

ФІЛОСОФСЬКЕ ОСМИСЛЕННЯ СУЧАСНОСТІ: ПОСТ-, МЕТА-

DOI: 10.26565/2226-0994-2025-72-4

УДК (UDC) 141.72:111.1

Nataliia Zahurska

OBJECT-ORIENTED FEMINISM IN THE POSTHUMAN ENVIRONMENT

The article's narrative begins by considering the negative attitude of women philosophers, particularly feminist philosophers, towards speculative realism (hereinafter referred to as SR) and object-oriented ontology (hereinafter referred to as OOO). This negation is partly due to anxieties of increased objectification. To dispel these anxieties, the article proposes such forms of objectivity as subject object, object as subject, experimental subject, disidentity, interject, hyposubject and others in their allures. In addition, it is suggested to re-evaluate the concept of thingification and return its own philosophical valuable connotations to it. The article displays that object-oriented feminism (hereinafter referred to as OOF) demonstrates its potential political, erotic and ethical advantages. OOF is considered in connection with agential realism, new feminist materialism, xenofeminism, queer theory and other related conceptions. Together, they best outline the posthuman context. It is displayed that OOF fits into the post-postmodern posthuman speculative turn while retaining the actual features of the postmodern linguistic turn. Similarly, in the context of OOF, the turn from aesthetics to erotic, from production to seduction, etc., is understood. In the article also the inception, development process, collaborations with OOO philosophers and the influence of OOF on them are researched. As a result, the intra-action in-between treating women like objects and treating objects like women happens. Thus object-hood, affirming the democracy of any objects, appears instead of objectivation, which fully corresponds to the posthuman intentions of the OOF and contributes to the formation of the posthuman environment. The article is written on a material of contemporary art and literature and, at the same time, ecophilosophy and bioethics.

Keywords: *object-oriented feminism (OOF), object-oriented ontology (OOO), posthuman, feminist materialism.*

From the very beginning of the emergence of speculative realism (hereinafter referred to as SR) and object-oriented ontology (hereinafter referred to as OOO), women philosophers, feminist philosophers in particular, were very skeptical about it. For example, although Isabelle Stengers acted as the author of a programmatic collection of articles *The Speculative Turn: Continental Materialism and Realism*, there she argued, that «materialism loses its meaning when it is separated from its relations with struggle» [Stengers, 2011, p. 369] from which it may follow that the new feminist materialism is not materialism at all. Later she also showed negativity towards OOO. Or, as another example, Catherine Malabou realizes the critique of speculative realism, considers it as a political void and opposes its new materialism [Malabou, 2021]. Meanwhile, in the context of feminism, they, rather, do not contradict but rather complement each other, as will be shown later in this article.

The resuscitation of the subject in contemporary philosophy can partly explain this skepticism and negativism. This resurrection of the subject is best emphasized in the interview Rosi Braidotti gave with the metamodernist Timotheus Vermeulen. «For me, the human or posthuman subject is still very important, if only because we experience everything from a position that is human. <...> The so-called speculative realists tend to be paradoxically dis-embedded and dis-embodied: they are really speaking from nowhere, though they try to hide it. They are unable to account for where they are speaking from. To me, however important it is that we concern ourselves with a-subjective or non-human matter, the politics of locations of the subject is something we cannot let go» [Braidotti & Vermeulen, 2014, p. 133]. In such a way

© Zahurska N. V., 2025.



This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License 4.0.

Braidotti claims a position of critical posthumanism, that is closed to postmodern with the possibility of may-being. OOO in this sense is paradoxically more definitive and more plural at once. This allows Jordi Vivaldi to speak about OOO's non-onto-taxonomical pluralism and escape a brutal eclipse of the subject in Malabou's parlance. He reconciles her, Braidotti's and other similar conceptions, especially Laboria Cuboniks' xenofeminism with OOO in xenological subjectivity: «OOO retains the human subject as a component in many real objects, and thus it is by no means nonsensical to rethink human subjectivity through ontologies that are "object-oriented"» [Vivaldi, 2021, p. 319]. Thus «despite the decisive ontological differences mediating between OOO's non-onto-taxonomic pluralism and Braidotti's posthuman subjectivity, the *transversal*, *composite*, and *locative* dimensions of the posthuman subject are compatible with OOO's principles» [Ibid., p. 322]. From his point of view contemporaneous subject is a being both host and guest, situated both *of* and *in* itself. The main question, in this case, is «how to establish forms of hospitality (*xenia*) without an instance (*xenos*) that continues to be there as a possibility of critical distance?» [Ibid., p. 330]. This question is largely answered by Lucy Suchman when notes shifting, the moment-to-moment of subject objects and «choreography of its lively objects and obliging subjects» [Suchman, 2011, p. 120]. Marsha Rosengarten in a similar vein uses Karen Barad's concept of experimental subject in biomedical and bioethical research. «Although the concept of intra-activity enables us to consider the co-affective nature of different forces or entities such as drugs, protocols, blood tests, visits to the trial site within the temporality of the RCT, it tells us little of how an objection may emerge. My appropriation of Barad's phrase expressed as "*experimental subjects kick back*" in the title of this chapter may thus be understood to emphasize the contribution of research subjects well beyond or contrary to the usual. As such I hope it also serves as a further rejoinder to the worrisome attributing of a linear causal responsibility» [Rosengarten, 2016, p. 297].

Some critical posthumanist already comprehend a moving from the postmodern linguistic turn to the post-postmodern speculative turn. Thus, according to Patricia Ticineto Clough, subject is not only human but rather a point of view left as a Deleuzian virtual residue and at the same time the interior of some intentional whole in Graham Harman words. «Writing becomes a critical method that is more than representational and necessarily compositional, a matter of piecing together as a practice of allurements or enthrallment, offering a resource both of stunning clarity and tantalizing obfuscation. As such, the compositions are meant to entice those who read them, to seduce a participation in the question of the subject in the form of the other questions about philosophy, poetry writing, the personal, the impersonal of all things, human and nonhuman. To raise the question of the subject then is not to return, or to recover what has been excluded. It is to create, to compose, to intervene, to mobilize. It is to dance» [Clough, 2010, p. 62]. So, the choreography of subject objects is an allure by way of a lure to feeling as Harman insists.

On the other hand, compatibility of OOO and material feminism becomes possible when referring to Barad's conception with its disanthropy as it makes Carol Taylor. «Furthermore, the "weirdness" of Barad's quantum physics promised a queer(y)ing that could undo identity by unmooring the fixed coordinates of time, place, and space» [Taylor, 2016, p. 202]. Then uncertainty principle in quantum physics is understood by way of indeterminacy. In searching for an answer to the question of how matter matters, Barad is considering discourse practices, agencies and relations as specific material (re)configurations. So, «objectivity means being accountable to marks on bodies» [Barad, 2003, pp. 824] and such *onto-epistem-ology* resists thingification. «I present a relational ontology that rejects the metaphysics of *relata*, of "words" and "things". <...> I have proposed a posthumanist materialist account of performativity that challenges the positioning of materiality as either a given or a mere effect of human agency» [Ibid., p. 827]. Rebekah Sheldon thus explains this Barad's thought: «To put it epigrammatically, for Barad relations precede *relata*, which then alter relations» [Sheldon, 2015, p. 202].

Thus, a quite OOO's bundle wording/worlding/weirding appears, explaining well-known Barad's conceptual persona brittlestar, which does not divide knowing, being and doing. The

reality of brittlestar is a corpo-reality according to Stacy Alaimo. «Instead of taking the nonhuman as an object of inquiry, it is possible to turn toward the nonhuman *as* ourselves not exactly human – a practice that often materializes from subjects who have themselves been positioned as *objects* [italics supplied – N. Z.]» [Alaimo, 2013, p. 391].

However, SR and OOO remain doubtful for feminist philosophers. Even in the collection of texts *Object-Oriented Feminism*, we find Irina Aristarkhova's perplexity about the very possibility of *object-oriented feminism* (hereinafter referred to as OOF) and the question of whether it is some kind of joke. Katherine Behar writes in this regard: «Irina Aristarkhova poses a sly question: *Is OOF a joke?* As one might suspect, the answer can only be *maybe*. OOF – a grunt of an acronym meant to stand for “object-oriented feminism” – is, after all, called “OOF”» [Behar, 2016a, p. 3] and further «thus, by swapping OOO's gasp for a gutsier grunt, OOF aims to inject feminism into this discourse, but without dismissing these notions that, in fact, are essential for contemporary activism» [Ibid., p. 5]. It is also worth noting that there parallels here with may-being Braidotti are found. Further Aristarkhova considers Martin Heidegger's understanding girl as a young thing. «Let us then take Heidegger at his word and approach her as a thing thoughtfully so as not to assault her but rather to enable, to reveal her independent and self-contained character» [Aristarkhova, 2016, p. 44]. One needs to listen videlicet to such a thing because in comparison with it full human has excessive tasks. According to Aristarkhova «thingification» of a girl or, it can be added, in the parlance of Lewis Carroll and Gilles Deleuze, a little girl, is better than scientific objectivation. There seems no need to clarify that the girl here is a conceptual character and does not imply any reference to age. Besides that, as Helen Hester insists, «becoming thing-woman, then, can operate as a productive part of feminist polemic and provocation, given the long history of the privileging of inanimate things» [Hester, 2017].



Girl turns from postpunk to quadrober. Shots from the musical video and cover of Posthuman by Ash Code [Belluccio & Nottebella, 2016].
Camera by Alessandro Belluccio, Klaudia Roczeń, Chriss Addams,
Chris Bjørnsen, cover by Sandra Roczeń.

Such a philosophical explanation of a feminist object allows to ponder Katherine Behar's OOF understanding more clearly. «OOF originated as a feminist intervention into philosophical discourses – like speculative realism, particularly its subset OOO, and new materialism – that take objects, things, stuff, and matter as primary. It seeks to capitalize perhaps somewhat parasitically on the contributions of that thought while twisting it toward more agential, political, embodied terrain. Object-oriented feminism turns the position of philosophy inside out to study objects while being an object oneself. Such self-implication allows OOF to develop three important aspects of feminist thinking in the philosophy of things: politics, in which OOF engages with histories of treating certain humans (women, people of color, and the poor) as objects; erotics, in which OOF employs humor to foment unseemly entanglements between things; and ethics, in which OOF refuses to make grand philosophical truth claims, instead staking a modest ethical position that arrives at being “in the right” even if it means being “wrong”» [Behar, 2016a, p. 3]. Engaging Barad's agential realism can be added, that even physical objects may erotically experiment at the same time experiment with their identities. An example of such disidentity is intra-active touching and caressing as a situation when an electron releases a photon and absorbs it, at the same time photon may also enjoy itself. In this way matter as such can be enjoyed through her agents.

The subject in this case is non-anthropocentric and queer, it seems rather interject. Thus, objectification changes to objectivity and post-objecthood, at the same time feminist ethics of care is complemented by the ontology of care. This is minimalist ontology as well as minimalist esthetic of found and readymade objects. So post-objecthood is conceptualized as postphenomenology both pre-Cartesian and post-Kantian: «the production of minimalist works involved a certain deferral on the part of the artist, who relinquished authorial place of pride to the ecology of things in a world outside, which we might associate with speculative realist philosopher Quentin Meillassoux's wondrous “great outdoors” of pre-Cartesian things-in-themselves» [Behar, 2016, p. 24]. Both minimalism and OOO find, appropriate and perform mainstream culture objects, making them opaque and open at the same time.

Behar's botox ethics is emotionally minimalist. Behar insists that vivophilia eliminates an object from its own ontology and doesn't look deep within it. Necrophiliac botox ethics, in some sense pharmakon ethics and pharmakon ontology, which is not associated with botox as a stuff or any other stuff. «Botox ethics does not avoid death – it aspires to it. Its self-fashioning is the corporeal practice of inhibiting life within oneself. It is a praxis of practicing death. <...> As a self-practice, a little shot of death provides all the object-orientation we need. In place of the vivophiliac ethics of “Don't kill me!” Botox ethics says “I'll kill myself!” Shooting up to shut up, Botox ethics recommends battenning down the hatches on our own black boxes and becoming killer objects who will shoot ourselves first» [Behar, 2016b, p. 139] – thereby Behar develops considerations by Emmanuel Levinas in OOF's vein.

At the same time, humor is of great importance for the OOF and Behar's understanding of humor is close to Harman's. «It is often the case that humor carries a note of truth, but at least on the face of things, object-oriented feminism appears to keep its distance, remaining aligned with artifice and unconcerned with being complete or being right» [Ibid., p. 17]. Entanglement and agility of humor and erotic free post-truth from negative connotations and associate it rather with experiment. Besides that, such an approach can explain a lot of the importance of humor, in particular, memes as a more vernacular kind of humor, in post-postmodern relationships. On the one side, memes often frankly display erotic and, on the other side, sending memes is significant, especially in the candy-meme period of a relationship.

So, Behar proposes erotic instead of aesthetics and seduction instead of production. «Erotics erodes boundaries between self and other, as well as the complementarity that upholds the master-slave dialectic by requiring the integrity of each of these figures delimited as humanist subjects» [Behar, 2016c, p. 36]. Behar terms Harman a madam because he arranges meetings of even exotic, drag objects and considers by way of a dancing-girl, charming and alluring, but unfit for marriage. According to Behar vicarious causation and allusiveness of allure suggest any less

withdrawn surface and erotic fetishism. «Any fetishist will attest that weirdness can be sexy, and this holds true, it would appear, even in philosophy. Whether or not one chooses to read terms like *allure* and *withdrawal* as flirtatious or frigid, attributing distant availability to objects produces what I call an exoticism of objects» [Ibid., p. 28]. Sometimes erotic of OOF becomes so intensive, that Adam Zaretsky post-ironically regards OOPS: Object-Oriented Psychopathia Sexualis [Zaretsky, 2016]. It is significant that Behar treated this with humor and included the text of the same name in the collection *Object-Oriented Feminism*, edited by her.

In this regard, it is no accident that Frenchie Lanning, a specialist in erotic fetishism, herded the OOF. She connects allure and crush in crush-allure. «The *crush*, which is defined as “a brief but intense infatuation for someone, especially someone unattainable or inappropriate” [Lanning uses here the definition from Google Search – N. Z.] – to which I will add the conditions of “unrequited,” “unaccepted,” and hopefully, “unbeknownst by the beloved” – to further set the proscenium for this special performance of allure» [Lanning, 2016b, p. 118]. So, allure somehow and partially makes the object’s margins penetrable and then an exchange of qualities happens. This may well explain Jean Baudrillard’s thought that one, who is not seduced cannot seduce. Like Behar, Lanning considers that allure acts through metaphor, but creates a gap in it and ensnares and so is a *chorismos* as division. Taylor comes to a similar opinion «Perhaps it is me, but Harman’s objects bear some resemblance to the *femme fatale* of film noir, a dangerous enchantress attempting to elude the male gaze, a thing capable of reworking the sexualized norms of abjection» [Taylor, 2016, p. 210]. According to Taylor, both allure and withdrawal are already found in Howard Lovecraft’s work as one of the OOO’s backgrounds.

To consider the relationship between speculative realists and object-oriented ontologists to OOF, it is necessary to turn to prehistory. With OOO’s appearance, Donna Haraway post-ironically marked speculative realism as a new kid on the block and threw a catchphrase phrase *Girls welcome!!!* [Harman, 2010]. Also, object-oriented ontologists were marked as sausage fest in media, considering that initially, these were exclusively male theorists. However, one can also see in it a status struggle between philosophical trends. Harman paid tribute to women theorists, in particular, defining Jane Bennett as a “Fellow Traveller” within the OOO movement, and agreed with Haraway. «Harman reassures her [Haraway – N. Z.] that girls are indeed welcome (his exclamation gives this paper its title) and we shall see that quite a few girls have (always) already accepted that invitation» [O’Rourke, 2011, p. 287]. Although Michael O’Rourke notes that OOO became more hot than queer, this invitation was accepted by not only feminists but also queer theorists, himself, Stanimir Panayotov and others. It is worth saying that OOF is also in many ways not only a feminist but also a queer trend.

Panayotov is already calling X, *Welcome!!!*. By X he means all those, who are situated in a placeless place, chora. Using Maurice Blanchot’s and Jacques Derrida’s thoughts, he notes, that it is always x without x, i. e. queer, which hasn’t definite essence, nature, or identity. Hospitality is a weak force like the queer event or OOO’s and OOF’s allure. It allows both queer and OOO to consider objects as subjects and designate the dignity of objects in Eileen Joy’s and Rourke’s words. «The emergence of object-oriented philosophy, speculative realism (regardless of the acceleration of splinters), and theories such as Bryant’s “democracy of objects” all seem to explicitly indicate an already (t)here queer-affective onto-political framework for the progress of thinking in fidelity to the Real» [Panayotov & O’Rourke, 2011, p. 119].

Object-oriented ontologists Ian Bogost and Timothy Morton actively take part in OOF movement, especially in developing its posthuman threats. «Perhaps then we can understand OOF as a perturbation of human and world, as a freedom to move through that door between inside and outside at will, noting the differences but not being limited by them» [Bogost, 2010]. In Timothy Morton «humble ecocritical opinion», which he outspeaks in comments, this is the most important issue here. Maybe it is worse to move out feminist stereotypes. As Ian Bogost notes in comments «the name “radical” would truly be an earned one for a feminism that managed to wrestle free entirely from correlationism» [Ibid.]. After the incident, when during Bogost’s speech, girl in playboy bunny suit flashed between random bunny images, he posed the

rhretorical question: «are women or girls or sexiness to have no *ontological* place alongside chipmunks, lighthouses, and galoshes?» [Ibid.]. Later Behar maintained him: «the image toy generates what he calls a “tiny ontology,” a microcosmic image of the diversity of being» [Behar, 2016a, p. 2] and traced a connection between tiny ontology and OOF’s minimalism. She also didn’t agree with negative assessment of this image of a female dean. «The dean’s response very well may have been motivated by this sort of politically correct (and thus politically impotent) feminism. But by abolishing women, girls, and sexiness, OOF perpetuates this same abstraction and silencing» [Behar, 2016a, p. 21]. Alaimo expressed her attitude towards this situation as follows. «Feminist, queer theory and disability studies have themselves developed, however, complex, playful, pro-sex understandings of bodies, objects, pleasures, and desires that would contest simple notions of sexual objectification?» [Alaimo, 2014, p. 18–19]. She insists, that even Bogost considers a human being, including himself, as a thing, Harman and Behar move further and consider a human being, including themselves, as an object.

This is a condition of seduction by Baudrillard, enchantment by Harman and realist magic by Morton. Lunning argued that woman’s body and image may be understood as a hyperobject and fetish as a particular object in the allure of hyperobject: «If we look at the objects that twinkle out from the maelstrom, which evince hypocrisy, weakness, and lameness, we find the aesthetic notes from abjecting/abjected objects as they appear in the heat of exchange – in allure» [Lunning, 2016, p. 96]. However, the hypocrisy here indicates that it is rather hyposubject as a version of the subject object, object as subject or experimental subject. Rebekah Sheldon also pays attention to, that «feminist new materialism sees objects as a concrescence or intensive unfolding of an extensive continuum» [Sheldon, 2015, p. 196] and further «The contradiction between plenum and dunamis appears logical precisely because it begins from an originary cut between the given and the immutable and the contingent and mutational. A resurgent, vitalized understanding of the “sphere,” the “support,” the “chain or ... system,” “the moving substrate” in Foucault; the “spatium” in Deleuze and Guattari; begins to suggest a way back to the chora in its activity, to inhuman reproductions, to an irruptive chora that exerts its own autonomous force» [Ibid., p. 213]. Unlike Judith Butler’s point of view, from this one, the chora is passive to be a placeless place.

Morton collaborated most actively with OOF. During this collaboration, he proceeds with the conception of Luce Irigaray. «Irigaray observes that women’s speech is alogical. <...> Irigaray asserts that women’s bodies are “neither one nor two.” What object-oriented ontology does is simply apply this thought to any object whatsoever» [Morton, 2016, p. 73] and earlier «thus Irigaray’s theory of woman as self-touching loop is in fact a theory of everything» [Ibid., p. 78]. In Irigaray’s vein he tries to replace the language of vision with a language of kinesthesia and so to approve a weird essentialism with uniqueness and difference and also ecological intimacy of an object-oriented feminist and queer ecology and even ontology.

«An ecofeminist ontology might be better off starting with darkness and withdrawal. <...> A feminist ontology might support objects that merely exist, without any interaction whatsoever. Objects should be allowed to be inward, introverted – to exceed any gaze, any encounter at all. <...> Entities appear to interact all the time, but only because some aspect of them doesn’t interact» [Morton, 2013, p. 65–66]. Thus, compared with Irigaray, Morton considers, that women aren’t obliged to communicate. They rather intra-act in Barad’s parlance or have deep and intimate even if uncanny and contradictory at the same time relationships. «It seems as if one entity, an entity that is strictly unthinkable according to intra-action, disturbs the intra-active festival: a feminine, withdrawn entity. <...> Things must be what they are in order to intra-act» [Ibid., p. 63–64]. So, it turns out that we are not halfway to the Universe, but already in it. Morton also removes Barad’s accusation of narcissism against the hyposubject of *Love Song of J. Alfred Prufrock*. In his opinion, withdrawal means that some entities aren’t more intra-active than others and this opinion supports non-human weird essentialism.

To avoid negative connotations of objectification or reification notions, Morton prefers to use not the notion of object, but the notion of thingy what does it mean neither exclusion nor

inclusion, but seclusion in Heideggerian mean or withdrawal in Harmanian mean. It can also be added that entity here means a non-totalizable «not-all», which, according to Jacques Lacan, is a woman. Behar agrees completely with these considerations: «object-oriented feminism is directly concerned with treating humans like things. Equally, it is engaged in extending intra-human feminist ethics to the object world and in cultivating posthuman solidarities» [Behar, 2016, p. 29]. However, Morton proposed a bolder option. Using the phrase of «great philosopher» Big Lebowski, he invokes posthumanly to treat objects like women. Collaboration with the OOF greatly influenced Morton's conception and living experience while he was introducing the concept of subscendence instead transcendence. «The important thing being not so much the content conveyed, but rather the energetic infrastructure itself. And then, instead of seeking to transcend my physicality, I try to subscend my fantasy of disembodiment and its perfect marriage in heaven between the misogynistically disembodied matrix and my own inevitably white male power trip. That becomes an identification with the poor nonhuman beings, such as one's own flesh, that have gone to the trouble of allowing you to think fantasies of yourself. I think "subscendence" is beautiful by the way. "Hyposubjects subscend" is another slogan to play with» [Morton & Boyer, 2021, p. 70].

Women philosophers use concepts like Morton's, for example, viscosity, in turn. Thus, Nancy Tuana creates an intra-actionist ontology of viscous porosity. «I will demonstrate that while an interactionist ontology eschews the type of unity and continuity celebrated in traditional Western metaphysics, viscous porosity helps us understand an interactionist attention to the processes of becoming in which unity is dynamic and always interactive and agency is diffusely enacted in complex networks of relations» [Tuana, 2008, pp. 188–189]. She understands viscosity as both fluidity and solidity. Tuana also argues that debates between realism and constructivism, materialism and semiotics, etc. aren't useful for feminism, it need rather in-between intra-actions for the dance of agency in Andrew Pickering's parlance.

«To the speculative turn, feminism is not a radial line, something that extends from within the centre, but an orb. It is an act of enclosure as revealing: those who proclaimed speculation were too busy weaving their webs to see that they already lived inside an insect colony. <...> Behar's object-oriented feminism is seductive, elastic, and alluringly nylon» [Konior, 2017]. Bogna Konior ascribes viscosity to OOF itself, thereby inscribing it into the post-human environment. In contrast with Sara Ahmed, who from the constructivist position criticizes unattainability and at the same time compulsion of happiness and joy, Claire Colebrook, from the posthuman point of view affirms them. «If animal happiness is strictly unrepresentable and unthinkable – the thought of a being that simply is with no sense of a world – then joy is no less inhuman. Joy is that capacity to expand beyond the goods and evils that affect one's finite life; it is the recognition of the force of life as eternal, as above and beyond any of its perceived points. Joy is the power to affirm and live life, rather than judge life. Joy is freedom from the position of the self in its relation to the world» [Colebrook, 2015, p. 202]. Nevertheless, a matter, in this case, is also a *motter* (*french* mot – word) in Colette Soler parlance.

Such an intra-action in-between materialism and semiotics is close to Harman's immaterialism. «However, social theory stands to benefit from object-oriented philosophy through what we call posthuman relationism – characterised as a commitment to the reality of the nonhuman, but not divorced from the human» [Campbell, Dunne & Paul Dylan-Ennis, 2019, p. 121]. It is worth noting that here, like Colebrook, we are talking rather not about the non-human, but about the posthuman, given the importance of the semiotic aspects of the issue. Notwithstanding Norah Campbell, Stephen Dunne and Paul Dylan-Ennis stress also peculiarities of the feminist position from OOO's. «Feminist science studies demand a normative responsibility towards ontological inclusivity and humility. If in Harman's philosophy everything gets determined as an object (including subjects), then the 'who, how, what, when and where' of object-making gets glided over» [Ibid., p. 130]. This can be avoided by introducing the concepts of hyposubject, subjective object, etc.

As a certain strand of posthumanism OOO is being come on also by Yogi Hale Hendlin. «Indeed, as OOO inner-circle writer of the popular blog *Larval Subjects* Levi Bryant describes in his *The Democracy of Objects*, individuating objecthood is emancipatory, liberating objects from the ways in which people attempt to instrumentalize objects to meet their own ends. <...> Not all posthumanists are object-oriented ontologists, and vice-versa, but both movements tend to intentionally blur or erase the boundaries not just between humans and nonhumans, but between living organisms, artifacts, ideas, and science fiction – without accounting for real differences» [Hendlin, 2023, p. 318]. He also adds, that feminist posthumanism (Haraway, Braidotti, Barad), vital materialism (Bennett) and queer theory may help to empower their conception through an appellation to OOO from the one side and, on the another side, OOO may develops through OOF in a wide sense, i. e. aggregation of a whole specter of conceptions, in which OOO, feminism, materialism, queer theory, etc. intra-act in one way or another. Thus, becoming more-than-human and versatility of queers and quirks in metamodern understanding may be possible. Kathleen Stock in *Material Girls: Why Reality Matters for Feminism*, for example, insists on the importance of material and real issues: «What the material and psychological effects of the political successes of gender identity theory have been on older transsexuals, for whom the concept of gender identity has played little part» [Stock, 2021, para. 8]. She doesn't accept the position of Judith Butler, oscillating between two extremes with too much amplitude. Earlier Reena Mistry has already stressed that «the association between Madonna and *Gender Trouble* is more of an academic observation than a queer revolution» [Mistry] and Madonna stayed an illustrative example of a queer material girl. In conversation with Harman Monika Kaup speaks out in a similar way. «Unlike materialism, realism is not committed to the exclusion of mind-dependent objects, such as the imaginary characters and worlds of post-apocalyptic fiction. In response to your questions about gender, I would counter with another question: in addition to feminist materialisms, why are there no feminist realisms?» [Harman, Kaup].

At the same time, Behar tries to disassociate with intersectional feminism because it as data-mining puts too much attention to secondary qualities of objects up to connection impossibility: «In all seriousness, I do think that we need strategies to become more imperceptible now, and these strategies will also rail against the notions of identity *and* identifiability» [Behar, 2019, p. 161]. Such a disidentity may be realized in non-Euclidean politics, esthetics and ontology. «If there is a new non-Euclidean political space coming out of this, I hope it's a space of care» [Ibid., p. 165]. Earlier artist Helen Barff on the question about a sense of the object already answered: «Objects for me take on personalities, they become almost like my children, they are creatures and the resulting work becomes an object that is a being, so it is projecting my own being onto them, making them something I can relate to. And a means of understanding or negotiating with the world» [Evans, 2014, p. 34]. Her art objects are in a becoming, in a process, what in the best way is displayed through using non-Euclidean models, for example, a Klein bottle, in which inside and outside intra-act.



Helen Barff. The Inside and Outside of a Jug. 2008.

Bodies in this case aren't nomadic singularities and have dimensions, which can intra-act and intra-wine in a non-Euclidean pose or an overweight. Anna Mirzayan in an interview with

Behar puts attention to the conceptualization of fatness as a kind of vagueness, opacity and imperceptibility, therefore it has a subversive potential [Behar, 2019]. Behar also considers non-Euclidean aesthetics as a decelerationist one. «There's something disruptive about perversion, and one might leverage that disruptive power of the perverse to gum up the machine and the acceleration of capital» [Ibid., p. 168]. In Behar's own artworks, decelerationism is realized through the aesthetization of post-contemporary waste. «Her *E-Waste* things have their Being without even trying to have it: we do not know what is excessive to them or not» [Aristarkhova, 2016, p. 56].



Katherine Behar. Roomba Rumba. 2015.

So, care here means neglect and neglect means care, which good correlates with imperceptibility and disidentity. In the best way, it realizes in Behar's *Roomba Rumba*. Two Roombas with plants on them are dancing and flirting with one another and with outlookers while playing a song about the little old ant. So, «this project exposes continuities between human labor and the feminization and domestication of machinic productivities. <...> This pas de deux aims to upset distinctions between natural and artificial, biological and machinic, behind-the-scenes service work and performative display, and to prompt solidarities across these categories» [Behar, 2015]. Anna Mirzayan highly appreciated the project: «to me your work was really playful and goofy – I mean in a project like *Roomba Rumba*, Roombas are so goofy and I don't think you can ever escape that; and even perverse, like sticking together the organic and the inorganic» [Ibid., p. 165].

Morton considers Roombas as an important embodiment of a hyposubject. «So, as hypersubjects seeking to reform, we have begun in a Roomba-like way to consider the political potentiality of hyposubjects» [Morton & Boyer, 2021, p. 14]. Even more, he considers a human being as basically Roomba of the philosophical, close to the earth agent, fellow hyposubject for the cats and other agents, «always less than itself» [Ibid., p. 71]. And that's why Roombas often became a character of contemporary art projects like Eva & Franco Mattes' *Roomba Cat*, which is kind of sums up the flood of numerous home videos of pets and plants on Roombas.



Eva & Franco Mattes. Roomba Cat. 2023.

Although it cannot be said that OOF has developed very actively since its emergence, this concept can be productively applied to the study of posthuman appearance. Take, for example, *The Instant* by Amy Liptrot, whose reference to the partners is comparable to that of Roland

Barthes or, rather, Andy Warhol. The fact that Bart refers to his partners by initials already looks quite posthuman, since when partners change (X or Y), his loving discourse continues. Warhol goes further and signs himself as A and all others as B. When Liptrot doesn't distinguish her sexual partners, «this instant access romance works both ways» [Liptrot, 2022]. Moreover, romantic communication become impersonal. «I've found lately that when people message me, perhaps suggesting meeting up, or in a potentially romantic situation, they drop personal pronouns – it's all 'Be in touch?' or 'Wanna meet up?' rather than 'Would you like to meet up with me?' – never implicating themselves, or making firm plans, always suggesting they have somewhere else or better to be. We like to give the impression that things don't mean that much and we're not taking risks» [Ibid.]. Firstly, it may deflate, but then such a realization of OOF gives a greater degree of freedom. And this tactic may be supplied to politics, erotic and ethics as Behar suggests.

In conclusion, it is worth saying that OOF, despite the initially negative attitude of feminist philosophers towards OOO, has developed into an extremely fruitful concept for posthuman feminism. The fact that in the context of OOF, erotic is intertwined with humor, which means it does not pretend to be ultimately right, indicates that it contains a pronounced potential for development. It would like to wish the development of OOF to be more intensive and to express a hope, that the given article will contribute to this. On the strength of Harman's immaterialism, OOF succeeds in largely resolving one of the most important problem of the contemporary philosophy of intra-action materialism and semiotics, and consequently of critical posthumanism and speculative posthumanism. Since OOF, from a philosophical point of view, explores the problems of Botox ethics, both minimalist aesthetics and overweight or posing as the creation of non-Euclidean space, erotic fetishism and crush as an allure, etc., it can not only make a worthy contribution to feminist philosophy but also offer interesting tactics for the vernacular life of women.

REFERENCES

- Alaimo, S. (2014). Sexual Matters: Darwinian Feminisms and the Nonhuman Turn. *J19: The Journal of Nineteenth Century Americanists*, Vol. 1, Issue 2, 390–396, 461.
- Alaimo, S. (2013). Thinking as the Stuff of the World. *O-Zone: A Journal of Object-Oriented Studies*, Issue 1. *Object/Ecology*, 14–21.
- Aristarkhova, I. (2016). A Feminist Object. In K. Behar (Ed.), *Object-Oriented Feminism* (pp. 39–63). Minneapolis, L.: University of Minnesota Press.
- Barad, K. (2003). Posthumanist Performativity: Toward an Understanding of How Matter Comes to Matter. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, Vol. 28, No. 3, 801–831.
- Behar, K. (2016a). An Introduction to OOF. In K. Behar (Ed.), *Object-Oriented Feminism* (pp. 1–36). Minneapolis, L.: University of Minnesota Press.
- Behar, K. (2016). Arbitrary Objects: Minimalism and Nonanthropocentrism. In K. Behar & E. Mickelson (Eds.), *And Another Thing: Nonanthropocentrism and Art* (pp. 22–33). N.-Y.: punctumbooks.
- Behar, K. (2016b). Facing Necrophilia, or «Botox Ethics». In K. Behar (Ed.), *Object-Oriented Feminism* (pp. 123–143). Minneapolis, L.: University of Minnesota Press.
- Behar, K. (2019). Objects that Matter. Bodies, Art, and Big Data. Katherine Behar interviewed by Anna Mirzayan. *Chiasma*, 5, 155–168.
- Behar, K. (2015). *Roomba Rumba*. Retrieved from: <https://www.katherinebehar.com/art/high-hopes-deux/index.html>
- Behar, K. (2016c). The Other Woman. In K. Kolozova & E. A. Joy (Eds.), *After «The Speculative Turn»: Realism, Philosophy, and Feminism* (pp. 27–38). N.-Y.: punctumbooks.
- Belluccio, A., Nottebella C. (2016). Posthuman. On *Posthuman* [CD]. Sessa: Swiss Dark Nights.
- Bogost, I. (2010). *Object-Oriented Feminism*. Retrieved from: https://bogost.com/writing/blog/object-oriented_feminism_1/ Published November 5, 2010.

- Braidotti, R., Vermeulen, T. (2014). Borrowed Energy: Interview. *Frieze: Contemporary Art and Culture*, Issue 165, 130–133.
- Campbell N., Dunne S. & Dylan-Ennis P. (2019). Graham Harman, Immaterialism: Objects and Social Theory. *Theory, Culture & Society*, Vol. 36, Issue 3, May 2019, 121–137. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0263276418824638>
- Clough, P. T. (2016). Notes for *And They Were Dancing. After «The Speculative Turn»: Realism, Philosophy, and Feminism* (pp. 59–70). N.-Y.: punctumbooks.
- Colebrook, C. (2007). Narrative Happiness and the Meaning of Life. *New Formations*, no. 63, 82–102.
- Evans, G. (2014). An interview with artist Helen Barff. In P. Harvey, C. E. Casella, G. Evans, H. Knox, C. McLean, E. B. Silva, N. Thoburn, & K. Kath Woodward (Eds.), *Objects and materials: a Routledge companion* (pp. 27–39). L.: Routledge.
- Harman, G. (2010). *Question Period: Stengers and Haraway on Speculative Realism*. Retrieved from <http://doctorzamaiek2.wordpress.com/2010/12/03/question-period/>.
- Harman, G., Kaup, M. (2022, February 11). A Conversation with Graham Harman and Monika Kaup on 'New Ecological Realisms' (Part 2). *Edinburgh University Press Blog: Connecting People and Ideas*. Retrieved from <https://eupublishingblog.com/2022/02/11/a-conversation-with-graham-harman-and-monika-kaup-on-new-ecological-realisms-part-2/>
- Hendlin, Y. H. (2023). Object-Oriented Ontology and The Other of We in Anthropocentric Posthumanism. *Zygon. Journal of Science and Religion*, Vol. 58, Issue 2 (June 2023), 315–339. <https://doi.org/10.1111/zygo.12864>
- Hester, H. (2017). Towards a Theory of Thing-Women. *Living in the Future*, 4. Retrieved from <http://www.litfmag.com/issue-4/towards-a-theory-of-thing-women/>
- Konior, B. (2017). Review of *After the “Speculative Turn”: Realism, Philosophy, Feminism*, ed. by Katerina Kolozova and Eileen A. Joy. *Canadian Society for Continental Philosophy*, November 27. Retrieved from www.c-scp.org/2017/11/27/katerina-kolozova-and-eileen-a-joy-eds-after-the-speculative-turn
- Liptrot, A. (2022). *The Instant*. Edinburg: Canongate. Kindle edition.
- Lunning, F. (2016). Allure and Abjection: The Possible Potential of Severed Qualities. In K. Behar (Ed.), *Object-Oriented Feminism* (pp. 83–105). Minneapolis, L.: University of Minnesota Press.
- Lunning, F. (2016b). The Crush: The Fiery Allure of the Jolted Puppet. In K. Kolozova & E. A. Joy (Eds.), *After «The Speculative Turn»: Realism, Philosophy, and Feminism* (pp. 117–132). N.-Y.: punctumbooks.
- Malabou, C. (2021). Le Vide Politique du Réalisme Contemporain. In C. Crignon, W. Laforge and P. Nadrigny (Eds.), *L'écho du réel* (pp. 485–498). Paris: Mimésis.
- Mistry, R. (2013). Madonna and Gender Trouble. *lasdisidentes*, 15 march. Retrieved from <https://lasdisidentes.com/2013/03/15/madonna-and-gender-trouble/>
- Morton, T. (2016). All Objects Are Deviant: Feminism and Ecological Intimacy. In K. Behar (Ed.), *Object-Oriented Feminism* (pp. 65–81). Minneapolis, L.: University of Minnesota Press.
- Morton, T., Boyer, D. (2021). *Hyposubjects: On Becoming Human*. L.: Open Humanities Press.
- Morton, T. (2013). Treating Objects Like Women: Feminist Ontology and the Question of Essence. In Gaard G., Estok S. C., Oppermann S. (Eds.), *International Perspectives in Feminist Ecocriticism* (pp. 56–69). N.-Y., L.: Routledge.
- O'Rourke, M. (2011). «Girls Welcome!!!»: Speculative Realism, Object Oriented Ontology, and Queer Theory. *Speculations II*, 275–312.
- Panayotov, S., O'Rourke, M. (2011). «X, Welcome!!!»: Stanimir Panayotov in Conversation with Michael O'Rourke. *Journal for Politics, Gender and Culture*, Vol. 8, No. 2, Summer 2011, Issue 19, 97–135.
- Rosengarten, M. (2016). Experimental Subjects Kick Back: A Provocation for an Alternative Causality in Biomedical Research and Bioethics. In V. Pitts-Taylor (Ed.), *Mattering: Feminism, Science, and Materialism* (pp. 284–299). N.-Y.: New York University Press.

- Sheldon, R. (2015). Form/matter/chora: Object-oriented ontology and feminist new materialism. In Grusin R. (Ed.) *The Nonhuman Turn* (pp. 193–222). Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Stengers, I. (2011). Wondering about Materialism. In L. Bryant, N. Srnicek & G. Harman (Eds.), *The Speculative Turn: Continental Materialism and Realism*, (pp. 368–380). Melbourn: re.press.
- Stock, K. (2021). Material Girls: Why Reality Matters for Feminism. L.: Fleet. Kindle edition.
- Suchman, L. (2011). Subject objects. *Feminist Theory*, Vol. 12, Issue 2, 119–145.
- Taylor, C. A. (2016). Close Encounters of a Critical Kind: A Diffractive Musing In/Between New Material Feminism and Object-Oriented Ontology. *Cultural Studies ↔ Critical Methodologies*, Vol. 16, Issue 2, 201–212. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1532708616636145>
- Tuana, N. (2008). Viscous porosity: Witnessing Katrina. In S. Alaimo & S. J. Hekman (Eds.), *Material feminisms* (pp. 188–213). Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Vivaldi, J. (2021). Xenological Subjectivity: Rosi Braidotti and Object-Oriented Ontology. *Open Philosophy*, Vol. 4, No. 1, 311–334. <https://doi.org/10.1515/opphil-2020-0187>
- Zaretsky, A. (2016). OOPS: Object-Oriented Psychopathia Sexualis. In K. Behar (Ed.), *Object-Oriented Feminism* (pp. 145–182). Minneapolis, L.: University of Minnesota Press.

Zahurska Nataliia V.

D.Sc.in Philosophy

Professor of the Department of Theoretical and Practical Philosophy named after Professor J. B. Schad

V. N. Karazin Kharkiv National University

4, Svobody sqr., 61022, Kharkiv, Ukraine

E-mail: zagurskaya@karazin.ua

ORCID: <http://orcid.org/0000-0001-5142-8064>

Article arrived: 10.03.2025

Accepted: 23.04.2025

ОБ'ЄКТ-ОРІЄНТОВАНИЙ ФЕМІНІЗМ В ПОСТАЮДСЬКОМУ ДОВКІЛЛІ

Загурська Наталія Віталіївна

доктор філософських наук

професор кафедри теоретичної і практичної філософії імені професора Й. Б. Шада
Харківський національний університет імені В. Н. Каразіна.

майдан Свободи, 4, Харків, 61022, Україна

E-mail: zagurskaya@karazin.ua

ORCID: <http://orcid.org/0000-0001-5142-8064>

АНОТАЦІЯ

Наратив статті починається з обміркування негативного ставлення жінок-філософів, зокрема філософів-феміністок, до спекулятивного реалізму (далі – СР) та об'єктно-орієнтованої онтології (далі – ООО). Ця негація частково пов'язана з побоюваннями посилення об'єктивації. Щоб розв'язати ці побоювання, стаття пропонує такі форми об'єктності, як суб'єктний об'єкт, об'єкт як суб'єкт, експериментальний суб'єкт, дисидентичність, інтер'єкт, гіпосуб'єкт та інші у їх аллюрії. Крім того, пропонується переоцінити концепцію реіфікації та повернути їй її власне філософські оціночні конотації. У статті показано, що об'єктно-орієнтований фемінізм (далі – ОФФ) демонструє свої потенційні політичні, еротичні та етичні переваги. ООФ обмірковується у зв'язку з агентурним реалізмом, новим феміністським матеріалізмом, ксенофемінізмом, квір-теорією та іншими відповідними концепціями. Разом вони найкраще окреслюють постаюдський контекст. Показано, що ООФ вписується в пост-постмодерний постаюдський спекулятивний поворот, зберігаючи актуальні риси постмодерного лінгвістичного повороту. Так само в контексті ООФ розуміється поворот від естетики до еротики, від виробництва до спокуси тощо. У статті також досліджується зародження, процес розвитку, колаборації з філософами ООО та вплив ООФ на

них. У результаті відбувається інтра-акція в-між поводженням з жінками як з об'єктами та з об'єктами як з жінками. Таким чином об'єкт-ність, утверджуючи демократію будь-яких об'єктів, постає натомість об'єктивністю, що цілком відповідає постлюдським інтенціям ООФ і сприяє формуванню постлюдського довкілля. Стаття написана на матеріалі сучасного мистецтва та літератури і, водночас, екофілософії та біоетики.

Ключові слова: об'єктно-орієнтований фемінізм, об'єктно-орієнтована онтологія, постлюдина, матеріалістський фемінізм.

Стаття надійшла до редакції: 10.03.2025

Схвалено до друку: 23.04.2025

Як цитувати / In cites: Zahurska, N. (2025). OBJECT-ORIENTED FEMINISM IN THE POSTHUMAN ENVIRONMENT. *The Journal of V. N. Karazin Kharkiv National University, Series Philosophy. Philosophical Peripeteias*, (72), 39-51. <https://doi.org/10.26565/2226-0994-2025-72-4>