

[The Reversal of Gender Roles: Girl Gangs in Rebecca Prichard's *Yard Gal*]

Petra Kalavská

University of Pardubice
Pardubice, Czech Republic

[Abstract] *The article concentrates on dramatic works by the younger generation of British women who started writing in the 1990s and explains why their plays were not initially viewed as fitting into the category of women's drama. It considers the changes in feminist thinking and the reasons why second-wave feminism seems to have lost its edge and has become regarded as insufficient by the new generation. Even though *Yard Gal* (1998) by Rebecca Prichard (1971) differs from the feminist plays written in the 1980s, the article suggests that it is a subtly feminist and implicitly political play, as it condemns apolitical power feminism which does not consider the disadvantaged and socially deprived. The play criticises 'girl power' and uncovers the deleterious effects of postfeminism, which does not aim to transform the social reality of those who are on the edge of British society.*

[Keywords] *In-Yer-Face Theatre; postfeminism; power feminism; Rebecca Prichard; *Yard Gal**

[1] Introduction: Women's Voices at the Century's End

While the 1980s were the decade of women dramatists in British theatre and the surge of women's creative activity was undeniable,¹ in the 1990s not many new women playwrights emerged. Aleks Sierz refers to a new generation of playwrights who were born around 1970 and grew up in the 1980s as "Thatcher's Children" (237), and Elaine Aston characterises the younger generation as consisting "mostly [of] angry young men, joined by a few angry young women" (*Feminist Views* 2). At first glance, the plays by the younger generation of women seem deeply permeated with what Aston calls the "feminism fatigue of a 1990s postfeminist society" ("Feeling the Loss of Feminism" 24). Written in postfeminist times, i.e. when equality between the sexes and women's full access to independence were presented as having already been achieved, and when feminism was regarded as rigid and passé, the plays by 1990s women dramatists differ significantly from the work by the older generation staged in the 1980s.

In *The Cambridge Companion to Modern British Women Playwrights*, the editors Elaine Aston and Janelle Reinelt explain why the dramatists Sarah Kane and Rebecca Prichard are not included in the study: "Both Prichard's and Kane's theatrical landscapes are 'frightening' [Aston and Reinelt refer to the prediction of the 'frightening' future for impoverished women which closes Caryl Churchill's *Top Girls*], but in very different ways which it would be wrong to try and make 'fit' into some category of 'women's playwriting'" (2). Despite the fact that the work by the younger generation of women was not seen as fitting into the category of women's drama, the present article analysing Rebecca Prichard's *Yard Gal* (1998) is influenced by more recent research which suggests that the plays by the younger generation can be disinterred from what Aston calls "a masculine cult of 'in-yer-face-ism'" ("Feeling the Loss of Feminism" 19) and that they can in fact be studied in the context of women's playwriting. The paper analyses Rebecca Prichard's critically well-accepted play *Yard Gal*, which, together with Judy Upton's *Ashes and Sand* (1994), is a representative of so-called girl-gang drama. While Judy Upton's oeuvre, and especially *Ashes and Sand*, is studied in Rebecca D'Monté's chapter *Thatcher's Children: Alienation and Anomie in the Plays of Judy Upton*,² Prichard's girl-gang play, to the best of my knowledge, has not yet received the attention it deserves. The aim of this paper is to suggest that Rebecca Prichard's *Yard Gal* is a subtly feminist and implicitly political play which challenges all the myths that the postfeminist era helped to create. Although Prichard's play does not explicitly propagate feminism, the analysis of *Yard Gal* aims to propose that what its young adolescents lack is feminism which would alter their lives.

[2] Postfeminism, 'Girl Power', and All That

Although postfeminism can be approached as a varied and contentious term which has two basic meanings, this article works with an older and more widely-used notion

of postfeminism which perceives feminism as passé and prudish.³ This approach was promoted not only by the media, popular culture and advertising, all of which perceived feminism as redundant and potentially harmful, equality between the sexes as already achieved, and women's full access to independence as already gained, but also by such writers as Katie Roiphe (*The Morning After: Sex, Fear, and Feminism*, 1993), Naomi Wolf (*Fire with Fire: The New Female Power and How to Use It*, 1993), Rene Denfeld (*The New Victorians: A Young Woman's Challenge to the Old Feminist Order*, 1995), and Natasha Walter (*The New Feminism*, 1998).

The above-mentioned authors distance themselves from second-wave feminism, to which they most commonly refer as victim feminism and which they mistake for its radical strand. While Katie Roiphe attempts to persuade the reader that attention to sexual violence highlights female vulnerability and helplessness and that "right now there is strength in being the most oppressed" (44), Rene Denfeld presents Andrea Dworkin, a radical fringe thinker, as a "feminist leader" (13). Instead, the postfeminist writers propagate a new-styled feminism that, as Deborah L. Siegel explains, is called "power feminism," "babe feminism," or "feminism for the majority" (64). Postfeminism, often called the new feminism, is based on women's empowerment and on the realisation of their own will. Rather than being community-driven, power feminism is highly individualistic and elitist. It disregards the feminist ideal of female solidarity and stresses individual advancement and progress. While victim feminism, as Naomi Wolf explains, "sees money as contaminating" (136), power feminism is materially oriented as it presents poverty as unfashionable and connects money with glamour, self-realisation, and independence. The concept of glamour seems to be particularly significant for postfeminist writers, as sexual appeal and feminine beauty contribute to their dismissal of 'outmoded' second-wave feminism.

The rhetoric of competition and consumerism of the Thatcher/Reagan years influences and characterises power feminism. It encourages women to seek and gain what they desire while enjoying themselves and pursuing pleasure and fun. Power feminism motivates women to believe that they can achieve success while being fashionable and attractive. Unlike second-wave feminism, the new feminism is not politically oriented, and it tends to disregard the vulnerable. It just demands, to use Wolf's phrase, "[m]ore for women" (138) without any promises of loyalty, organised activism, caring collectivism, and political programmes or agendas. The personal is no longer political for a post-feminist generation.

Such a generation appears to be convinced that equality between the sexes has been achieved and that women can seize power quite easily, as it is within their grasp. In order to become empowered, women need to be active, outspoken, and even aggressive, yet always glamorous. In the British context, the Spice Girls (1996) represent postfeminist icons promoting 'girl power'. As Imelda Whelehan explains:

These 'girls' are constantly quizzed about their attitudes to femininity, and their vision of 'girl power' plays on the illusion of a contemporary culture full of ready choices and opportunities for self-expression available equally to all women. Girl power adds fuel to

the myth that young women are 'in control' of their lives and as such offers a more positive liberatory message to young women than contemporary feminism ever could. (38)

Elaine Aston's definition of 'girl power' helps to create the full picture: "'Girl power' was this contradictory mix of feminist and anti-feminist discourses that promoted an image of aggressive 'sisterhood' and feminine glamour through a creed of selfish individualism designed to 'get what you want out of life'" (*Feminist Views* 6). 'Girl power' is then promoted by young women who are confident and who can, as the members of the Spice Girls acknowledged, "give feminism a kick up the arse" (qtd. in Whelehan 45). Not only do young women give feminism a kick but they also readily compete with men, who are believed to be equal or slightly less than equal. Joanna Burgin and Jane Waghorn mention young women's slogan that captures the essence of 'girl power': "It's about what you want. It's time to give men a wake-up call. We aren't going to sit back and let them have it all their own way any more" (qtd. in Whelehan 47). Because of the apolitical nature of 'girl power'/power feminism, the "wake-up call" is not supposed to challenge the status quo. Instead, the postfeminist rhetoric promotes the idea that second-wave feminism has lost its edge and presents it as insufficient.

[3] New Writing in the Postfeminist Era

While in the 1980s the surge of women's creative activity was undeniable, in the 1990s not many new women playwrights emerged, and plays by young men became popular. Dominating the decade, such plays reflected on the crisis in masculinity, the rootlessness, disaffection, and discomfort of (macho) individuals, the antifeminist backlash, and "'new lad' misogyny" (Aston, *Feminist Views* 3).⁴ As Aleks Sierz explains, "the advent of boys' plays was partly a reaction – by both media and theatre managements – to the women's plays of the eighties" (153). While Patrick Marber's *Dealer's Choice* (1995) concentrates exclusively on male characters and their passion for poker, *Closer* (1997) examines, as Marber explains, "what is happening after feminist politics and the age of the New Man, when no one knows what's going on any more" (qtd. in Sierz 191). In *Shopping and F--king* (1996), *Faust is Dead* (1997), *Handbag* (1998), and *Some Explicit Polaroids* (1999) Mark Ravenhill studies men in the age of a consumerist vacuum as he focuses on selfish individualism, nihilism, sexual excesses, and male sexual diversity. David Eldridge's *Serving It Up* (1996) dramatises the topic of betrayal and sexual rivalry between unemployed men, and Nick Grosso's *Peaches* (1994) focuses on the way 'new lads' talk to/about 'peaches' (good-looking young women). What the above-mentioned plays share with some other plays by young male writers (e.g. Jez Butterworth, Antony Neilson, Joe Penhall, and Philip Ridley) is not only their depiction of masculine disaffection, but also their emphasis on the experiential nature of theatre.

Obviously, new writing is not exclusively a male phenomenon. It is characterised not only by the depiction of male discomfort and disaffection, but also by the representation of girls being violent, behaving badly, and reversing gender roles. Sarah Kane, Rebec-

ca Prichard, and Judy Upton are probably the most famous female practitioners of in-her-face theatre. Like their male counterparts, they were born in the early 1970s and started writing in the 1990s, in postfeminist times when equality between the sexes was presented as having been fully achieved and women's full access to independence as already won and when it was not fashionable to identify with the 'f-word' since feminism was considered rigid and passé. Even though Kane's, Prichard's and Upton's plays are not overtly feminist, closer examination indicates that feminism is covertly addressed in their work. Reinelt coins the phrase the "feminist residue" to refer to feminist concerns that "have been identified and are still present, but they are ignored, pushed aside or simply denied" (20). Despite the fact that the members of the younger generation distance themselves from the woman label,⁵ the residue of second-wave feminism is apparent in their plays, for example in Rebecca Prichard's *Yard Gal*, which presents 'girl power' as a myth.

[4] Girl Gangs in Rebecca Prichard's *Yard Gal*

Rebecca Prichard's third play, *Yard Gal*, was first performed by the Clean Break Theatre Company (an all-female theatre company which is based on cooperation with women who have a criminal record) in association with the Royal Court Theatre in May 1998. *Yard Gal* concentrates on the demoralised teenage members of a girl gang who live on the edge of postfeminist and post-Thatcher society. In *Yard Gal*, elitist power feminism, indifference to the vulnerable, and the loss of the second-wave feminist ideals and agenda seem to influence the lives of disadvantaged young women. Although selfish individualism and (sexual) aggression may imply the empowerment of these youngsters, these qualities, as will be further suggested, in fact function as evidence of their disempowerment. Prichard uses two characters, Bukola and Marie, who take turns in telling a story about a girl gang, "the story that is FI'REAL" (5) and that concentrates on street life in Hackney, East London. Although Prichard puts only two characters on the stage, she gives a voice to all the members of the gang by a multiple-role-playing strategy. Boo, who is of Nigerian origin, and Marie speak for/represent not only themselves but also Deanne, Nadine, Sabrina, and Threse.

Yard Gal focuses on a group of teenage girls who resist the ideal of female communities and friendships propagated in the feminist drama of the 1980s. While in feminist plays female bonds symbolise an alternative to exploitative heterosexual relationships, in *Yard Gal* young adolescents come together as a group in order to promote their power by behaving aggressively. As Aston claims, "Boo and Marie are not victims, but [...] 'fighters': tough yard gals who won't take 'shit' from anyone" (*Feminist Views* 74). That the girls are on the farthest margins of British society is obvious not only from their way of life but also from their family background. The teenagers steal, deal and use drugs, sell their bodies, physically hurt men, and fight with a rival girl gang. Moreover, intergenerational connections are entirely absent. Boo, Deanne, and Nadine come from a children's home, from which they keep escaping, and Marie lives with her abusive father, from whom she repeatedly runs away. Not much is known about Threse's background, apart from the

fact that “she got thrown out of a window when she was five” (Prichard 7). In the absence of a sense of belonging, community, and caring collectivism, the gang culture functions as a refuge for the teenagers, and it provides them with a form of power.

While in another ‘girl gang’ play, *Ashes and Sand* by Judy Upton, the members of the gang cannot completely trust one another, in *Yard Gal* the question of intragenerational ties is more complex. As Aston specifies, in *Yard Gal* “Prichard counterpoints two narratives: the friendship and affection between Boo and Marie, and the violent life of their all-female gang. The friendship between the two girls is constantly put at risk by the violence of the group, of which they are also a part” (*Feminist Views* 75). From the beginning of the play, Boo and Marie present themselves as best friends, and their shared narrative suggests that loyalty to each other plays an important role in their lives. Although they sometimes argue during the process of telling the story about the gang, they mostly cooperate and listen to and support each other. As Aston explains, “[t]he play begins with, and never loses sight of the fact that the girls need each other to tell their story; to back each other up” (*Feminist Views* 75). When Boo and Marie start talking about Deanne killing herself, it is Boo who senses the topic is still too depressing for Marie and takes on the responsibility of explaining how the accidentally-on-purpose suicide was committed – Deanne jumped from the balcony of the building in which the girls squat:

Boo: I felt it inside and I said out loud “Shit she gonna kill herself.” Sabrina goes “don’t touch her man – you push her off.” Deanne was laughing going “Come up here man it’s wicked,” like she was lovin’ it – but I see her fear. [...] She lose her balance and put her hand out to catch herself. I look at Sabrina’s eyes and they was wide staring. I look at Marie and her eyes was closed. (Prichard 24)

In this part of the narrative Marie is so upset that she cannot speak. She asks Boo to carry on talking about the girl gang herself for a while, and this is what Boo does:

Boo: You OK?

Marie: Yeah. It was Deanne man. We shouldn’t have told them about Deanne.

Boo: You want to stop telling it?

Marie: Yeah.

Boo: Marie? Marie!

Marie: I’ll be alright ... I’ll back you up... I’ll be alright. (*Slight pause.*) Jus run dis ting Boo! (Prichard 25)

That the relationship between Boo and Marie is reciprocal is obvious; Boo does not speak much when Marie talks about taking revenge on Wendy, a rival gang leader. The audience knows that at that time Boo was desperately seeking Marie, who escaped from hospital, as she needed Marie by her side. Marie’s description of the situation in a club where she cuts Wendy in the neck is too painful for Boo, as it signals the long-term separation of the best friends. Obviously, Boo and Marie support each other not only on the stage but also in the streets. When a person is attacked in a nightclub, Boo watches Marie “in case we see a body – she has fits sometimes don’t ya. And it’s only me that knows what to do.

It almost make me feel happy sometimes when she have a fit, it mek me feel happy that I know what to do” (Prichard 20). During a street fight with Wendy’s gang it is Boo who stops running away, as she is aware that barefoot Sabrina has no chance of escaping and needs help. When Boo is threatened with a knife by Wendy, it is Marie who saves Boo and gets wounded instead of her friend. Consequently, Marie is taken to hospital and Boo into custody.

While Boo and Marie stay loyal to each other, the members of their gang cannot fully trust one another. Boo is aware of the uniqueness of the bond between her and Marie – a supportive friendship is rare among the gang members, who are supposed to be selfish, aggressive, violent, and competitive: “They was just jealous man. Cos none a them have a best mate like Marie was to me” (Prichard 9). When Marie is wounded by Wendy in the street fight, Boo is truly worried about her friend, while Sabrina teases Boo:

Boo: Marie was curl up on the floor holding her stomach, she was fitting and blood was coming through her hands. I felt sick. Like the world was ending. I put my arm round Marie and started shouting at all the people around us to fuck off but it seem like they was deaf or stupid or love the sight of someone cut up. I thought I was gonna throw or faint and Sabrina’s like “What’s the matter with you man, it’s Marie that got cut not you.” (Prichard 29–30)

As the quotation suggests, the other members of the gang are individualistic and tough. In serious situations, individual well-being plays a more important role in the life of the demoralised teenagers than solidarity and cooperation with their friends. Without hesitation, the young adolescents shatter the supposed unity of the gang and betray one another. This is especially evident at the end of the play, when, pregnant and frustrated, Marie attacks Wendy. Although the group leader, Threse, constantly encourages Marie to take revenge on the rival on behalf of the whole gang, Threse (together with Nadine and Sabrina) selfishly leaves Marie when she realises Marie’s attack was too savage and life-threatening:

Then Sabrina started cussing me [Marie] saying I shouldn’t have gone for her neck I was only sposed to go for her face and now they’d all be up for a murder charge. Threse who was always going on about being a pussy and being a chicken was shitting bricks. Part of my mind felt afraid for myself. Part of my mind didn’t care. I told them all to fuck off – they had all wanted her dead. Threse started speechin’ me back so I just told her to fuck off and get out my face and run home. She goes “We none of us ya co-d if that’s what ya thinking,” but I weren’t listening no more. They goes “Come on Bukola,” because she was the only one that weren’t walking away but Boo stayed. (Prichard 37)

It is the violent street life and the ‘girl power’ myth that not only challenge the healing effects of the bonds among women, but also split the gang. As the quotation suggests, only Marie and Boo’s caring friendship is of any worth, and yet it cannot last in such harsh conditions. Even though Boo is loyal to her friend and saves the pregnant Marie

from being jailed by taking the blame on herself, the friendship is ruined by Boo's imprisonment and the ensuing separation.

It is beyond dispute that the play challenges elitist power feminism, which implies that women can achieve equality with men and can get what they desire. Power feminism foregrounds individual progress, consumerism, self-confidence, and (sexual) aggression. Even though in *Yard Gal* the disadvantaged young women display all these qualities, they are disempowered and have no chance to leave the margins of British society. According to the 'girl power' myth, young women are not only to be outspoken and determined to get on in life; they are also expected to be physically attractive. A feminine appearance, which is, however, accompanied by aggressive behaviour and crude language, plays an important role in the lives of the teenagers. In a cruel parody of 'girl power,' the teenagers, with the exception of Nadine, who is far from glamorous-looking as a result of her serious drug addiction, put the emphasis on sex appeal and feminine beauty, about which they care in any circumstances (however ridiculous the circumstances may be). For example, the most glamorous member, Sabrina, who "used to wear them Nike Airs" (Prichard 10), who "always look good" (Prichard 10), and who is so slim that "[h]er legs go right up to her bum" (Prichard 10), was fighting "with her feet cos she always be protecting her hair. She be like 'Bitch, I fight you, but don't be distressing my weave – took me all day star – right'?" (Prichard 11). That recent fashion trends and an attractive appearance are crucial for the young adolescents is evident. When going to a nightclub, Trezn, the members of the gang pay special attention to their appearance:

Marie: We spend hours on our hair ...

Boo: Hours graftin' for the right clothes.

Marie: And shoes.

Boo: We put on our lacy tops and our thigh boots man.

Marie: And we are OUT THERE!

Boo: Basically every one of our posse – we look the biz. (*Marie stands behind Boo and begins doing her hair. They take on the different voices of the posse.*)

Marie: I do your hair, and you do Deanne's. Nobody done Sabrina's cos she already spent all day on it anyway. (Prichard 15)

A feminine appearance encourages the members of the gang to believe in their empowerment as sex appeal enables them to advance individually, to seek pleasure, and to deceive men.

Obviously, the demoralised girls cannot afford to buy what is on offer in materially-oriented times. Nevertheless, their poverty and disadvantaged position do not stop the young women seeking and gaining what they want. To possess what they fancy, the teenagers either earn money by dealing drugs and selling their bodies, or they shoplift and rob men who are lured into believing "we're gonna love them up nice" (Prichard 11). All these activities supposedly empower the young adolescents, as through them the teenagers demonstrate their physical strength, confidence, and determination to get what they desire. It is Threse, the gang leader, who is probably the toughest dealer and thief. She

is too blatant and unscrupulous even for the narrators, who, as they admit, do not like shoplifting and/or dealing with her. As Marie explains, Threse “could front [shoplift]. She just walk into shops pick up what she wanted and walk out innit” (Prichard 6). When dealing drugs, Threse is also unashamed of the illegal activity. Boo clarifies that Threse “carry all her dope wrap up in her pussy. And when she want it she jus’ reach inside her and take it out. Anywhere. Didn’t matter. On the street. In a shop. Anywhere” (Prichard 6). However absurd it may seem, Threse is depicted as a person who behaves both as a consumer and an entrepreneur. Despite the fact that she belongs among the socially disadvantaged, who are disregarded in post-Thatcher Britain, she takes part in consumerism when shamelessly shoplifting. The fact that she cannot afford to pay for the goods she needs or fancies does not stop her. She is not ashamed of dealing drugs either, as this is the way she manages to be self-sufficient in a post-Thatcher society which emphasises individual enterprise.

When in touch with a male victim who awaits sexual excitement, the girls display qualities such as outrageousness and violence, and steal his money. Boo and Marie do not hesitate to sexually assault a police officer who supposedly betrays them. That their revenge is harsh and malicious is beyond dispute. It is the ‘girl power’ myth that appears to encourage the gang members to compete with men on male terms – the young women manifest their physical strength, aggression, and toughness. Nevertheless, outrageousness and violence signal the powerlessness of these disadvantaged teenagers.

[5] Conclusion

Rebecca Prichard’s play *Yard Gal* depicts the lives of abandoned adolescents in a postfeminist and post-Thatcher society. The members of an all-female gang display the qualities power feminism promotes. They are self-confident, active, outspoken, (sexually) aggressive and glamorous, and they pursue pleasure and fun. Violence and illegal activities give the teenagers the feeling of advancement in society, which disregards the waste of young lives and serious social dysfunction. *Yard Gal* condemns apolitical power feminism as it does not consider the disadvantaged and socially deprived. Such individuals are incapable of changing their economic situation, and they need a materialist-feminist agenda which would assist them in altering their lives. The play criticises ‘girl power’ and uncovers the deleterious effects of elitist feminism which does not aim to transform the social reality of those who are on the edge of British society. Despite the fact that *Yard Gal* differs from the feminist plays written in the 1980s, it can be concluded that it is subtly feminist and implicitly political.

[Notes]

- 1 Writing about the 1980s in British theatre, the playwright David Edgar notes the importance of women dramatists. He explains that the writers “who emerged in the early to mid-1980s – didn’t answer to names like David, John and Howard but to names like

Sarah, Bryony, Louise and Clare. In 1979 there were two currently-writing, nationally-known women playwrights in Britain (Pam Gems and Caryl Churchill). Ten years later there were two dozen, whose work had dominated the decade” (8). Apart from Pam Gems and Caryl Churchill, one can also mention, for example, Andrea Dunbar, Nell Dunn, Louise Page, Claire Luckham, Charlotte Keatley, Bryony Lavery, Sarah Daniels, Clare McIntyre, Sue Townsend, Timberlake Wertenbaker, and Valerie Windsor.

- 2 See D'Monté, Rebecca. “Thatcher's Children: Alienation and Anomie in the Plays of Judy Upton.” *Cool Britannia? British Political Drama in the 1990s*. Eds. Rebecca D'Monté and Graham Saunders. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008. 79–95.
- 3 While the older approach is counter-feminist and understands postfeminism as a backlash against the second wave, another approach is the subject of Ann Brooks's *Postfeminisms: Feminism, Cultural Theory and Cultural Forms* (1997). Brooks, researching and writing in Australia and New Zealand, disagrees with the anti-feminist interpretation of postfeminism and considers postfeminism “an expression of a stage in the constant evolutionary movement of feminism” (1). Brooks is convinced that postfeminism is related to and influenced by postmodernism, poststructuralism and post-colonialism, and she suggests that postfeminism represents “pluralism and difference and reflect[s] on its position in relation to other philosophical and political movements similarly demanding change” (1). Brooks's postfeminism is resolutely feminist and purely theoretical.
- 4 Elaborating on the ‘new lad’ culture, Aleks Sierz explains that “[t]he nineties was the decade of the boys. Wherever you looked, blokes were thrusting their way into the limelight: on the telly men behaved badly and in the cinema they did the full monty. They played fantasy football and acted dumb and dumber. On every sofa you could find two blokes, boasting about sex and setting fire to their farts, while the beer cans and fag ends piled up around them” (153). The ‘new lad,’ as Aston explains, “displaced the earlier, 1980s image of the ‘new man’” (*Feminist Views* 3) and normalised sexual harassment. The appearance of the ‘new lad’ coincided with the emergence of ‘girl power,’ as well as with the backlash against second-wave feminism.
- 5 Sarah Kane's quote concerning women writers became notoriously known: “I have no responsibility as a woman writer because I don't believe there's such a thing. When people talk about me as a writer, that's what I am, and that's how I want my work to be judged – on its quality, not on the basis of my age, gender, class, sexuality or race. I don't want to be a representative of any biological or social group of which I happen to be a member” (Stephenson and Langridge 134–35). Whereas Judy Upton's view on this matter is unknown as Upton refuses to give interviews, Rebecca Prichard's position is not dissimilar to Kane's: “I feel as objectified about being called a young writer as I do about being called a woman writer” (qtd. in Edgar 61).

[Bibliography]

- Aston, Elaine. "Feeling the Loss of Feminism: Sarah Kane's *Blasted* and an Experiential Genealogy of Contemporary Women's Playwriting." *Contemporary Women Playwrights: Into the Twenty-First Century*. Ed. Penny Farfan and Lesley Ferris. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013. 17–34.
- . *Feminist Views on the English Stage: Women Playwrights, 1990–2000*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.
- Aston, Elaine, and Janelle Reinelt. "A Century in View: From Suffrage to the 1990s." *The Cambridge Companion to Modern British Women Playwrights*. Ed. Elaine Aston and Janelle Reinelt. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000. 1–19.
- Brooks, Ann. *Postfeminisms: Feminism, Cultural Theory and Cultural Forms*. London: Routledge, 2003.
- Denfeld, Rene. *The New Victorians: A Young Woman's Challenge to the Old Feminist Order*. New York: Warner Books, 1996.
- D'Monté, Rebecca. "Thatcher's Children: Alienation and Anomie in the Plays of Judy Upton." *Cool Britannia? British Political Drama in the 1990s*. Eds. Rebecca D'Monté and Graham Saunders. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008. 79–95.
- Edgar, David. "Provocative Acts: British Playwriting in the Post-war Era and Beyond." *State of Play: Playwrights on Playwriting*. Ed. David Edgar. London: Faber and Faber, 1999. 3–34.
- Prichard, Rebecca. *Yard Gal*. New York: Dramatists Play Service, 2001.
- Reinelt, Janelle. "Navigating Postfeminism: Writing Out of the Box." *Feminist Futures? Theatre, Performance, Theory*. Ed. Elaine Aston and Geraldine Harris. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006. 17–33.
- Roiphe, Katie. *The Morning After: Sex, Fear, and Feminism*. Boston: Black Bay Books, 1994.
- Siegel, Deborah L. "Reading between the Waves: Feminist Historiography in a 'Postfeminist' Moment." *Third Wave Agenda: Being Feminist, Doing Feminism*. Eds. Leslie Heywood and Jennifer Drake. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1997. 55–82.
- Sierz, Aleks. *In-Yer-Face Theatre: British Drama Today*. London: Faber and Faber, 2001.
- Stephenson, Heidi, and Natasha Langridge, eds. *Rage and Reason: Women Playwrights on Playwriting*. London: Methuen, 1997.
- Wolf, Naomi. *Fire with Fire: The New Female Power and How to Use It*. New York: Ballantine Books, 1994.
- Whelehan, Imelda. *Overloaded: Popular Culture and the Future of Feminism*. London: Women's Press, 2000.

[Address]

Department of English and American Studies
Faculty of Arts and Philosophy
University of Pardubice

*Studentská 84
532 10 Pardubice
Czech Republic
petra.kalavska@upce.cz*

Petra Kalavská teaches at the Department of English and American Studies, University of Pardubice. She gained her Ph.D. in the field of Literatures in English at Masaryk University. Her research interests include 20th century British drama authored by women.