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4.1  INTRODUCTION

This unit will introduce you to some of the positive interventions being made by feminist scholars, in the fields of science, social science and humanities. In the previous three units of this section, we have seen how feminist scholars have examined and critiqued male biases in all these fields. Many scholars have gone beyond critique, to actually reformulate the disciplines. Here, we will look at some of these reformulations. Rather than reject these knowledge systems entirely, feminists are claiming the right to re-define knowledge, so as to include gender and women’s concerns. This is not at all a process of simply ‘adding’ women to the existing disciplines. Rather, it entails rethinking many different aspects, including methodologies, theories and underlying assumptions.

4.2  OBJECTIVES

After reading this unit you should be able to:

- Achieve an overview of some of the broad trends regarding feminist interventions in knowledge;
- Explain and describe some specific feminist interventions in science; and
- Examine some specific feminist contributions in the social sciences and humanities.
4.3 FEMINIST INTERVENTIONS IN KNOWLEDGE

In the previous three units of this block you saw the different ways in which feminist theory tends to unsettle and problematize the entire domain of western knowledges. It does this by revealing the male biases systematically interwoven into the various bodies of knowledge (Grosz, 1988, p.57). We have looked at feminist critiques in the social sciences, in the natural sciences, and in the humanities. Rather than only note the fact of exclusion of women’s concerns from the various disciplines, feminist scholars are now participating in the production of new knowledge.

Locating women’s exclusion, and the ways in which it is manifested, is the first step. Transforming the knowledge systems requires several more steps. Feminists have devised a number of strategies to challenge the prevailing patriarchal methods, terms and frameworks. They have created ‘counter-knowledge’ by developing women-centered perspectives. Often they have developed areas left out by the prevailing male-centered knowledge domains. They have reclaimed and expanded upon knowledge that was neglected or suppressed.

Masculine knowledge systems generally claim to be universal. However, feminist theory openly states that knowledge is necessarily limited. It recognizes that knowledge is partial, representing only some perspectives and possibilities. It also acknowledges that it is invested, in the sense that it champions certain interests. It acknowledges that every scholar has limitations and biases, which will creep into every discipline. It is important to identify and be aware of these biases.

E. A. Grosz points out that mainstream Western academic knowledge made it impossible for women to represent themselves and their interests. Feminist interventions are rendering female autonomy and self-representations possible (Grosz, 1988, p.92-104). These interventions are helping bring out alternative facts and frameworks, which are more balanced than the earlier frameworks.

‘Women’s studies’ goes beyond male-biased theories and norms, to create a genuinely unbiased knowledge. Women become active producers of knowledge, moving from being ‘objects’ to ‘subjects’ of knowledge. In this process, feminist scholars have created new methodological criteria, perspectives and modes of analysis. Feminists have challenged the foundations of mainstream knowledgesystems, including its unspoken assumptions, methods and motivations.
Feminist challenges and interventions in knowledge include a commitment to go beyond ‘objective’ patriarchal knowledge. Rejecting positivist and empiricist methods and models, in the natural as well as social sciences, feminist scholars have devised alternative modes of theorizing.

Grosz identifies some of the major elements in feminist research as follows:

- Feminist theory openly accepts its position as dependent on particular contexts, interests and perspectives.
- Feminist theory is neither subjective, nor objective; rather, it establishes criteria of validity, different from those inherited from patriarchal traditions.
- Feminists engage with language and create new modes of expression, so as to articulate different experiences and realities.
- Feminist theory accepts the continuity and interrelatedness between the subjects and objects of knowledge. Different subjects may, in fact, produce different forms of knowledge.
- Feminist scholars go beyond problematic assumptions of patriarchal texts, and explore the territory from different points of view, with different methods and interests.
- Feminist knowledge is concerned not only with facts and truths, but also with autonomy and political effectiveness.

Keeping the above points in mind, let us look at how some of these have been constructively used in terms of feminist interventions in different disciplinary areas.

### 4.4 FEMINIST INTERVENTIONS IN SCIENCE

You have already read about feminist critiques of the natural sciences in the first unit. Let us now delve further and examine some positive interventions made by feminists in this area. Feminist scientists seek to go beyond the flaws of objectivism and reductionism, in the search for alternative ways to describe and understand the natural world. Several feminist scientists have actively worked towards creation of alternative models - with alternative explanatory frameworks and ways of gathering and interpreting evidence.

For instance, Barbara McClintock has made remarkable contributions to the study of plant genetics. Her major work, the discovery of genetic transposition, was accepted and acknowledged, although its significance is
McClintock’s theorization has not been accorded due respect. In fact, her theories are rooted in a very different view of nature. Her view of nature is very distinct from the conventional scientific view. For her, nature has a complexity that far exceeds the capacities of human imagination. Organisms have a life and an order that scientists can hardly begin to understand. She emphasizes, therefore, the need to “listen to the material” (McClintock, 1983). She criticizes contemporary research as being based on insufficient humility. She finds scientists too ready to impose their own ideas on the material. They hardly recognize anything that indicates something different. They try to fit new observations into old rules. In so doing, they miss much of what is actually going on.

McClintock draws attention to the multiplicity that exists in nature. This multiplicity cannot be reduced to simple formulae. Scientists often try to force nature to fit into tightly defined rules of organization. In so doing, they miss out on the individual differences. She thinks that we should be content, in fact, to rest with the fact of difference and multiplicity. We should not try to impose unified, all-encompassing laws upon nature. McClintock notes that respect for differences can be a starting-point for relatedness. Finding a different fact, which does not fit our earlier theories, is a challenge to create a larger, multi-dimensional framework into which the new observation fits.

McClintock’s scientific passion motivated her to engage in years of patient observation, to understand each plant she worked with. This resulted in an ability to write, almost, the ‘autobiography’ of each plant. In such an understanding, the scientist is a person who works empathetically - exhibiting a form of love, which allows for intimacy without demanding obliteration of differences. She consistently describes her method as involving affection, kinship, attention and empathy. Her understanding of matter is not premised on any notion of superiority of the human mind. Nor does it accept the premise of any fundamental division between ‘subject’ and ‘object’.

McClintock’s relationship with the objects studied is illustrated in her own words, by the following description of some of her work with chromosomes: “I found that... when I was really working with them I wasn’t outside, I was down there. I was part of the system. I was right down there with them, and everything got big. I was even able to see the internal parts of the chromosomes - actually everything was there.... As you look at these things, they become part of you. And you forget yourself” (Keller, 1983, p.165).

The paradigm formulated by McClintock is of a world where mind and nature, self and other, co-exist, with integrity. Good scientific research
does not require any fundamental division between researcher and object of research. In fact, good research requires a form of attention that enables us to progress to thinking and knowing about reality, in its own terms. In order to pay such attention, one has to let go (during scientific observation) of egocentric thoughts, arrogance and self-centeredness. Good observation implies encountering the object as such, in its own fullness. The goal of science is not the power to manipulate objects, but rather a deeper empowerment, that comes from understanding the world around us.

In the positivistic view of science (which was a dominant framework in the west), nature is a resource, to be manipulated and used for human ends. Nature is seen as inert and passive. Scientists display an arrogant confidence that they will be able to comprehend nature, reducing its functioning to certain universal principles and laws. Any new observation should fit into these scientific laws. A scientist like McClintock challenges these assumptions.

**Francis Bacon**, father of modern science, laid the groundwork for positivism in the sixteenth century. In his articulation, mind dominates over nature, researcher dominates over the objects researched, and man dominates over woman. Nature was personified as feminine, and scientific knowledge was explicitly equated with the domination of nature. The goal of scientific knowledge was laid down, as mastery over nature. Power over nature was seen as the purpose of human knowledge. This kind of science sees the world of nature as fundamentally chaotic. The human mind is invested with the capacity to impose order on this chaos. Moreover, the methods of science require violence and aggression. As Bacon said, the methods of science “do not merely exert a gentle guidance over nature’s course, they have the power to conquer and subdue her”. In his book *New Atlantis*, written in (1664), Bacon described the ideal society as patently patriarchal, with the father exercising authority over all his kin, and the women virtually invisible (Bacon, 1664). Similarly, his *The Masculine Birth of Time* (Bacon, 1602) criticizes “the older science” as “female... passive, weak”, and the new science as masculine and virile. The establishment of the Royal Society in England in 1662 marked the institutionalization of the new science. Soon after the Royal Society was established, its Secretary, Henry Oldenburg, announced that its intention was “to raise a masculine Philosophy... whereby the Mind of Man may be ennobled with the knowledge of Solid Truths” (Mehrotra, 1994).

In establishing the supremacy of the new science, scientists aggressively rejected earlier, ‘feminine’ forms of knowledge. For instance, thousands of women healers were labeled ‘witches’, and burnt at the stake. Bacon was
one of the chief proponents of witch-hunting. It was considered that if ordinary, illiterate women possessed knowledge of healing, they could only have acquired such knowledge from the Devil. Physicians (doctors) had a special interest in branding these women as evil, and seeing to it that they were destroyed.

Scientific knowledge has rejected all other sources of knowledge, apart from ‘objective’ ‘rational’ thought. The scientist is projected as being ‘objective’, superior and detached. Empathy, emotion, experience, intuition and insight are all declared to be invalid as sources of knowledge.

For scientists like McClintock, this view of science is extremely limited, distorted and dangerous. It necessarily limits the scope of our research and understanding. In fact, the highly superior attitude of the scientist makes it impossible to properly ‘know’ anything. Humility and openness are necessary conditions for knowledge.

Another feminist scientist whose work is immensely insightful is Donna Haraway. Haraway specializes in the study of primate biology. For her, it is problematic and false to think of organisms in terms of a path of (genetic) progress. But this narrative is deeply embedded in Western culture and academics. She has devised an alternative vision of the cyborg, which embodies some of her fundamental views about the nature of organisms. She uses the metaphor of the cyborg to critique traditional scientific frameworks with their reliance on identities and fixed binaries. Her vision of the cyborg implies fluidity, rather than fixity of living organisms. The organism is described as permeable and uncontrolled. This kind of description has serious implications for subjectivity and selfhood. She emphasizes flow across boundaries, rather than physical boundedness. Organisms, as she describes them, retain hardly any sense of being entities. Certainly, they are not the fixed entities that children are taught about, in school science classes! Rather, organisms are fluid and constantly changing. They seem to vanish into webs of complexity. Nor do they have permanence. Rather, they are simply “strategic assemblages” that last only momentarily (Haraway, 1991). Thus feminist scientists have contributed enormously to entirely different ways of conceptualizing organisms, individual entities, and the world of nature per se.

However, most scientists carry on as if such interventions have never been made. Either they are ignorant of the interventions, or unable to open themselves to explore these new ideas. Many scientists continue to be extremely prejudiced, in ways that spill over into their research. Scientists may have patriarchal biases, which influence their observations and
conclusions. Conditioned by their patriarchal thinking, they may assume that differences between the female in male (in human and other species) are very basic and fundamental. However, feminist scientists may begin with a more open mind regarding sex differences. This may lead to quite different observations, and different conclusions.

For instance, when biologist Lesley Rogers discovered asymmetry of brain function in chickens, many scientists assumed it was genetically programmed (Rogers, 1988, p.50-51). However, through further research she showed that the asymmetry depended on complex interactions between environmental, genetic and hormonal factors. Testosterone can reverse the direction of asymmetry. Thus, she showed that there is no unitary or reductionist explanation for the asymmetry. Further, sex differences are the result of a complex interplay of factors. It is not as if testosterone is the biological cause for sex differences in human brain asymmetry.

There is ample evidence by now, from several studies, for the inseparable interaction of genes and environment, yet most animal researchers continue to assign unitary genetic deterministic theories for asymmetry in animals. Theories of biological determinism in animals are often extended to similar theories about animals. This can be very harmful socially and politically.

**Check Your Progress**

a) Why does Barbara McClintock find the objective and rational scientific perspective limiting and distorted? Explain McClintock’s own viewpoint?

b) What do you understand by Donna Haraway’s metaphor of the ‘cyborg’? Has your understanding of this concept changed your own perceptions of organisms? How?

### 4.5 FEMINIST RECLAMATION OF CERTAIN FORMS OF KNOWLEDGE

Feminist scholars have reclaimed some traditional forms of knowledge. Many forms of knowledge have been discredited by mainstream science, developed in the modern West. Feminists have been particularly interested in examining certain forms of knowledge which were woman-centered.
Sociologist Ann Oakley has demonstrated how modern science rejected traditional midwifery (Oakley, 1984). Medical practitioners in seventeenth-century Europe claimed they had superior knowledge, in order to establish themselves professionally. Midwives’ knowledge was rejected, as being inspired by the Devil, working through illiterate women, or witches. In later centuries, feminist scholars and midwives have reclaimed many of the traditional midwifery practices. Oakley brings out some of the positive features of midwifery, as compared to modern obstetrics and gynecology. In India, an interdisciplinary research by the NGO ‘Matrika’ studied the repertoire of practices in the hands of traditional midwives. The data clearly indicates that this knowledge is extremely detailed, complex and valid. This knowledge has developed collectively over the centuries. It is held in a decentralized manner, practiced by millions of midwives and ordinary women. It has been developed through centuries of experience and close attention (Chawla, 2006). Writer Naomi Wolf analyses pregnancy, childbirth and mothering in the modern West, showing how it is distorted and aggressively controlled by modern medicine, culture and industry. Her book Misconceptions is a candid account of the personal costs that society imposes upon mothers (Wolf, 2001). Medical science and the social sciences enable this widespread exploitation.

Philosopher-scientist Vandana Shiva has reclaimed traditional ways of understanding nature, as being appropriate and non-violent. She questions the tendency of modern science to arrogate the right to understand, and to destroy, nature. Science and technology have been defined in a way that justifies human destruction of nature and the environment. This is done in the name of ‘progress’. She points out the violence inherent in this worldview. The human being is said to be justified in wreaking violence upon the environment. As she shows in her book Staying Alive: Women, Ecology and Survival in India, the traditional perspective on nature is very different. It accepts human responsibility as caring for nature, replenishing whatever one uses, rather than depleting and destroying it.

Shiva has noted that the ordinary village women, in places like the Uttarakhand hills, have a clear understanding of nature and the environment. This understanding proceeds from a deeply philosophical worldview, which accepts human beings as a part of nature, rather than as potential masters of nature. These village women are actively engaged in working in areas like forest management, horticulture, agriculture and animal husbandry. In all these areas, they exhibit their deep understanding. Thus their practices do not harm nature. For instance, traditionally the women will gather only deadwood for fuel, never cutting living branches.
Modern science has brought untold harm and destruction in its wake. As Shiva points out, the earth’s natural bio-diversity is today under severe threat. Traditional crop patterns have been destroyed, and farmers today have become dependent on expensive seeds, chemical fertilizers, pesticides and irrigation systems. The crops produced have poisonous toxins in them. Shiva recommends that we pay attention to the farmers’ traditional knowledge and wisdom. We should try to restore organic farming, in order to maintain our own health and bring back healthy land and agricultural practices.

As many feminist scholars have shown, Shiva too points out that science today serves the interests of profit-making corporations. It does not serve the interests of millions of ordinary people. Rather, scientific research is funded and promoted primarily by the corporate sector. The main motivation of the corporate sector is to provide evidence that supports its profits and its interests. Any evidence that indicates harmful effects of modern technologies is usually suppressed. Thus, scientists are serving commercial interests, rather than pursuing a path of disinterested knowledge (as they claim to be doing).

She brings out the importance of reclaiming traditional knowledge in the hands of women, and also in the hands of marginalized social groups like adivasis (indigenous people or tribals). As a scientist herself, she provides evidence to justify some of the traditional knowledge. For instance, she notes, “Ethnobotanical work among India’s many diverse tribes is uncovering the deep, systematic knowledge of forests among them. The diversity of forest foods used in India emerges from this knowledge. In south India, a study conducted among the Soliga in the Belirangan hills of Karnataka shows that they use twenty seven different varieties of leafy vegetables at different times of the year, and a variety of tubers, leaves, fruits and roots are used for their medicinal properties by the tribals.” She also points out, “The new insight provided by rural women in the Third World is that women and nature are associated not in passivity but in creativity and the maintenance of life” (Shiva, 1988, p.59). Science must take into account the knowledge systems created by women, by tribals and dalits, over the centuries. These knowledge systems are the product of people’s close association with nature, and their intelligence, experience and hard labour. In the next section, you will learn about the inclusion of women’s perspectives in the social sciences and the humanities.
4.6 FEMINIST INTERVENTIONS IN THE SOCIAL SCIENCES AND HUMANITIES

4.6.1 Social Sciences

Sociologist Ann Oakley was among the first to develop an appropriate feminist methodology for exploring women’s and men’s experiences. In 1972, she wrote *Gender, Sex and Society*, in which she clearly defined the term ‘gender’. Taking a cross-cultural perspective, she showed how gender roles differ in different societies. She thus questioned the assumptions regarding women’s ‘proper’ roles that many sociologists still held. In her book *The Sociology of Housework* (1974), Oakley explored details of women’s lives. Her methodology focused on talking with women about their lives. Her methodology included acknowledging her own experiences and involvement in the problems being studied. The book opens with a critique of the discipline of sociology, and the biased nature of sociological knowledge. She directly challenged male authority in this male-dominated discipline. Step by step, she showed how it defined women out of existence. She indicated how sociology was “a male science in a male society” (Oakley, 1974). Men set the research agenda, determined the priorities, asked the questions, validated the methodologies, verified the results, and handed out the degrees. The research agenda focused on studying institutions of power, which meant detailed studies of men. Very little research focused on women’s concerns. Even when families were studied, women were not studied in their own right, from their own perspectives.

Oakley began creating better understanding and balance in the discipline, through her systematic documentation of women’s lives, work and emotions. She noted that for centuries, men had been gathering knowledge about themselves in which their concerns were central, and calling it reliable knowledge. This knowledge confirmed the supremacy of men in the world. Oakley and other feminist social scientists have claimed for women the same right to gather knowledge about their own concerns. This knowledge questions male authority and supremacy, by bringing out the validity of women’s experiences and perspectives.

Feminist researchers have placed women’s experiences at the centre of their analysis. They have used gender as an analytical category to develop an understanding of women’s oppression, and to identify strategies for change. Feminist research and writing is inherently political, because it seeks to ultimately bring about a change in power relations between women and men. It provides resources that support struggles for gender equality.
Philosopher Mary Hawkesworth notes, “...the social sciences require systematic probing of precisely that which appears unproblematic” (Hawkesworth, 1999). The same situation may seem problematic to some, and unproblematic to others. What seems to be ‘natural’ and unproblematic may actually be related to the gender, race, class, caste or nationality of the investigator. To somebody more sensitive to these categories and structures of power, the same situation will reveal itself to be highly problematic.

Feminist historians have noted that women’s perspectives have been missing in most of the conventional accounts of historical events. They have been carrying out research on women’s lives and perspectives, to create more balanced accounts of the past. At the start of her book Rewriting History: The Life and Times of Pandita Ramabai, historian Uma Chakravarti notes that “Ramabai had all the elements required for a ‘great’ character: she was articulate, learned and forceful - a woman who got considerable media attention when she first burst upon the public arena in the 1870s....” She asks, therefore, “Why has the life and work of Ramabai and, more importantly, her critique of society been marginalized from mainstream history?” (Chakravarti, 1998, p.vii). Rather than lament upon this lack in mainstream history, historians like Chakravarti have gone on to ‘rewrite history’ by documenting and interpreting the lives of many women, hitherto ignored by the discipline.

In her monograph Writing Women’s Lives: Some Methodological Questions for Feminist Historiography, Veena Poonacha notes that the “development of feminist consciousness poses serious theoretical and methodological questions about the interpretation of historical events...” (Poonacha, 2007). Feminist historiography continues to throw up many exciting new facts and interpretations, which have altered the shape of the discipline, its research agenda, and widened the range of research tools.

4.6.2 Humanities

Feminist philosophers have shown how the concepts of ‘rationality’ and ‘Reason’, as defined in mainstream academia, are closely associated with masculine concerns. These concepts have led to a rejection and subordination of feminine concerns. In the conventional understanding, reason is theorized as superior to emotion. Men are seen as superior to women, and mind is said to be superior to body. Genevieve Lloyd, in her book The Man of Reason, indicates the need to go beyond these dualistic categories, and reclaim the values associated with emotion, body and the feminine realm. These concepts and values are essential to have a more balanced academic
understanding. They can lead to a richer and better conception of ‘Reason’ and of rationality. Thus, the concept of rationality does not have to be rejected. But it does need to be improved in very substantial ways.

Moira Gatens goes further along this path. She develops a philosophy that can accommodate physicality and femininity. Some concerns that were blanked out by male-centered mainstream philosophies have been accorded a central place. Feminist philosophies are articulating ideas and concepts that could not be spoken about in the earlier frameworks.

The conventional frameworks were dualistic (that, mind as superior and opposed to body; man as superior and opposed to woman; etc). In the face of the prevailing dualistic thought systems, Gatens recommends a non-dualistic philosophy. In such a philosophy, male and female would no longer be comparative or oppositional categories, rather they would be complementary and egalitarian.

As you have already seen in Unit 3 of this block (section 3.4.2), other feminist philosophers such as Luce Irigaray and Hélène Cixous articulate a critique of androcentricism (male-centeredness) inherent in mainstream Western thought. They have begun developing entirely new perceptions, which were so far excluded. They have articulated women’s concerns in entirely new ways. Their contributions to theory are bringing in totally fresh insights. Theory is being devised based on female experiences, rather than - as has so far been the case - exclusively male experiences. The differences between women and men are being looked at, to understand what exactly these differences are - rather than carry on with some imagined differences wherein men were supposed to be ‘naturally’ superior to women.

Psychologist Carol Gilligan has emphasized that women’s moral reasoning is generally different from men’s. Unlike mainstream psychologists, she holds that this difference does not imply that women’s moral reasoning is inferior or deficient as compared to men’s. In fact, women give priority to some different factors, which men generally neglect. Gilligan’s research, in her book In A Different Voice, indicates that women generally give more importance to the contexts, rather than to general ‘universal’ rules (Gilligan, 1982). They tend to focus more on subjective concerns, looking for real-world answers to meet the demand of real-world situations. Men, on the other hand, are more ready to apply rules, which they interpret as being ‘objective’. In other words, women care about the actual situations in which human beings make moral choices, while men are less concerned with the specific situations, and give less importance to the human element. Gilligan’s research indicates that men are generally more ready to
simplistically apply rules about ethical behavior. Women’s reasoning is often more complex, than the men’s. Gilligan’s work has been influential in challenging male-oriented assumptions and conclusions, within psychology. Her work has helped psychologists to reevaluate the role of gender in the discipline. Due to the contributions of Gilligan and other feminist psychologists, women’s perspectives have begun to be better understood within psychology.

Literature and cultural studies have been rich fields for feminist contribution. For instance, the two-volume *History of Women’s Writing in India*, edited by Susie Tharu, brings out an incredible wealth of women’s writings (Tharu, 1991). Women’s writings are presented and interpreted through literary criticism as well as socio-political analysis. Similarly, C.S. Lakshmi’s research presents well-rounded figures, situated in their actual contexts. For instance, her book *The Singer and the Song: Conversations with Women Musicians* explores multiple facets that influence the lives of women musicians. Her use of unconventional sources, such as photographs, deepens some of the insights. Like many other feminist scholars, Lakshmi’s research explores interconnections between personal and professional dimensions, leading to a much more precise understanding than the conventional biographies (Lakshmi, 2000). Biographies of women singers, painters, dancers and theatre artistes are helping build a fuller understanding of the forces at work within the field of cultural studies, art and aesthetics. We are better able to see the processes that lead to the making - or the disappearance - of an artist/performer.

4.7 LET US SUM UP

In this unit we have looked closely at the work of some feminist scholars, who have critiqued male-centered knowledge, and contributed positively to building up balanced knowledge systems. These contributions represent some of the most interesting and cutting-edge academic work going on today. The basic frameworks in which ‘knowledge’ is conceptualized have been questioned. New frameworks have been suggested. Patriarchal and sexist forms of knowledge have been superseded. Feminists have reclaimed other ways of knowing, and understanding. They have opened up new directions and visions in different branches of knowledge. Their contributions are not ‘separate’ or ‘add-on’, rather they question basic assumptions within science, social science and the humanities. Feminist contributions make us look anew at our motivations as knowers, our assumptions and preconceived notions. They suggest far better, healthier and more caring ways to approach knowledge.
Feminists are reclaiming, formulating and articulating diverse knowledge systems, so as to establish better theories and practices. Feminist interventions are calling for a thorough transformation of the mainstream academic disciplines. They are actively working to create knowledge systems that are more accurate, balanced and equitable.

4.8 UNIT END QUESTIONS

1) Discuss some broad features of feminist interventions within academic disciplines.

2) Discuss specific feminist contributions to rethinking basic frameworks and assumptions in any one scientific discipline.

3) What are some of the significant feminist interventions in the social sciences? Explain.

4) Do you think some important feminist interventions have been made in the humanities? Substantiate your answer with examples.
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### 4.10 SUGGESTED READINGS

