

Objectivity means neutrality - it's not inherently tied to facts:
(Merriam Webster)

<https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/objectivity#:~:text=Definition%20of%20objectivity,objectivity%20about%20their%20children's%20accomplishments.>

: the quality or character of being objective : **lack of favoritism** toward one side or another : **freedom from bias**

The single standard is breaking down patriarchal norms.

Engaging in feminist critical policy analysis is key to break down assumptions that recreate oppressive structures.

Shaw 4 — Kathleen M. Shaw, Associate Professor of Urban Education and Chair of the Department of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies at Temple University, Ph.D. in Higher Education from the University of Michigan, 2004. ("Using Feminist Critical Policy Analysis in the Realm of Higher Education: The Case of Welfare Reform as Gendered Educational Policy," The Journal of Higher Education, January/ February, Available Online at <http://homes.chass.utoronto.ca/~tkennedy/Courses/38H3/Shaw.pdf>, Accessed 07-04-2017, p. 57-8)

This article is an attempt to provide a partial corrective to more traditional analyses of higher education policy that most often obscure broader social factors that contribute to unequal power relations and educational outcomes related to social class, gender, and race/ethnicity. In this article I focus specifically on gender issues and employ a feminist critical policy analysis framework. As I explain in more detail below, **feminist critical policy analysis challenges the positivist assumptions on which most policy analysis rests and employs methodological tools that provide a more complete understanding of policy from the perspective of both policymakers and those affected by the policy.** I have chosen to utilize the 1996 welfare reform legislation as a case study to illustrate the usefulness of this methodological and analytical approach to policy analysis. The article begins with an overview of feminist critical policy analysis, placing it within the context of more traditional approaches to the study of policy and providing a rationale for its use as an alternative lens through which to examine policy. Second, **I illustrate the usefulness of this analytical tool by employing it to uncover the gendered nature of one piece of federal public policy, namely, welfare reform.** In particular, I utilize feminist critical policy analysis to examine the discourse that surrounded the development of the policy and that surrounds it now, as early research regarding its implementation and outcomes emerges. Finally, I utilize the words and experiences of welfare recipients enrolled in college to illustrate, through their eyes, how this policy affects their ability to obtain postsecondary education. In utilizing feminist critical policy analysis on this "test case" of welfare reform, I hope to provide an example of the ways in which this particular

analytical tool can be used to analyze and examine higher education policy in ways that reveal both the intended and unintended effects such policies have on women. I argue that **because the dominant discourse surrounding welfare reform focused on such gender-neutral and seemingly innocuous concepts as “self-sufficiency” and “work first,” employing critical feminist policy analysis is particularly useful in uncovering the ways in which dominant policy discourses can obscure the very gender-specific effects of a particular policy.** The implications of this analysis, as well as the applicability of feminist critical policy analysis for the examination of other higher education policies, are discussed in the final section of the article.

Using feminist pedagogy in an educational space helps eliminate ideologies of privilege within educational spaces. This is a prerequisite to larger moral policy discussions, because otherwise the only voices we hear are those of the privileged.

(Technology)

What Is Feminist Pedagogy?, www.teach-nology.com/teachers/methods/feminist_pedagogy/

While ideally used in a university setting, **feminist pedagogy can be employed in elementary schools, middle schools, high schools, or universities.** Since **each individual is different** and thus their background, motivations, ideals, are all diverse, discussion within the feminist pedagogy can be difficult as it relates to literature because it forces students to open up, share personal views or understandings, make assertions derived from facts, and accept that there are many right answers and that being different is not wrong. **The goal** of feminist pedagogy **is** mainly focused on **equality.** It challenges students **to avoid** controlling others, **using** advanced **rhetoric to manipulate or alter other** persons' **views or interpretations,** and instead to simply each contribute within a safe and free environment where they can trust that their voices and opinions will be valued. **By participating** in this type of discussion and learning, **students** find their voices, **are empowered to** deliver their thoughts and **challenge** **traditional** acceptance of **education.** They no longer need conform, but rather respect old measures or new measures and contribute their own to the overall process. **This freedom of rhetoric creates** a community within the classroom, and eventually within society, which nurtures **growth and equality.** **Authority** is not **focused on** one author or one teacher or one leader, but rather open to **a multitude of voices, imperative to crossing cultural lines.** **By nullifying** these **differences and accepting diversity**, relationships and social ideals are only part of what builds an experience both individually and **as a community.** Respect, critical and positive thinking, and empathy create better relationships and safer, more open learning environments. Lastly, by **removing the connotation that education is only given to those privileged** enough, **or those of the proper gender** or family background, **education becomes free.** It no longer sets distinction among friends or family or neighbors, but **allows** everyone the **same opportunities.**

The contention is feminist advocacy.

Only the neg solves - Advocacy journalism is key to anti-oppression media.

(Froio 21), Nicole. "How Journalists Are Challenging Ideas Of Objectivity While Empowering Their Communities." Current. May 20, 2021. Web. February 12, 2022.

<https://current.org/2021/05/how-journalists-are-challenging-ideas-of-objectivity-while-empowering-their-communities/>. [Brick]

In his book *The View From Somewhere: Undoing the Myth of Journalistic Objectivity*, Wallace challenges traditional approaches to journalism that fail to recognize the context of oppression and racial hatred in the U.S. He argues that the conversation about objectivity cracks open uncomfortable truths about how journalists practice cultural dominance in newsrooms. "You cannot have a successful career in public media as somebody who publicly takes a stance on racial hostility or publicly takes a stance on patriarchy or abuse, and that is obviously messed up at a moral level," Wallace said. "But it also creates this just ridiculous conundrum for the efforts in public media to be more representative and to be more driven by the public." During the protests that followed the killing of George Floyd, some public media organizations made clear to their employees that they could take a stance on racial injustice on their social media accounts. That may indicate change in some newsrooms, but

Wallace also advocates for challenging the very concept of objectivity in journalism. "To me, **the conversation about objectivity is just a wedge conversation that opens all these other issues that are really about** cultural white supremacy, and cultural racism, and cultural dominance, and **oppression in these spaces**," he said. "But **we** really **can't have an honest conversation** about oppression **if we are still attached to the myth that it's possible to be neutral**," so it comes out over and over, every single time."

While Wallace was working on *The View From Somewhere*, he met Ramona Martinez, who at the time was working as a producer for the

podcast *BackStory*. During a conversation about journalism, Martinez said something that stuck with Wallace: **"Objectivity is the**

ideology of the status quo." Two years later, Martinez started producing Wallace's podcast about the history of movement journalism, also titled *The View From Somewhere*. In the first episode, Martinez explained her assertion about objectivity: "... What is considered objective or neutral is really only a matter of social agreement, or the ideological consensus of the majority or the status quo."

Martinez told Current that her perspective on the myth of neutrality stems in part from her experience as an associate producer at NPR from 2012 to 2016, where she came to see the tradition of journalistic objectivity as an obstacle to news coverage. Much like Wallace, Martinez said,

she believes that her colleagues' **investment in neutrality d[oesn't] leave space for honest conversations about race and power**.

"Younger journalists are being courageous about speaking up about how race and power are affecting journalistic coverage," she said. "But I don't have a lot of faith that the people in power are going to be able to divorce themselves from these ideas, which to them is the foundation of being a good journalist. And movement journalism is a completely different way of perceiving journalism."

Feminist movements like #MeToo spread through media

(Nuraddin, 18) Nabila Nuraddin. "The Representation of the #Metoo Movement in Mainstream International Media".

<http://FULLTEXT01.pdf> [Brick]

In this section are the theories that will act as a structure to guide the analysis of the representation of the #Metoo movement in mainstream media. Hence identifying the relationship between society's relationship with a movement whose aim is to become a platform for women all over the report to support each other, spread awareness and bring social change through social media, and mainstream media which aims to

influence People. In this study where the main notion is to understand how is **the #Metoo movement** and its female

supporters represented in the media, the theory of representation **was** deemed appropriate. For identifying the relation of these media organizations and the causes for portraying the movement and its female supporters, the theories of power and ideology were used to give an additional insight in regard to the data's findings. Hence, it is clear to witness that power has many different elaborated definitions, where for scholars such as Fuchs and Thompson power could be possessed by the dominant group and they exercise their 'possessing power' on those who don't have it, to reach their own aim; on the other hand, scholars such as Foucault elaborates how power is not the property of anyone but rather a scheme that is deciphered in a network of relations. Interestingly, Castells (2011) refers to power to networks, as he elaborated how power in the network society is exercised through different networks. In a concise manner, the shared notion between these perspectives is how power is used to attain a goal or reach an aim. Hence, according to Avelino and Rotmans (2009), the nearest definition of power would be, the ability of actors to organize resources to attain a certain goal. In addition to that Castells (2011), states that power relationships are the

foundation of society since institutions and norms are constructed to fulfill the interests of those who are in power. On that note, using power is to recognize the power of social actors, in this case, could be the sexual harassers who maintain a position of power who dictate or influence the victims of sexual harassment. Moreover, it is also important to understand the power of such movement which **fueled by** social **media**, would be all due to **[and] 'mass self-communication'**, and how **the movement used** social **media to connect victims of sexual harassment all over the globe to recount their stories** through the hashtag. According to Castells (2007), the rise of mass self-communication created an astonishing medium for social **movements [could] to build their independence and confront the several institutions in their societies, providing an indispensable platform for debate and action.** Putting the mass self-communication notion into perspective, and the power that it gives to the people, it comes as no surprise how social media has helped several social changing movements such as #Blacklivesmatter and #Lovewins to report injustices and bring change, which gives a new form of power being exercised by 'weak' to change the reality imposed by the 'strong or the dominant'. Regarding #Metoo, different groups of women have experienced this birth of sexual harassment self-reporting movement in diverse ways, where there are those who fully shared their experiences and those who used it as a platform to gain support from the raised awareness from different women across the globe. Hence as stated by Lazar (2005), the mechanisms of power not only often work in subtle and complex ways, but the relations of asymmetry are also produced and experienced in complexly diverse ways for and by different groups of women.

#MeToo changed the culture of the workplace and broke down patriarchal norms like the silencing and dismissal of feminine voices - those norms reinforce hegemonic masculinity

(Bentley 19) Liz Bentley "How #MeToo changed the workplace and what to expect in 2019". Jan. 24, 2019, 11:22 AM CST. Liz Bentley is the founder and president of Liz Bentley Associates, a consulting firm specializing in leadership development programs. She is a nationally recognized keynote speaker and executive coach to top leaders and teams across a broad range of industries. <https://www.msnbc.com/know-your-value/how-metoo-changed-workplace-what-expect-2019-n962211> [Brick]

We are living in a time of enormous change. And while it has been exciting for many, it has also been unsettling because with change comes disruption and leaving behind what we once knew in order to grow and evolve. The good news is that all of this change is making the workplace better all around; both men and women will benefit from the progress taking place. This change is happening on three major fronts – technology, communication and people. What we are seeing with people specifically is the power of movements to shape discussions and alter behavior, most notably demonstrated by the #MeToo movement. While it officially started in 2007, it ignited in the fall of 2017 and swept into 2018 with a lot of momentum and impact. Fueled by the perfect storm of the women's march around Donald Trump's inauguration, the exposure and fall of Harvey Weinstein followed by many others, and the voices that rose up, it spurred major changes in the workplace, which we saw firsthand in our coaching. Last year was great for women in many ways. And while I want to acknowledge that there is still a very long way to go, a lot of ground was covered and here is what we saw.

The ability to talk freely about sexual discrimination issues was the first change we saw in the workplace and in coaching. Flagging issues with clients became imperative. For example, we asked if they would be criticizing a man for being "too aggressive," "competitive" or "pushy," as these adjectives are seen as positive in men but negative in women. Or we'd ask, "Are you giving your female colleagues the real feedback or are you holding back because they are women and it makes you uncomfortable?." We asked why there were no women in senior positions or being considered in a promotion pool. While we still had to tread lightly in our

questioning, **we** were allowed to say it out loud. **Previously**, these questions **would have been dismissed or viewed as inappropriate** and even threatening. **The #MeToo movement opened** both men and women's **eyes to seeing discrimination** or considering it and made them feel more obliged to listen. **Along** with this voice **came louder questions on pay and job level inequity. Women**'s courage to **ask[ed] for raises, higher salaries and promotions** grew while organizations became less emboldened when discriminating. Women more frequently rejected the usual advancement process of "doing the work first to prove yourself and then the title and pay will (hopefully) follow" – a process only women have had to endure when advancing in organizations. And people openly pointed out all or majority male boards, C-suite teams, and executive level positions where women have not been allowed, encouraged or set up to succeed. In the past, this had been whispered about, but now it was said aloud by both men and women.

We particularly saw millennials, who have an eagle eye for discrimination, speaking out. They were constantly flagging infractions that would not have even been considered an injustice in the past, sometimes to the chagrin of their veteran elder female colleagues, but to them were obvious and outrageous. Next we saw the shift to a more feminine workplace. While this was subtle to anyone living inside it, it was a definite shift to those of us coaching from the sidelines (e.g. going in and out of different work environments). Here's how it unfolded: first it showed up in how women dressed. Women continued to dress more feminine and in styles they liked. Looking like men in suits was out. Boring pant suits became more feminine or got replaced by dresses and all kinds of better and more fun options and

accessories. The **workplace culture became more collaborative** and with gentler communication. The masculine workplace style of command-and-control, suck it up and move on, aggressive language and talking at each other became more frowned upon. Men were given feedback to listen more, tone it down, collaborate more effectively and in general be more aware and sensitive of others. Women, who traditionally had been seen as "over-talkative" or too emotional or sensitive, in many cases were now seen as handling things appropriately. They were given feedback that they were team building, listening, and communicating with all parties effectively. In general, they were less ego-driven and more centered on helping the whole. Women also became more willing to talk about motherhood and their families. Motherhood had been a real problem for women as it impacted their hirability, pay rate and opportunities for advancement. Often, they would diminish this aspect of their lives so as not to draw attention to it. But now women are out! They have pictures of their families on their desks and are more willing to discuss their lives at work. One of the biggest issues centered around how companies evaluated their workers, particularly the average or competent performer. This is the person who makes some mistakes, might not work really hard but has glimmers of hope. The bias called out was that average men are typically seen as fixable and encouraged to try harder and even given promotions on the hope that they will rise to the occasion. On the other hand, average women are seen as unfixable, they are given less responsibility, marked as incompetent and discouraged. In the past, the norm was superstar women being promoted along with average men. That was considered advancement simply because the women got promoted at all. Everyone looked at the fact that a woman was promoted and while they knew she was over-qualified, they were happy it happened. Now they're asking why the average women aren't getting the same opportunity to grow and rise. They have potential too. Why do you have to be a super star to succeed as a woman? Lastly, women have evolved into the breadwinners in their families and are not as afraid to talk about it and companies are starting to realize that women also "have mouths to feed." In 2019, we will see this progress continue. There may be some push back from people who wish it would "just go away" and there could be some big divides. But here is what we would like to see coming down the pike: Women set up for success in male work environments where traditionally it has been very hard for them to succeed. Women in senior positions being allowed to "swing for the fences," take big risk like the men do, and not be fired if it doesn't work. Stop analyzing women's weaknesses and ignoring their strengths, especially at the senior level. Treat women like men, overlooking weaknesses to see their special talents. Women continuing to support each other and rise in these efforts, flagging unfairness and having each other's backs even at the risk of a backlash.

While society and the workplace have been evolving over many years, we saw a more significant shift in 2018 **after #MeToo went viral** because women were not afraid to step out.

The traditional norm of objectivity in journalism prevents reporters from expressing opinions about how complicated issues affect their communities.

(Carpenter 08) [Serena Carpenter. "How Online Citizen Journalism Publications And Online Newspapers Utilize The Objectivity Standard An." J&MC Quarterly 85:3. October, 2008. Web. February 12, 2022.]
<<https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/107769900808500304>>

Reliance On Objectivity. Shoemaker and Reese claim that **journalists rely on** the **objectivity** principle **as** a **defense against those who criticize what they classify as news.**¹⁴ News content featured in daily publications has typically been presented as neutrally as possible to appeal to a large audience. Objective or more detached reporting became the standard around the 1930s. It was **strict adherence to objective reporting** that **encouraged journalists to fear presenting information that had** the appearance of **bias.**¹⁵ Critics maintain that **this** strict, more standardized approach to journalism **limits a journalist's ability to go beyond** reporting **"just the facts," instead of interpreting whether facts truly reflect reality.**¹⁶ Instead, journalists seek external sources to convey their interpretations. Other authors have pointed out that many journalists follow the straight reporting formula because of deadline pressures, lack of creativity, or their inability to interpret complex events.¹⁷ Traditional journalists are not likely to include their opinions. On the other hand, recent survey research revealed that online citizen journalists seek to interpret how an issue affects their community, rather than presenting straight description of facts.¹⁸ Blogging is one way for citizen journalists to disseminate their articles. Wall says journalism blogs should be constructed like a column in a newspaper with highly personal and opinionated comments from bloggers. However, many news organizations do not allow the inclusion of reporter opinion in their stories. For example, two U.S. newspapers, the Washington Post and the Arizona Republic²¹ do not allow reporter opinion in their blogs. If a news organization does allow journalists to include opinion, this inclusion may put journalists in an uncomfortable role because many journalists have been trained to be objective observers of news. Thus, blog and news content may be similar in nature on newspaper homepages.

On Case -

Only advocacy can stop intentional mistruths -

(Jensen 18) [Tanner Jensen, senior English major with a minor in Digital Media at Buena Vista University, 12-05-2018, "Journalistic Objectivity in the Era of Trump," Tack Online, <https://bvtack.com/31543/uncategorized/journalistic-objectivity-in-the-era-of-trump/>]/Kanke

For much of the modern era, objectivity in journalism has been an ideal tempered by reality; while journalists aim for objectivity by fairly presenting as many sides of an issue as possible, they have never claimed to be anything more than inherently biased humans. As a 2018 Time article on the subject argues, objectivity does not require that journalists refrain from making judgements at all, only that the judgements they do make are based on "dispassionate analysis," and that each side is presented equally. The problem with this approach is that the objective model may no longer be applicable. Objective journalism assumes that good reporting requires finding at least two sides to any story and presenting them equally; the assumption being that presenting each side accurately equates to presenting the story accurately. Well intentioned as it is, this approach opens journalism to issues with misrepresenting two sides as equal when they are far from it. The issue has become particularly relevant in the era of President Trump. By most accounts, the Trump administration has been the most difficult in modern history for the press to report on fairly. An ongoing counter run by The Washington Post has recorded, as of Oct. 30, a total of 6,420 demonstrably false claims made by President Trump so far in his presidency, and the number continues to grow. In the wake of an administration that continues to present provably false claims, what approach can be taken by the objective reporter, accustomed to presenting each side with equal fairness, particularly when disproving these mistruths, leads to such vitriolic responses from supporters of the administration? For many news organizations, the answer has been to rally against the spread of misinformation: at least, initially. Two years into Trump's presidency with partisan journalism running rampant, many have begun to feel that this approach brings their own objectivity into question. The New York Times updated their social media guidelines last year, on the urging of executive editor Dean Baquet, over concerns that a liberal bias was showing. According to an interview by Politico, Baquet particularly addressed a concern that it, "be clear to the public that the paper's motivation is 'journalistically sound' and not part of 'a vendetta' against the president," indicating fears that the press's coverage of the Trump administration may be calling their objectivity into question. I would argue that the time for the opposite has come. Faced with an administration that has changed the very landscape of journalism – rampant lies and misrepresentations, overtly biased support by some presses, a rabid following that views any criticism as an unjustified attack – the traditional journalistic objectivity is no longer enough. Harkening back to Edward Murrow's special report condemning Joseph McCarthy, Columbia Journalism Review author David Mindich argues that two criteria justify the shedding of media objectivity: when they are joined widely by other critics, and when the views of their target go far beyond what is acceptable. The Trump administration has seen widespread criticism from the start of its campaign, and assertions made by the administration – particularly tweets that attack presses critical of the administration and speeches that incite violence in administration supporters – are far beyond what is considered acceptable. In dealing with Trump, Mindich argues that, "No respected journalist would seek a balancing quote from someone who held such a view," further warning that journalists, "are complicit if we don't stand up." I agree. The time has come to stop tiptoeing around coverage of the Trump administration, nervously tempering the severity of the issue by seeking fairness out of a fear of being accused of unobjectivity. New York Times writer David Leonhardt called it best in a 2017 article on the subject: "There is no escaping this tension at times. News organizations have to decide whether they place a higher priority on seeming subjective to some readers or on stating the facts." Journalism pushes to present a clear and accurate account of the truth, and views objectivity as the best course to achieve that goal. However, when an administration gone rogue has taken to attacking the very foundation of journalism,

the support and belief of the people, is objective reporting really enough?

Objectivity is based in patriarchal norms and expectations- science is projected from masculinity

(Soble 94), Alan. "GENDER, OBJECTIVITY, AND REALISM." The Monist, vol. 77, no. 4, Oxford University Press, 1994, pp. 509–30, <https://www.istor.org/stable/27903407> [Brick]

Evelyn Fox Keller's Reflections on Gender and Science¹ was a provocative, interdisciplinary contribution to the feminist critique of science. Keller has continued her iconoclastic ways with Secrets of Life, Secrets of Death,² a collection of essays published in various books and journals after Reflections. She is renowned, in particular, for her intriguing psychoanalytic exploration of the masculinity of science, which was received with some fanfare, although primarily only among feminists.³ Still, Keller's essay "Feminism and Science" is the token feminist piece in the gigantic, mainstream teaching anthology The Philosophy of Science,⁴ so her work has been noticed, and will be scrutinized, by a wider audience. Many scholars occupied with the feminist

epistemology project tip their hats to Keller for having done ground-breaking work.⁵ She proposed, for example, that **"masculine" and "scientific"**

have, historically, **been yoked together**, but also that men's (or a masculine) cognitive/emotional style does not have to be the principal or only mode of investigating the world. In light of this latter supposition, we are naturally prompted to wonder how far the feminist revamping of science can be pushed. Would women's (or a feminine) cognitive/emotional style have even more to contribute to our understanding of the world? In this paper I examine to what extent Keller's work grounds this exciting, but extreme, idea. Keller's attitude toward science can be situated in the humanist tradition that is more suspicious than congratulatory. We get a taste of this antipathy in Russell, whose The Scientific Outlook⁶ voiced sixty years ago some of the concerns that animate Keller in Reflections and Secrets. According to Russell, "We may seek knowledge of an object because we love the object or because we wish to have power over it. The former impulse leads to the kind of knowledge that is contemplative, the latter to the kind that is practical" (p. 261). The original, ancient impulse for knowledge was the love for the world that sought the "ecstasy" (p. 262) of contemplating it, not the love for the material benefits of manipulating it. Where science went wrong was in replacing contemplation with manipulation. "In the development of science the power impulse has increasingly prevailed over the love impulse" (p. 261), and science became "sadistic" (p.263). Russell is here anticipating a motif of Keller's, for in speaking about the difference between love-knowledge and power-knowledge he is alerting us to an alternative women's (or feminine) nonaggressive way of confronting nature. For Keller, too, the ancients and moderns had different notions of science: knowledge in Plato is associated with love and union, in Bacon it is associated

with power (Ref., p. 95). Plato's objects of knowledge, the Forms, were thought of as male, and the seeker of knowledge desired communion with them. **The**

material world, being female, was not a fitting object of knowledge. When the

object of knowledge does become the physical world, with the rise of materialism, "the meaning of understanding changes. Consistent with the shift from male to female object, the goal of understanding is no longer primarily that of communion but of power; its aim is the domination of nature" (Ref., p. 30), i.e., men scientists now attempt to control and exploit a female Nature.

The fact that **men have been in charge** of science explains, in part, the victory of the masculine quest for power-knowledge over the feminine quest for

love-knowledge. However, Keller urges us to "take serious notice not only of the fact that **science has been produced by** a particular subset of the

human race? that is, almost entirely by **white, middle-class men**? but also of the fact that it **[science] has evolved under**

the formative influence of a particular ideal of masculinity" (Ref., p. 7). Keller

ties this "ideal" to the exclusion of women (and the feminine) from science: With the rise of modern science, **knowledge came to be understood**

as . . . the power to dominate nature. In this history we can see the construction of gender as the construction of exclusion? Of women, of what is labeled

feminine. . . . **The exclusion of the feminine from science has been historically**

constitutive of a particular definition of science? as incontrovertibly objective, universal, impersonal? and

Masculine.⁷ The implication is that the inclusion of women would make love-knowledge more important in science; in Reflections (p. 125), Keller quotes the scientist June Goodfield: "the best analogy [for the doing of science] is always love." At least, taking the masculinity of science "seriously . . . would suggest that, were more women to engage in science, a different science might emerge" (Ref., p. 76). Hence "there are many reasons . . . for thinking that gender (itself constructed in an ideological context). . . does make a difference in scientific inquiry."⁸ Despite Keller's protest at the beginning of Secrets (p. 2) that readers have misinterpreted her as attacking science, there is plenty of harping in her writings about science's uncaring exploitation of nature. It is clear that Keller doesn't much like men's science, in particular? but on her own account that is virtually all science. Indeed, the damnation of science in Secrets is relentless, largely on the grounds that men's science gave us the two disasters of nuclear physics and molecular biology. Men's nuclear physics solved the secret of death, unveiling a monstrously efficient way to destroy everything. Molecular biology, which on the surface appears benignly to explore the secret of life, is actually an agent of death, reducing the living to the dead (Sec, p. 52). "Men love death" is what we heard from Andrea Dworkin, who found that terrifying message to be the deep meaning of men's pornography.⁹ Men love to build and detonate bombs is what we hear from Keller, who detects this message in men's physics.¹⁰ Keller offers no counterbalancing praise for the magic of computers or life-preserving antibiotics, contributions to civilization due to men. What to do about science? The platitude? we need to decide carefully what we want to accomplish with science? concludes Russell's The Scientific Outlook (p. 265). It is also the finale of one of Keller's essays in Secrets (p. 92): Given our remarkable ingenuity . . . I have no doubt that . . . we could develop representations of natural phenomena adequate to the task of changing the world in different ways? perhaps . . . giving us solar energy, rather than nuclear power; ecological rather than pathogenic medicine; better rearing rather than better breeding of our offspring. . . . [I]t's time we thought more about what we want. Keller expresses the optimism that if we would only opt for the right goals, science would come into its own. Given how badly she thinks science has been done by white, middle-class men over the years, there is reason to consider earnestly the idea that this superior science of ecological medicine and solar power would be a feminine science, and would shine in what it aims at, in how it approaches nature, and, as a result, epistemologically. Taking a cue from Goodfield: women would love and nurture Nature, and thereby learn a lot more from and about it, a style much preferable to men's hating and aggressively destroying it. 7. Gender Even though these claims? it has always been men doing science in a masculine way; science infused with women could very well be different? are central pieces of Keller's critique of science, there is another ingredient in her work that is distinctive, bold, and ambitious: Keller is also doing the psycho analysis of the genesis of ideas. In one principal

instance of this strategy, Keller claims that (1) **people in our culture believe that the scientific is masculine and that the masculine is objective and autonomous**; that is, **we "associate" both masculinity with objectivity and autonomy, and science with masculinity**?

Where masculinity is composed of a narrow type of autonomy and objectivity; and (2) our holding these associations?our believing that what is masculine is objective?can be explained by the psychoanalytic object-relations theory of childhood development. "Our early maternal environment. . . leads to the association of female with the pleasures and dangers of merging, and of the male with the comfort and loneliness of separateness."¹¹ "For all of us? male and female Alike? Our earliest experiences [being parented mostly by the mother] incline us to associate the affective and cognitive posture of objectification with the masculine, while all processes that involve a blurring of the boundary between subject and object tend to be associated with the feminine" (Ref., p. 87). In virtue of our childhood experience with a single woman and a single man?being attended to primarily by mother, while father hovers in the background? We mentally associate men with detachment (autonomy, objectivity), women with a lack of those things. Note that no claim is made here, nor is one implied, that men are autonomous and objective, women not. The bold ingredient of Keller's project, that is, does not involve describing actual cognitive/emotional gender differences. Thus, when Keller remarks, "to the extent that my analysis rests on the significance of the gender of the primary parent, changing patterns of parenting could be of critical importance" (Ref., p. 93), she means "of critical importance" in changing specifically our beliefs about gender differences, not in changing gender differences themselves. This fact makes Keller's thesis interesting'; if the cultural belief that men, but less so women, are autonomous and objective is merely a false or exaggerated bit of gender ideology or stereotyping, then the program of explaining why the belief is held is quite exciting. The question of the reality of gender differences has been the territory of others with whom Keller is often identified, including Dorothy Dinnerstein, Nancy Chodorow, Carol Gilligan, and Lillian Rubin,¹² who have discerned the existence of gender differences and explained them in various ways. Keller, by contrast, claimed in the early stages of her work that whether there are any gender differences "remains ultimately an empirical question" (Ref., p. 89; see p. 88) that she does not address: "It is important to emphasize that what I have been discussing is a system of beliefs about the meaning of masculine and feminine rather than any either intrinsic or actual differences between male and female". In her most recent writings, Keller claims to be continuing this distinctive aspect of her work. She says, in "Gender and Science: An Update," that one of her chief concerns is what "has been accomplished [in science] by the association of gender with virtually all the root categories of modern science" (Sec, p. 20), by which she means that she is continuing to study how the association of science with masculinity (as objectivity/autonomy) has affected the doing of science. Keller remarks that this question must be "cleansed of any implication about the real abilities of actual women." In an interview in Science,¹³ Keller says the same thing: "I'm interested in the ideological equation of masculinity and science and how that equation has shaped the forms, the questions, and the goals of scientific research." By contrast, whether men and women have different scientific styles, she says, is both "difficult to resolve" and "irrelevant." And Keller avows that she has never said that men and women do science differently: "That mistranslation [of my work] is so insistent, I have really puzzled over it for years." Whether there are cognitive/emotional gender differences that differentially equip men and women for science is apparently

not Keller's concern, despite the fact (among others noted above) that the **science** she complains about **is gendered**: men's science **carried out in a masculine way**. The distinction between the study of the genesis of beliefs about gender and the study of actual gender differences is crucial, because the following is

not Keller's view. Living in this culture, we straightforwardly observe that lots of men are bossy, manipulative, calculating, and emotionally aloof (i.e., in some ordinary?and unflattering?sense autonomous and objective), while women are less so. This is, by and large, the way men and women are made in our culture (= **the social construction of**

gender). On the basis of these observations of men, which we make in late childhood and beyond, we come to believe in a **link[s]** among **men, masculinity, objectivity, and autonomy**?

rather than by an object-relations process, in early childhood, involving the relatively absent father. This simple account of the genesis of our beliefs is a discrete alternative to Keller's; it explains our beliefs about gender differences by referring, somewhere in the causal sequence, to the existence of real (even if rough) gender differences. Why should we bother with Keller's psychoanalytic explanation of our belief in the autonomy/objectivity of the masculine when a simple alternative exists? Keller often does assert that there are cognitive/emotional differences between men and women. Comments such as "to the extent that boys rest their sexual identity on an opposition to what is both experienced and defined as feminine, the development of their gender identity is likely to accentuate the process of separation" (Ref., p. 88) and "it is a persistent fact of our culture that men tend to be especially preoccupied with questions of their autonomy and are considerably more likely than women to seek to support that autonomy through the pursuit of mastery and domination" (Ref., p. 106) indicate that Keller is also developing the psychoanalysis of the genesis of gender differences.¹⁴ Keller speaks about gender differences so often¹⁵ that it is hard to resist concluding that empirical observations of the gendered natures of men and women are already plentiful and that their substance makes the direct mechanism of the alternative explanation of our beliefs more plausible than an explanation in terms of object relations processes.