such as Amazon, or one of the other few global corporations. So you could say that it is the free-market itself that has been destroyed. And, of course, what some people say is that capitalism is just eating itself up. You know, through creating so much inequality and environmental ruin.

Catherine: I think that this is always a question because it's becoming harder and harder to conceptualize alternatives... Local alternative markets are amazing and wonderful but can they, and do they, ultimately lead to wider solutions. I mean, now the world is so globalised, and neoliberalised, is it enough to focus on the local...

Pauline: And often those local markets –thinking of the ones in London, but plenty of others– the local farmers' markets for example, are so expensive, that they are actually trading on that utopian ideal of going back to... you are in touch with the producers but, in fact, the price structures could only possibly be for well-off middle-class consumers. And they are not actually alternative structures...

Lynne: You know, some people talk about these contingent utopias, or everyday utopias ... And people, like in Exarcheia, it is people trying to create, I don't know, very cheap availability of goods through some alternative system, which usually involves people exploiting themselves, as in a way we did in the 1970s. I don't... It's paradoxical, because it's impossible to see how they'll survive for too long because they do tend to rely on quite a bit of self-sacrifice. And while at first people can say "Oh, this is nice, we're all doing it together, we are enjoying this"... you can't afford to do this... Well, if you are very young and unemployed, maybe for a while you can... So, I don't think... I've got nothing against all markets, or alternative markets, or ethical consumption. And I think it does go on. I mean, people do set up little spaces of resistance. I get my hair cut at a local barber's, which is creating this alternative space for trans people and anyone can come in and you pay whatever you feel able to pay. So that's another alternative market, and, you know... I think that, it's real and they've managed to survive. So, would that idea spread? I mean, in a way, maybe it will have to spread if everyone is to live in complete destitution, perhaps it has to spread... Even as models, as models, that some people might develop for the future... I don't know, it's terribly hard to see how we grow back the fangs of neoliberalism. I mean the tentacles are just everywhere, as you say, undermining public spaces. But then people are trying to recuperate these public spaces and I mean, we have to have some hope, don't we?

Lynne: And also, another thing is recycling things, recycling commodities. I mean, I still like to... Everything I'm wearing is second-hand, and has been. That's what I want, I mean that's what some people *do* like to be able to do...

Fredric Jameson said it's easier to imagine the end of the world than to imagine the end of capitalism... which reminds me also of something that Lenin said and that I've used in my book, which... he said that when times were more colourful, that the workers would take over and create an egalitarian state in workers' control, capitalism will sell workers the rope with which to hang themselves. But I said, in fact, what seems to be happening is capitalism is selling the workers the rope with which to hang *ourselves*.

Catherine: Well I would think about Andreas's ending and you raised the possibility of consumerism and ethical consumption as part of a much larger strategy and that will be a much better place than talking about hanging ourselves...

Pauline: [laughs] correct! There is a certainly a space for resistance in the market but one should not stop there...

Lynne: Well we're beginning with arguments around what is it to actually care for each other and care for the world. That is still at the heart of feminism and at the heart of green politics: how do we care for each other and care for the world. That's the only place to begin. Neoliberalism wants to destroy even thinking about that question.

Andreas: And again to play the devil's advocate, the likes of Daniel Miller will say that much of our caring labour is materialised *via* consumption...

Lynne: Well, I don't completely dismiss that, but what he doesn't seem to be interested in is the structures of neo-liberalism and the fact we have so little control over... the fact that many people are not able to go to the supermarket and buy what they want to!

Bios:

Pauline Maclaran is Professor of Marketing and Consumer Research at Royal Holloway. Her research focuses on the experiential and symbolic aspects of contemporary consumer culture, especially in relation to gender issues. She has published widely on these topics and has co-edited and co-authored various books including *Marketing & Feminism: Current Issues and Research* (2002), *Critical Marketing: Defining the Field* (2007) and *Motherhoods, Markets and Consumption* (2013).

Catherine Rottenberg is a 2016-18 Marie Skłodowska Curie Fellow in the Sociology Department, Goldsmiths, and a Senior Lecturer at Ben-Gurion University of the Negev in Israel with a joint appointment in the Gender Studies Program and the Department of Foreign Literatures and Linguistics. Her current research project is on the rise of neoliberal feminism, and her most recent article, "Neoliberal Feminism and the Future of Human Capital," appeared in *Signs* (2017). Rottenberg is also the co-editor (with Dr. Sara Farris) of the themed issue "Righting Feminism" for *New Formations*.

Lynne Segal has been engaged in Left & feminist politics since coming to London from Sydney in the early 1970s. She teaches at Birkbeck, University of London, in Psychosocial Studies, and has published widely on feminism, gender and politics, including *Is the Future Female? Troubled Thoughts on Contemporary Feminism* (1987); *Slow Motion: Changing Masculinities, Changing Men* (1990); *Straight Sex: The Politics of Pleasure* (1994); *Why Feminism? Gender, Psychology & Politics* (1999); *Making Trouble: Life & Politics* (2007); *Out of Time: The Pleasures & Perils of Ageing* (2014); her latest book is *Radical Happiness: Moments of Collective Joy* (2017).

Andreas Chatzidakis is a senior lecturer in marketing at Royal Holloway University of London. His research deals with the broader intersection of consumption with ethics and politics, working on projects such as consumer-oriented activism in post 2008 Athens and the role of care and relationality in everyday consumption. He has co-edited a book entitled *Ethics and Morality in Consumption: Interdisciplinary Perspectives* (with Prof Deirdre Shaw and Dr Michal Carrington) and just finished co-authoring a book entitled *Contemporary Issues in Marketing* (with Prof Liz Parsons and Prof Pauline Maclaran).

For Citation

Chatzidakis, A. (2017). In Conversation with Pauline Maclaran, Catherine Rottenberg and Lynne Segal. *Journal of Consumer Ethics*. 1(2), 120-129.

License Information

This is an Open Access article distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0 International License (CC BY-NC-SA 4.0).