The discussion questions number;

Many feminists tend to stand against/do not concern themselves with nature since the notion of nature has been bound up with biological determinism, which neglects the cultural, social or historical construction or influences on humans. It can legitimize the racist and patriarchal norms which assign roles and characteristics to the certain group of people as if they should be naturally like this (Grosz, 2005, p.13). Some feminists have argued that , Darwin’s book *the Origin of Species* explaining natural selection, including sexual selection, seems to racialize and legitimize the naturalness of domination/subordination, patriarchy and power relationships; and racism since it refers to how the strongest ones are to win and the others are to lose naturally (Grosz, 2005, p.16). On the other hand, Grosz argues that Darwin’s theories with a different perspective that considers the evolution and transformations and indeterminacy into account so that feminists can strengthen their “nurture vs. nature” arguments with Darwin’s theory instead of standing against it. Darwin explains how the contemporary species have been transforming, modifying or mutating differently than their earlier ancestors (Grosz, 2005, p.18). Because evolution is dynamic, including the individual, geographical and ecological variations, different conditions and circumstances, the inheritance variability combined with the exterior variability, human beings and the other species tend to change through the life struggle (Grosz, 2005, p.20-21). As a result, Darwin also stands for the complexities and variability through exterior conditions cultural and social rather than being fixed on the natural or inheritance. Therefore, feminist can use his arguments about nurture and dynamic/unfixed changes throughout life span (Grosz, 2005, p.14).

So Grosz adovates an affirmative critique – which is not ‘ready use’ but taking concepts inventively to new domains.

Darwin argues 3 principles about how the species are forced to evolve: individual variation, the heritability of certain characteristics resulting in individual variation and proliferation, and natural selection (Grosz, 2005, p.19). These are interrelatedly working to cause dynamic evolution for the future regardless of the past of the present of the creatures. Firstly, genetic individual variation leads to variability/diversity of species such as different characteristics and features, eventually give rise to different proliferation. As a result of the proliferation of some species, some of the other species can be harmed or improved. Therefore, they would compete for natural selection (Grosz, 2005, p.19). Secondly, heritability rests on the proliferation or high reproduction of some species would cause scarcity, degradation, hostility and limited resources so that they need to eliminate the other species in order to put the world in an order (Grosz, 2005, p.19). Eventually, these two cause natural selection, meaning that natural selection would provide improvement of the certain group of the species while eliminating the others (Grosz, 2005, p.21). Natural selection includes both artificial and sexual selection as because natural selection also depends on how the exterior factors such as the breeders or the other environmental conditions treat the offspring (the artificial selection) and the sexual appeal of the species to be chosen as sexual partner to reproduce in order to pass the genes through the offspring, meaning (sexual selection) (Grosz, 2005, p.21). Darwin considers sexual selection regarding the environment rather than the dictation of racial differences and choices. In certain geography, a certain race would be selected. TGorsz argues that these sexual selections make for racial variability (Grosz, 2005, p.22-23).

Obviously, Darwin was not feminist but through his arguments, he was valuing feminist arguments by focusing the agency and indeterminacies of environmental ‘natural’ factors so that he was not biological determinist. According to him, natural selection was the result of the interrelation between culture, society, political (artificial selection) and heritable characteristics as well (Grosz, 2005, p.27). As a result, Darwin should be studied by feminists. However, most of the feminist are dogmatically hostile to studying “nature” without considering the deep arguments behind it so that they avoid studying such things. As a result, they are at risk of closing themselves to the understanding of the notions and the underlying deep meanings. By simply avoiding, they also avoid using such notion in order to explain their theories more and more deeply with the help of the new notions that they simply and dogmatically refuse. By not improving themselves, they basically do not evolve their self-overcoming (Grosz, 2005, p.27).

Lidya

(1)  Very good answer, which includes many references from the text.

(2)  I don’t think the part of your answer “dynamic evolution for the future regardless of the past” is mentioned in the text. The author states that constraints the new only through the history that made it possible. In addition, another part of your answer that “Darwin considers sexual selection regarding the environment rather than the dictation of racial differences and choices. In certain geography, a certain race would be selected.” seems wrong. According to Darwin’s theory, racial differences are the result of a preference for particular characteristics evolved through sexual selection.

(3)  I agree with the idea. Feminists should not avoid Darwin’s theory but try to carry over into it in feminism theory. It will give a new perspective to solve problems and could contribute development of feminism theory.
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