

<p>Source: <i>Adam Smith and the family</i> (Nuti, 2011)</p>		<p>Date: 16/05/18</p>
<p>Type of source: Book, Subscription Database, Website, Article, Film, Interview, Other: Journal article</p>		
<p>What have I read? Quote your source for accuracy and reference.</p>	<p>What does it mean? Explain your source (may require summarising and/or paraphrasing).</p>	
<p>A first brand of interpretations of Smith's work took momentum during the 1970s and the 1980s with the rising of the feminist movements and the parallel flourishing of gender economics.⁵ Scholars following the gender approach primarily levelled their criticism against the <i>Wealth of Nations</i> (wn), highlighting how it was patently biased against women. In the following decade their focus broadened to include both the <i>Theory of Moral Sentiments</i> (tms) and the <i>Lectures on Jurisprudence</i> (lj): while tms was generally interpreted as a robust confirmation of the conservative view that underpinned Smith's biased assessment, lj provided the basis for a more favourable assessment of Smith's thought about the topic. As for wn, the absence of any explicit reference to women's labour and to wage discrimination against women contrasted with the fact that women were working at the time in most of the industries described by Smith in his exemplifications.⁶ At the same time, such typical feminine works as child rearing, housework and household self-production were not considered in wn or, worse, relegated in the sphere of «unproductive labour». Even though there were important evidences of the manifold role played by women in favouring the development of modern manufacture markets, women were never mentioned as decision makers in the field of production, consumption or reproduction. According to this literature, the absence of women in the <i>Magna Charta of modern political economy</i> affected the following developments not only in economic thought but also in the reality of industrial societies. The most important element in this process of exclusion is the outright division operated by Smith between «productive» and «unproductive» labour, as a first step in the process of understanding economic development (wn, 2.iii.1). The inclusion of many feminine activities in the sphere of unproductive labour prevented women from being considered relevant for the development of capitalism, reinforcing their social dependence on men.</p>	<p>Adam Smith, oft seen as the father of modern economics, entirely failed to consider women's domesticity as 'productive', unlike French scholars who published much work on the female body and its reproduction. While French scholars saw growing a working and successful population as a source of national wealth, Smith saw women solely within the home as contributing effectively nothing to the economy.</p> <p>Wakefield, while not drawing on the French school of thought, criticised Smith for not extending his arguments for women and valuing their contribution to the share of productive labour for the good of the whole.</p>	
	<p>What do I think about it? Apply your source to your line of reasoning.</p> <p>As already discussed, the understanding of economics as a mathematical science rather than a social science will be the crux of the issue as to why its theories are so masculine and support a patriarchal structure. However, another significant element is that the key thinkers, such as Adam Smith, had little interest in the role of women. As such, they inherently saw economics as only pertaining to the man (who at that time, would directly contribute to the market more overtly than a woman would). Evidently, not only the gender neutrality of this Cartesian rationality in economics supports its implicit gender bias, but additionally the patriarchal structure in which the main body of its ideas was written has translated into a sexist economics which we see today.</p>	

EPQ Research Journal

Source: <i>Power/Knowledge</i> (Routledge, 2016)		Date: 29.07.18
Type of source: Book, Subscription Database, Website, Article, Film, Interview, Other: Website		
<p>What have I read? Quote your source for accuracy and reference.</p> <p>For Foucault, power and knowledge are not seen as independent entities but are inextricably related—knowledge is always an exercise of power and power always a function of knowledge. Perhaps his most famous example of a practice of power/knowledge is that of the confession, as outlined in <i>History of Sexuality</i>. Once solely a practice of the Christian Church, Foucault argues that it became diffused into secular culture (and especially psychology) in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Through the confession (a form of power) people were incited to “tell the truth” (produce knowledge) about their sexual desires, emotions, and dispositions. Through these confessions, the idea of a sexual identity at the core of the self came into existence (again, a form of knowledge), an identity that had to be monitored, cultivated, and often controlled (again, back to power). It is important to note that Foucault understood power/knowledge as productive as well as constraining. Power/knowledge not only limits what we can do, but also opens up new ways of acting and thinking about ourselves.</p>	<p>What does it mean? Explain your source (may require summarising and/or paraphrasing).</p> <p>Foucault believed that power and knowledge were related, as knowledge exercised power and power was a function of knowledge.</p> <p>For Foucault, power and knowledge are inextricably linked.</p> <p>For postmodern feminists, this means a reconceptualization of power so that it is no longer vilified as had been before.</p>	
	<p>What do I think about it? Apply your source to your line of reasoning.</p> <p>For Foucault, power and knowledge are inextricably linked: Foucault believed that power and knowledge were related, as knowledge exercised power and power was a function of knowledge.</p> <p>For postmodern feminists, this means a reconceptualization of power so that it is no longer vilified as had been before.</p>	