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Between 1500 and 1700, the Western world began to take on the features that, in the dominant opinion of today, would make it modern and progressive. Now, ecology and the women’s movement have begun to challenge the values on which that opinion is based. By critically reexamining history from these perspectives, we may begin to discover values associated with the premodern world that may be worthy of transformation and reintegration into today’s and tomorrow’s society. (Merchant, 1980, p. xix)

Introduction

Today, this moment, is another hopeful opportunity to be doing something to further our understanding of how we can envision solutions to solve the ecocrisis as we are living on borrowed time. According to the projected models put forth for the last 50 years the collective problems representing the ecocrisis were supposed to become irreversible by 2010. Either all the predictive models were erring on the side of caution, or we have already passed the failsafe point and are now hanging on by our fingernails to prevent the Earth from imploding—“not with a bang but a whimper” (to borrow a quote from the last line of T. S. Eliot’s 1925 poem “The Hollow Men”).

As we pointed out in our Editor’s Introduction for the first issue of Restoration Earth (Batten [MacDowell] & Schroll, 2011), Euro–American science needs to find a way to remember and reintegrate Eros into its way of knowing as science is a socially constructed framework. Men like Descartes, Bacon, Newton, and Kant created it. These and other men proclaimed the Logos-oriented way of knowing is value-free, and claimed this represented a moral high ground with the assertion that gathering and analyzing data is free of bias and assumption (Schroll & Greenwood, 2011). And yet, the way in which we gather data, and the way in which we analyze it and respond to its resulting conclusions is a value (Schroll, 2010). Social constructionist theorist Kenneth Gergen (1994) writes of our inherited Western model of science and by greater degree how we legitimate knowledge:

In large degree scientific reports are distinguished from commonplace accounts by virtue of their objectivity: the scientific text is privileged because unlike the common argot of the culture, it is not a product of subjective, self-serving bias. But if the scientist is truly objective, as is commonly claimed, how is this objectivity achieved? How can others acquire this skill? .... The concept of objectivity has enormous rhetorical power in contemporary affairs. It serves as the keystone in justifying and planning scientific research, educational curricula, economic policies, military budgets, and international programs. When decisions seem to lack objectivity, they are open to a range of unhappy epithets: illusory, subjective, unrealistic. As many believe [emphasis added], the achievement of objectivity is closely linked to the capacity for survival: if one’s decisions are not grounded in objective ap-
praisal, they may be ill-adapted to the world’s contingencies. In many quarters the demand for objectivity is little short of a moral imperative; to live a life of delusion or false consciousness is to fall short of achieving full humanity. But what is it to achieve objectivity in action? What is it about certain accounts or decisions that grants them the authority of objectivity, while others are held to be deluded or deceived? (p. 165)

Gergen suggests questioning the nature of Western scientific inquiry destabilizes the individual creating a sense of “existential doubt” (p. 64) and even threatens ideals of democracy and political policy. Gergen highlights the illusion of a value-free science, what we term Logos-oriented inquiry, is one that often ensures the status quo, noting women are often required to accept conclusions that “alienate herself from her body” (p. 35). This is why we place special emphasis on the word men, because Euro–American science is a very masculine or androcentric worldview; a worldview of values that often undermines women and, at best, solidifies their location in relation to men and society as an inferior gender (Gray, 1979/1981; Griffin, 1978; Mijares, 2012, this issue), at worse, it subjugates women as other-than human through persisting descriptions of them in “pejorative animal terms” (Warren, 2000, p. 27). This latter issue further serves to reinforce the cognitive and emotional gap between human beings and nonhuman species.

Specifically, we may see the Euro–American worldview as being defined by four characteristics in relation to its perception and location of women and by extension nonhuman species. First, the emphasis on objectivity versus subjectivity leads to a denial of the individual (including nonhuman species) as valid and a subsequent lack of care for the rights of the individual (see Kheel, 2008). Women, like nature, become resources or objects that may be utilized and literally raped (Gomes & Kanner, 1995; Griffin, 1978; Warren, 2000). Women’s bodies become political objects of competitive debates of ownership among largely male legislators (Arrillaga, 2012). Second, this worldview is cold, analytical, and detached relying on cognitive ways of knowing and dislocating emotional processing (Warren). Through this emphasis women are often viewed as being overly emotional and through this denied any capacity of reason to engage in the discourse of a Logos-driven culture; while other species are denied both intelligence and emotion and eradicated entirely from the discourse. The third characteristic is that matter is tainted, imperfect, grotesque, fallen. Theologian Melissa Raphael (1996) writes:

In the patriarchal scheme female being does not have the privileges of the self-defining subject. A woman’s being is a historical self-for-other. She is constituted by a variety of other people’s desires: at worst she is a pornographic non-subject, a screen of flesh for male sexual projects. The political conditioning of ontological discourse is visible in the very historical reluctance of men to ascribe a stable ontology or “being itself” to women. Its exclusions have relied upon myths like those of Pandora or Eve which reduce female being to a fall—an accident waiting to happen. (p. 72)

Finally, this masculinist/androcentric worldview may be seen as emphasizing lust for power, which ecofeminists and feminists define as domination logic (Warren, 2000): a view of competition and power-over others. With this emphasis he controls and dominates women—dislocating her from her body (Daly, 1978/1990; Gergen, 1994; Griffin, 1978; Raphael, 1996; Warren, 2000) and mutilating and muting women’s minds (Daly).

It is therefore especially important for us to remember, and something we would hope future researchers would further investigate, the worldview of Euro–American science has had the personality orientations of the men who created it woven into its very structure. This is why the study and careful examination of the history of science is essential to understanding how the worldview of Euro–American science came into being, and how through further insight we can discover the means to re-envision it. This invitation to reinvent science and culture not only suggests we reclaim the value of Eros as a way of knowing, but that we also find a way to weave other feminine ways of knowing into its structure, such as cooperation and empathy (Noble, 1991; Kheel, 2008). Moreover, this invitation to reinvent science and culture is a reaching out to other cultures, other
world perspectives, and welcoming them into this much needed multicultural dialogue.

Historical and Philosophical Roots of the Feminist Critique of Science

During the early 1970s, to my knowledge, no feminist critiques of science yet existed, with the single brilliant exception of Ruth Hershberger’s *Adam’s Rib*, published in 1948. . . . The first book-length feminist critical analysis of science by a scientist was my *Science and Gender*, which appeared in 1984. . . . Other books appeared in 1985, 1986, and 1987—by Evelyn Fox Keller, Anne Fausto-Sterling, and Sandra Harding. . . . In short, feminist critics challenge the very foundations and basic assumptions of Western science and epistemology and their concepts of positivism and rationality. They also reveal the gendered nature of the body of knowledge we call science and the preoccupation of scientists since the time of Aristotle with establishing the reality of gender differences and the natural, biological inferiority of Woman. (Bleier, 1988, pp. 189–190)

“Science,” as Ruth Bleier (1988) tells us, “has been defined at least from the time of Francis Bacon as a masculine pursuit, as a manifestation of the male mind: tough, rational, rigorous, objective, free of emotion and subjectivities—the latter being the province of women and the presumed characteristics of the female mind” (p. 193). This reiterates the criticisms of science with which we began. Continuing our inquiry into the historical and philosophical roots of the feminist critique of science, let us begin with Rene Descartes.

It was Descartes, at the age of 23 on November 10, 1619, that began to construct what has now ironically become the dissociated worldview of Euro–American science. We say ironically because Descartes’ inspiration to begin this “new philosophy” was, as Susan Bordo (1986) tells us: “. . . a series of dreams—bizarre, richly imaginable sequences manifestly full of anxiety and dread” (p. 439). Motivated by the religious significance he associated with these dreams, Descartes was moved to “. . . travel in gratitude for divine inspiration to the shrine of the Blessed Virgin in Loreto[,] Italy]” (Watson, 1978, p. 148). In Loreto, Descartes was led to interpret these dreams as a vision from the “Angel of Truth,” who, in her visit to him revealed her secret: mathematics was to be the basis of this new philosophy. Keep this in mind the next time you hear someone talking about education, and the need for greater emphasis on more mathematics, more science, and more technology. Quite possibly we may have found ourselves in an entirely different debate if Descartes’ had said *I exist, therefore I feel*. Then instead of mathematics becoming the foundation of Descartes’ new philosophy, with its focus on cognition linked with rationalism and materialism, the foundation of Euro–American science could have been on pure experience, with its foundation constructed upon the humanities, idealism, and romanticism. These differences will be a continuing theme throughout this issue of *Restoration Earth* and future issues.

The system of mathematics Descartes developed, guided by his inspiring vision, is known today as analytic geometry. Analytic geometry is based on a grid system of x-, y-, and z-coordinates whereby, says F. David Peat (1991), “. . . any point in space can be rationally represented and every material object associated with a set of numbers that become its dynamic essence” (pp. 22–23). Cartesian coordinates provide us with the predictive power to map star systems, track satellites, journey to the moon, and perhaps one day travel beyond the moon “to boldly go where no one has gone before.” His vision underscores that singular image of technology emphasizing the positive virtues that has inspired countless popular books, television programs, and films. Humankind likes to publicly acknowledge these positive virtues of technology (often with banner headlines), whose recurrent contemplation through the history of science has produced fantastic exaggerations regarding its abilities. In this issue, Laural Vogel (2012) and Lorraine Fish (2012) both reflect on the positive and negative consequences of technology in our lives. We are frequently told on our media enriched 24/7, cable news programs and other information sources that technology is shaped and driven by the “free market system.” A flaw in this viewpoint has been raised by Allen W. Batteau (2010)
who argues: “The grand illusion of a consumer-oriented society is that the consumers are free to choose—between different brands of cigarettes, or different automobile body styles. Some things that consumers are not free to choose include electric cars, all-solar houses, or well-designed, well-maintained urban neighborhoods” (p. 121). A real free market system would mean, as Batteau argues, the ability to be able to choose environmentally sensitive “appropriate technologies” that are built to last as long as possible, instead of engineered to increase profits based on planned obsolescence. But as Batteau knows this transformation of consciousness will not come from technology, or be a featured news story on 24/7 cable news programs. It will happen in the streets and, in tribute to the late Gil Scott-Heron, “The Revolution Will Not Be Televised;” it will be live.

There is also a more insidious shadow-side of technology, whose existence has been nurtured by our irrational fears of the unknown and our lust for power and immortality. It is this transformation of Descartes’ mathematical model into a tool for military purpose that reflects the kind of use we can expect from a system of philosophy of science that has been influenced by the assumptions of patriarchy: nuclear weapons. Winnifred A. Thomm (1990), following Gerda Lerner, defines patriarchy as “. . . the control by men of three major dimensions of social life: the economic and legal systems and female sexuality” (p. 220). The consequence of this patriarchal domination upon humankind’s social fabric has resulted in a worldview controlled by warriors (see Eller, 1993/1995; Stone, 1976 for discussion on herstorical accounts of peaceful, cooperative societies’ usurpation by warrior-dominated social groups that would give rise to Western civilization). Brian Easlea (1987) echo’s this viewpoint, telling us in his article “Masculinity, Scientists and the Nuclear Arms Race” that:

. . . the world of warriors, which comprises military strategists, scientists, and Pentagon officials, is ostentatiously defined by a “deliberately cool”, quantitative style that explicitly excludes “overt emotion” and rhetoric—it is a style modeled on “scientific method” and directly opposed to, for example, the “emotional,” anecdotal style of the anti-nuclear campaigner Helen Caldicott, whose arguments, according to [Freeman] Dyson, the warriors find unacceptable even when they manage to take them seriously. . . . The military historian Sue Mansfield has posed the problem at its starkest: the stress placed in the scientific world on “objectivity” and a quantitative approach to a guarantee of truth, together with the regulation of emotions to a peripheral and unconscious existence, has, she maintains, carried “from its beginnings in the seventeenth century the burden of an essential hostility to the body, to the feminine, and the natural environment”.

(p. 204)

It is this shadow-side of technology that Schroll (Schroll & Greenwood, 2011) has referred to as the “Night of the Living Dead” model. This shadow-side of technology has preoccupied our attention, keeping us focused upon a) the needs of a military–industrial warrior orientation toward life. And b) the creation of computer networks that have allowed the world’s most wealthy and powerful countries to use Descartes grid system as a means to target major industrial centers and threaten their destruction with nuclear warheads.

Highlighting these historical contributions of male authors who contributed to Euro–American science and culture’s paradigmatic orientation, Charlene Spretnak (1991) tells us:

These enormously influential shapers of modernity—Nietzsche, Marx, and Freud—were engaged with many of the spiritual concerns that lie at the heart of the wisdom traditions, but their explorations of those issues were skewed by two fundamental orientations of modern thought: they were patriarchal in style as well as core assumptions, which closed them off from a great deal of life, and they focused on the human drama as set apart from the “backdrop” of nature, often regarding human culture as the triumphal opposition to nature. The best intentions of many pioneers of modernity were compromised by their own patriarchal attempts to smash the inescapable bonds with the Earthbody, the female body, and the “stifling” female realm of the domestic. After attacking and displacing the old ways, they established themselves as the controlling fathers of the
new, the daring, the disconnected. (pp. 206–207)

Spretnak’s (1991) observations echo Bleier’s (1988) comments, leading us to a deeper inquiry of the ontological, epistemological and methodological concerns representative of the feminist critique of science, as Bordo (1986) tells us:

In the same brilliant stroke that insured the objectivity of science—the mutual opposition of the spiritual and the corporeal—the formerly female earth becomes inert res extensa: dead, mechanically interacting matter. “She” becomes “it”—and “it” can be understood. Not through sympathy, of course, but by virtue of the very objectivity of it. At the same time, the wound of separateness is healed through the denial that there ever was any union. (p. 452).

This denial of any union between the rational thinking mind and its precise, impartial, emotionally detached observation of dead, mechanically interacting matter—the essence of scientific objectivity—is a primary contribution to humankind’s dissociation from nature. Ralph Metzner (1999) has in fact defined our environmental disregard as the collective psychopathology of the relationship between human beings and nature, or dissociation (see pp. 80-113). This epistemological stance has been characterized by its detachment from nature as an essentially “masculine” orientation, as opposed to the “feminine” orientation of subjectivity. Commenting upon this dichotomy Evelyn Fox Keller (1985) suggests, “the most immediate issue for a feminist perspective on the natural sciences is the deeply rooted popular mythology that casts objectivity, reason and mind as male, and subjectivity, feeling and nature as female” (pp. 6–7).

Rather than being genetically bound orientations, Keller (1985)—focusing on the notion of scientific objectivity as a masculine orientation to knowledge—stresses the cultural influences that create this popular myth:

Having divided the world into two parts—the knower (mind) and the knowable (nature) scientific ideology goes on to prescribe a very specific relation between the two. . . . The scientific mind is set apart from what is to be the known, that is, from nature, and its autonomy is guaranteed . . . by setting apart its modes of knowing from those in which that dichotomy is threatened. In this process, the characterization of both the scientific mind and its modes of access to knowledge as masculine is indeed significant. Masculine here connotes, as it so often does, autonomy, separation, and distance. (p. 79)

Ecofeminism

The story of a land where women live at peace with themselves and with the natural world is a recurrent theme of feminist utopias. This is a land where there is no hierarchy, among humans or between humans and animals, where people care for one another and for nature, where the earth and the forest retain their mystery, power and wholeness, where the power of technology and of military and economic force does not rule the earth, or at least that part of it controlled by women. For usually this state is seen as a beleaguered one, surviving against the hostile intent of men, who control a world of power and inequality, of military and technological might and screaming poverty, where power is the game and power means domination of both nature and people. Feminist vision often draws the contrasts starkly—it is life versus death, Gaia versus Mars, mysterious forest versus technological desert, women versus men.

It is hard to deny the power of that vision, or its ability to harness the hope and the sorry the present world holds for those who can bear to confront its current course. We do live in a world increasingly and distressingly like the feminist dystopia’s, where technological mastery extinguish both nature and less technologically “rational” cultures, where we face the imminent prospect of loss of the world’s forests along with the bulk of its species diversity and human cultural diversity, where already many cultures have had the whole basis of ancient survival patterns destroyed by a species of development and “progress” which produces inequality as inexorably as it produces pollution and waste, and where the dominance of “rational” man threatens ultimately to produce the most irra-
tional of results, the extinction of our species along with many others. Ecological feminism tells us that it is no accident that this world is dominated by men. (Plumwood, 1993, p. 7)

Growing out of feminist studies' critique of science and the feminist spirituality movement of the 1970s (which served to awaken in women what Marion Woodman [1987] refers to as a “new connection to the earth, to the Goddess, to the transpersonal in ourselves and each other” [p. 207]), ecofeminism has emerged to provide an ideological critique of the prevailing Western worldview and alternative suggestions of how we might fundamentally alter the problematic elements of its masculinist/androcentric perspectives discussed earlier. Specifically, ecofeminism is grounded in four ontological assumptions: (a) women are globally perceived as other and often less-than human; (b) the subordination and oppression of women provides a viable framework for understanding how other groups of others are dominated within masculinist/androcentric worldviews; (c) the natural (organic) environment and species (other-than human) are oppressed within the prevailing worldviews; and (d) all of life is interconnected (Warren, 2000). In this fashion, ecofeminists rely upon feminist analysis of power and domination coupled with a scientific-based framework that life on earth functions as an interconnected system that is carefully balanced. Ynestra King (1981) writes on the linkage between gender and ecology:

As women we are naturalized culture in a culture defined against nature. If the nature/culture antagonism is the primary contradiction of our time, it is also what weds feminism and ecology and makes women the historic subject. Without an ecological perspective which asserts the interdependence of living things, feminism is disembodied (p. 15)

In this capacity, ecofeminisms is about the process of embodiment—reestablishing the body as a means of informing the mind and the spirit and thus also how we engage in the production of culture.

Christ (2006) writes the precise cause of a woman’s subordination lies in the interconnection with nature, specifically the ontological link between her body and Nature. Christ notes it is in this location where ecofeminism diverges from liberal feminism—feminism looks towards transcending the body, liberating women from the confines of her bodily functions (indeed an example of this is the increasing desire for birth control that entirely removes any visible remnant of a woman’s menstrual cycle as menstruation is viewed as an entirely unnecessary act) so that she may be able to freely pursue her desires within the current global structures. Ecofeminism by contrast and feminist spirituality specifically look at reconnecting women to body and establishing the body as a sacred space—thus establishing the sacrality of Nature (inclusive of environment and other species).

While ecofeminism may be simplistically reduced to an interpretative view of women as a monolithically and inherently all-good, all-nurturing, all-spiritual, all-peaceful gender, Plumwood (1993) cautions such assumptions, arguing there is enormous diversity within women’s lives whereby they are not bound by essentialist characteristics that oppose them to men and a masculinist/androcentric society. In this fashion, ecofeminism is not about defining what or who women are, but rather looking at the functions of society itself and how it is constructed. It is about a careful examination of the intersection between social oppression (women and other cultural groups that deviate from the dominant, controlling male group) and social constructions of what defines nature and its place in human society. In Plumwood’s framework women become simultaneously a real location from which to begin the analysis of the ecocrisis and an alternative construction of Self, cosmology, community, and way of living. Women become symbolic of Eros—a mythic return of cooperation, union, peace, care, emotion, and spirit to the prevailing disembodied Logos. It is the myth of Psyche and Eros (Apuleius, *The Golden Ass*, c. 158 CE), where Psyche (Mind) must overcome the challenges and betrayals of her siblings (human culture) and her gods (cultural cosmological constructs), which bar her path to being with love (Eros). She is only able to overcome these constraints through intimate cooperation with other species. Ecofeminism then inherently becomes about wholeness and inclusivity—of being with the “other” who becomes beloved, rather than controlling the other. In this fashion, Plum-
wood’s deepening of the ecofeminist discourse and our location of it as a literal mythic framework answers Diamond’s (2004) cautionary statement: today I worry that the defining metaphor of ecofeminism—the linkage of the domination and oppression of women with the domination of the earth—creates barriers to moving beyond dualistic conflict models and is tied to a praxis that does not acknowledge the power of stillness, the unfolding of the cosmos, the human suffering that cannot be explained by materialist accounts of the world, or the abundance, wonder, and exuberance intrinsic to the circle of life. In short ecofeminism is constrained by modernist assumptions regarding history and the separation of sentient humans from the energetic flux of the cosmos. (p. 9)

It is through the lens of ecofeminism this latest issue of Restoration Earth finds its focus; the articles within this issue explore ecofeminist concerns, as well as the stories of the land where women live as a means of finding yet one more path toward restoration of our own connection to the earth: finding our Gaia Consciousness.

This Issue

Terry Tempest Williams (2012) writes “today my words emerge from water. A woman’s water breaks, and she goes into labor. Birth is imminent. A writer’s imagination breaks loose and she, too, goes into labor (p. 16) and further that “each voice belongs to a place” (p. 20), this issue is ecological space that contains the child of men and women going into labor and the hope their child will be a source of optimism for and a source of positive change of the future informed by insight and critical analysis of the present. The first birth is “Ecofeminist Reflections on the New Technological Landscape” by Laurel Vogel and Lorraine Fish’s deepening commentary, “To Kindle or Not to Kindle”. Following in the footsteps of ecofeminist thinkers before, both of them contemplate the risks and benefits and contradictions of technology in our lives and in the lives of our children. Sharon G. Mijares tackles the theological and mythic frameworks that have served to dislocate women from positions of authority and reinforce further dislocations of Nature from human civilizations in her article “Embodying Power and Beauty: A Return to the Garden of Paradise”. She extends this discussion toward locating a new mythic framework for women—to counter how we are naturalized in culture as Ynestra King suggests (1981).

The recent US cultural debate and legislation of women’s bodies and personal rights becomes symbolically and literally represented in the subject of breastfeeding through Molly Remer’s two linked pieces “Breastfeeding as an Ecofeminist Issue” and “Breastfeeding as a Spiritual Practice”. Remer explores the ecological habitat that develops between mother and infant and the feminist and masculinist criticisms against breastfeeding: An apt article given the recent sexualized image of breastfeeding in Time magazine (Pickert, May 21, 2012).

Mark A. Schroll in “My First Encounter with Feminism & Environmental Awareness: Transpersonal Ecosophy as an Emerging Path Toward Their Integration” provides a unique perspective on the transformation of consciousness he experienced, exploring how feminism and ecofeminism are men’s issues—they are not systems of thought that are exclusive to women, nor should be. He further builds upon the ongoing process of this journal to provide a systematic philosophical alternative to the Euro–American conceptualizations of science and culture and their relationship to the nonhuman, non-enculturated world. In keeping with an exploration of avenues for integration and critique, Heather Walker critically examines the divisions between Marti Kheel’s ecofeminist ethical framework and Warwick Fox’s transpersonal ecological framework, as well as their intersections in “On Marti Kheel’s Nature Ethics & Its Implication for a More Integrative Approach to Transpersonal Psychology”.

The possibility of new mythic frameworks and stories and avenues for experiential changes of consciousness are explored in the last three primary articles. Feminist spirituality leader and co-creator of Motherpeace, Karen Vogel, dives into the benefits of recalling a matriarchal lineage, a feminist spiritual framework, and the possibility of consciousness transformations as means of bringing greater balance into the world through her article “Female Shamanism, Goddess Cultures, & Psychedelics”. Writer and
musician, Sondra Slade’s (aka Auntie Matter) article “The Mystery & Science of Magical Speech in Ritual Use” examines how voice and rhythm become sources for consciousness transformation and new awareness; while Mark A. Schroll’s interview with author Judy B. Gardiner, followed by a short interview with Montague Ullman, examines the importance of dreaming as a mode of knowledge and pathway toward changing how we approach the natural world and each other.

Concluding the journal are four book reviews exploring the themes of this journal written by Mark A. Schroll, Diane Rickards, Hope Davis, and Katherine E. Batten (MacDowell). At the end, Mark A. Schroll provides a sneak-peak at the topics we’ll be exploring in issue 2 of 2012, slated for publication November 15, 2012. Throughout the issue, women artists (Jennifer Powell, Lin Neiswender, Anne Westlund, Deanne Quarrie, Raymonde Savoie, Laura Atkinson) are featured exploring a range of issues from rape, Goddess, voice, nonhuman species, the natural landscape, and community. We hope you enjoy!

—Mark and Katie

Note
1 All too frequently feminist studies tend to be associated with the image of women who are angry with men, stressing the need for separatism. Our decision to use the term “feminist studies”, instead of Women’s Studies is in accord with Susan Groag Bell and Mollie Schwartz Rosenhan’s (1981) view that the term feminist studies, makes clear that this new scholarship is an area of involvement open to both men and women; moreover, the term helps to define such scholarship as an ongoing critique of traditional assumptions about the nature of intellectual inquiry and human experience. (p. 542)

Accurately naming the scholarship emerging from the women’s movement—and subsequently the academic field associated with this scholarship—continues to be a topic of debate among feminist scholars (Bell & Rosenhan). Thirty years later these attempts to clarify the history, definition and contribution of feminist studies on science and culture continues (Brooks, 2010). Christine Brooks and Courtenay Crouch remind us that:

For example, feminist scholarship in fields such as psychology over the past four decades have revealed the imbalance in gender representation in the vast majority of research upon which these disciplines were built (Yoder & Kahn, 1993; Enns, 2004). (Brooks & Crouch, 2010, p. 28)
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