

Response paper

Literature, Russian Literature



Response An exploration of the relationship between feminism and technology has developed both disciplines quite extensively. With each additional development in the area, these theories have built upon each other throughout all those years, also to incorporate certain contrasts among them. Wajcman points out some commonalities as well as differences to enrich out comprehension of technology and its associated products (1). In terms of culture, technology has enforced a patriarchal perspective that essentially includes all male-related activities to introduce a gap in the gender power relations. In terms of genderization, feminist theories took a turn from studying female accessibility to technology, to examining the processes that developed technology as well as its female constitution. Presently, the feminist outlook on technology and the digital era is positive unlike its counterparts in 1980s reflecting a marked change in feminist theories of technology.

De Lauretis seems to emphasize on the aspect of sexual difference throughout the paper as the concept was a prominent element of feminist writings during the 1960s and 1970s. Sexual difference is the idea that reinforces the differences between male and female, man and woman, as it creates a categorization that is an artifact, not of biology or sociology but of discursive constructs. De Lauretis has pointed several limitations of the term ‘sexual difference’ which includes its restriction on feminist critical thinking and recuperation of radical feminist thought to the bounds of one’s master’s wall (2). Then the author articulates the concept of gender as relating to technology as represented in various forms.

McGraw’s paper on essentially “feminine” technologies explains rather

novel concept of the term from a feminist perspective (13). Here, McGraw explains how certain female possessions such as bras, closets, collars, and bathrooms are “feminist” technologies because of their utility to women. While the word technology may engender necessarily male artifacts, McGraw explains how, a recognition of such things used predominantly by women will help us understand the technologies that were used previously. This will help us to expand our thinking of technology as not necessarily a piece of gadget that is electronic or digital but that which is of use to a particular section of the target users. In turn, this realization will help individuals to understand technology as not only comprising of male-oriented objects but merely anything that has been of utility to a section of the populace. This is why they are important because they also seek to point towards the faulty system.

Oldenziel’s paper is a sort of response to McGraw’s stand on feminine technologies (38). Oldenziel talks about masculine technologies and why they are important. Here the paper is focused on cars and automobiles and generally the overt love for cars by boys. Oldenziel explains how their fondness for cars is the result of economic and social construct characterized by consumerism. Males love cars because of the way in which information has been communicated to them. Such an affiliation between an automobile and a male individual is thus a result of a consumer process that begins from production to marketing to finally consumption.

Works Cited

De Lauretis, Teresa. *Technologies Of Gender*. 1st ed. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1987. Print.

McGraw, Judith. “ Why Feminine Technology Matters.” Gender & Technology. Ed. Lerman, Nina E, Ruth Oldenziel, and Arwen Mohun. 1st ed. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2003. Print.

Oldenziel, Ruth. “ Why Masculine Technology Matters.” Gender & Technology. Ed. Lerman, Nina E, Ruth Oldenziel, and Arwen Mohun. 1st ed. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2003. Print.

Wajcman, Judy. Feminist Theories Of Technology. Cambridge journal of economics 34. 1 (2010): 143--152. Print.