

CHAPTER FIVE

CONCLUDING REMARKS

We have examined and outlined the objective of ecofeminism in many contexts. We have seen in the course of our discussion that there underlies some close proximity between women and nature. However, there underlies a controversy regarding the source of relationship between women and nature. In broader perspective, it can be said that the relationship between women and nature is based on essence and hence it is supposed to be universal. However, there we find another dominant standpoint, which holds the other view. It holds that the relationship between women and nature is historical or cultural and hence it has been determined historically. We have already examined these points with ethical outlook.

Care Ethics

Care ethics is a very new concept which is included within the domain of ethics and this kind of ethical concept is predominantly related to women and nature. A care ethics is based on the values by girls and women involved in Carol Gilligan's psychological studies. It is a kind of context-laden value, which also happen to be those generally associated with women in Western Patriarchal Cultures. Care ethics is predominantly concerned with nurturing, care taking and maintaining relationship. Ecofeminist theories have taken up the care ethics based on the following three supposed facts:

1. Women are more interested in context, caring and relationship than is abstract, institutional rights and responsibilities.
2. Women for either natural (essentialism) or socially constructed reasons (historical) are considered nurturing and caring than men.

3. Ethical considerations about caring, intimacy and contextuality have been far less prominent in the history of philosophy than considerations of right and wrong actions have been.

Although care ethics is predominantly concerned with females for which women should be morally dignified, but equally it may be claimed, at least on the basis of the above observation, that care ethics in itself is not adequate. Even some examples of ecofeminist invocations of care ethics might reflect its appeal towards nature. Plant says, "Our pain for the death of the forest is simply, and most fundamentally, compassion for the senseless destruction of life. The compassion that we feel is the essence of a new paradigm which ecofeminism describes in details. Feelling the life of the other, literally experiencing its existence is becoming the new starting point of human decision making."⁷³ Plant, however, acknowledges that traditional women's role as caretaker has mostly been undervalued. Even knowing that women must struggle to claim those aspects of our socialization. Although female care and friendship are ignored or devalued by most traditional ethics, important insights into the bonds of affection, virtues of friends, and political potential of filial relationships are gained through the analysis and experience of women friendship and intimate relations. Critics of ecofeminism, however feel in the other way round. They would like to say that the so-called potentially fruitful aspects of women's socialization through friendship and intimate relations are the outcome of oppressive systems. If we assume that there is some logic to oppressive thinking, then it equally follows that there are reasons why women are socialized in certain ways. That means to say that there are reasons that contribute to the social construction of women's and promote the domination of women. Accordingly, it can be said that ecofeminism itself ensures the

⁷³ Plant, J. edit. *Healing the Wounds: The Promise of Ecofeminism*, New Society Publishers, 1989, P-1.

domination of women and nature first and thereby prescribes solutions to this issue.

Why is this actions of care morally or ethically justified? Why is it a part of environmental ethics? In response to these questions, it is said that caring is necessary for the health, livelihood and stability of individuals and communities. The benefit of caring is noteworthy as to take part in caring relationships is a part of what many people feel makes life worth living. Here we can call upon Hume who once wrote, "Whatever other passions we may be actuated by, pride, ambition, avarice, revenge or lust, the soul or animating principle of them all is sympathy."⁷⁴ Since caring is an attitude as basic as anything else we might want to label *morally important* on it at face value. Caring cannot be fully apprehended without discussing its agent, its object, and the context in which it occurs. Caring is thus evaluated in situ. Talk of caring and compassion in the abstract, devoid of attention to the object of caring and the context in which the caring occurs is ethically uninformative.

Thus, women's nature of caring for other particular beings or objects is thought to be a good activity if they hold subordinate social positions. This is justified by saying that caring cannot be evaluated unless the objects and purposes of care are made clear. There is nothing wrong to claim that complex norms of female caring and compassion for men and children are corner stone of patriarchal systems. Within these systems, women having been possession of caring attitude, have forgiven, stayed with abusers, and scarified their own desires because of their great ability to care for others. That is why, women's ability to care for others are supposed to be glorified quality in every corner of the globe. That is why some ecofeminists, particularly Card had argued that in the context of oppression; care ethics actually causes moral damage and can

⁷⁴ Hume, D, *A Treatise of Human Nature* I.A. Selby Bigge and P.H. Niddith edit, New York Calendon Press, 1978, P-363.

therefore be regarded as an unhealthy moral choice. In other words, caring can be damaging to the career if she neglects other responsibilities by caring for another. Even care for someone can be damaging to the object of care if she cares for herself. The life between empowerment and paternalism is as difficult to identify as the boundary between guidance and domination, although the relations might be labeled caring under certain circumstances. Thus caring attitudes and actions cannot be assessed without inquiries to determine if care taking is in the best interests of these objects of care. Humans need the care of other humans in ways in which non-humans do not.

According to ecofeminists, feeling the life of the other should be the starting point of ecological ethics. Some ecofeminist proponents of care ethics however recommend empathy and ego denial as the point of departure for reframing moral relationships. So giving up the ego as a necessary prerequisite to living out a compassionate commitment to the equality of all things that Naess calls for the demotion of the *individual self*. Ego denial is contrary to the kind of empathy that allows one to appreciate the oppression of another living being. Women always try to mitigate this approach simply by possessing the property of caring for others, which is very much unlikely to men. The significance of values such as caring, mothering and non-violence is embedded in their current meanings as well as in the genealogy of their meaning. An ecological feminist ethics holds caring for other beings as a good and clearly sets out the appropriate objects, and contexts of ethical caring relationships that could certainly be informative and ethically useful. In this regard, men need to learn some ethical lessons from women's experiences as caretakers and apprentices to feminine practices.

In proclaiming equal moral dignity of all biotic community, ecofeminism calls for moral equality in diversity. It holds that diversity must be valued above all

else. Vandana Shiva, an eminent ecofeminist also shows that feminine principles always include equality in diversity. In outlining the significance of diversity, Shiva discusses the predevelopment relationship between men and women in rural India in which the relationship was characterized by equal but diverse social roles for the sexes. Shiva also outlines the importance of diversity in preserving the integrity of forest and the livelihood of women who have depended upon the renewable products of the forest for survival. In this regard, Shiva vouches for an ethic that promotes a diversity of social roles along with a diversity of species. This, however, does not make sense to say that any variety of social roles or species should be welcomed in environmental ethics. Ecofeminism surely rules out the varieties such as patriarchy, anthropocentrism, imperialism and racism as bad or wrong.

Ecological Diversity

We think ecological diversity is another important point in understanding ecofeminism as it reveals ecological knowledge of the realities of biological dependence as well as ecological commitments to justice in diverse contexts. There is no question of doubt that interdependent relationships within the biota are incredibly numerous and complex. Though we know little about the intricacies of these relationships, but we do, of course, know that biota usually flourish when a great deal of species diversity exists. When this diversity is disrupted, far-reaching adjustments become necessary, and each readjustment is increasingly taxing on the biotic community as a whole. Amidst awareness of human ignorance regarding the subtleties of species, community and interpersonal interdependencies, ecofeminists affirm the importance of diverse communities. Accordingly, they aim to create theories that reflect this humble appreciation of diversity and the subtleties of diversity and the subtleties of symbiosis. Thus there underlies a conflict between human manipulations of

environment in one hand and ecofeminists attempt of restoration of symbiosis in the other hand. Human manipulations of environment always lead to result in the eradication of the whole species and ecosystems, on the contrary, to include a high number of different species and forms of life. Thus the objective of ecological ethics within environment often involves the restoration of natural diversity. Thus, ecological diversity is supposed to be a symptom of ecosystem health. Ecological diversity always tends to bring back a natural state in which all-biotic community coexists with same moral privileges. Thus it has been held that valuing ecological and social diversity as a healthy aspect of communities has to be included as an acknowledgement that healthy, thriving, integrated communities are the underlying goals.

One may, however, raise a point over there by saying that a plea for ecological diversity always leads to global unity. Even Spretnak calls for an ecofeminist ontology based on the oneness of all living beings united in a cosmic consciousness in which only the illusions of separation divide us. Although the ethical point of ecological diversity as echoed by Spretnak is ontological, but still there we have witnessed many ecofeminist spiritual writers emphasize global and ecological unity as an ethical goal without realizing the implications for human communities. Barring spiritualistic talk of unity some may even hope to inspire greater awareness of biotic and social interdependence, interconnection and similarity. One cannot however ignore the relevance of such awareness in context to environmental ethic as it is directed towards environmental flourishing. In fact, talk of unity and ways in which we are all connected in the web of life can be comforting. But at the same time calls for unity at times give to racial wars.

Dualism

We have also seen in the course of our discussion that anthropocentrism always lives up within the dualistic approach. There is no question of doubt that the concept of dualism is the root of exploitation of one species over other species, one class over other class, one form of gender over other form of gender. Anthropocentric approach, which is based on instrumental values, always invokes hierarchical dualistic approach through which the domination of women by men has been logically justified on many accounts. Accordingly, it can be said that dualism is endemic to systems of dominance and subordination of women by men. Thus women and nature and even anything else that comes to be associated with these are supposed to be less valuable. Even in some ecofeminists' thinking the relevance of dualism has not been ruled out. However, a good number of ecofeminists argue not against dualistic thinking, but against the hierarchical ordering present in most dualistic systems of thought. Deena Metzger even inclines to say that without an integration of masculinity and femininity humans will become deranged and destroy the planet. Ecology, she believes, implies the co-existence of the inside and the outside, the dark and the light, and the masculine and the feminine. Environmentalism, therefore, requires "that each of us change the essential patterns of our life which are based upon exclusivity, distinction, elimination, separation, inclusiveness, unification and relationship."⁷⁵ However, dualism in its any form is very harmful or detrimental in environmental philosophy in general and ecofeminism in particular. The objective of ecofeminism is to annihilate all sorts of dualism. Some problems concerning dualistic thinking can be mentioned in the following ways:

⁷⁵ Metzger, D. *Invoking the Grove in Judith Planet* edit. *Healing the wounds: The Promise of Ecofeminism*, Philadelphia, New Society Publishers, 1998, P-121.

Firstly, dualism is false dichotomies constructed in order to maintain a power structure and a false concept of essential reality. It gives importance to only extremes of existing entities. It sets up a dichotomy between masculinity and femininity despite the cultural variety in the actual context of the concepts. It holds that women naturally embody femininity and men embody masculinity in terms of genders without mapping neatly on to material reality.

Secondly, dualism is a binary concept having two components of which one is the superior to the other. Dualism is understood as a system of domination and subordination. Any form of dualism becomes hierarchical in context to the domination and subjugation of one class over the other class.

Thirdly and finally, many forms of dualism are rooted in a scientific view of the world that favours the simplest explanations consistent with the previous findings of science over more complex explanations. Truly speaking, it is difficult to find a world full of phenomena and possibilities beyond dualisms. Ecofeminism, however, rejects the scientific approach of dualism towards a simplest explanation. But Sober argues that parsimony, in and of itself, cannot make one hypothesis more plausible than another and that 'the philosopher's mistake is to think that there is a single global principle that spans diverse scientific subject matters. It is wrong to think that humans can comprehend the complexity of the universe. As poet A Rich Writes, "There is not "The truth," "a truth," truth is not one thing or even a system. It is an increasing complexity."'⁷⁶

It has been claimed by many ecofeminists that Western ideologies are completely based on hierarchical dualisms in which whatever is masculine, demanding, aggressive, competitive, rational and analytic is dominant over that which is 'feminine, responsive, cooperative, intuitive and sympathizing.'

⁷⁶ Rich, A. *Of Women Born: Mother as Experience and Institution*, New York, Mortan, 1976, P-77.

According to D' Souza, an eminent ecofeminist, favouring the 'made mode of aggression generates the militaristic mindset, the nuclear mentality and war culture that promote the degradation of anything perceived or marked as feminism. Thus D' Souza like many other feminists do not recommend an outright rejection of dualistic thinking, but pleas for an integration of the masculine and the feminine with a reminder that rationality and intuition are two modes of perception, two ways of knowing that are not independent of each other. They are not oppositional as mainstream holds, but two points of a single whole. Thus one should not interpret gender as a starting point of dualism through which the domination of one gender over the other has been justified; rather one should integrate both forms of gender as a single whole.

Unlike men, women traditionally listen to other inner voice. It is a kind of women's habit, which is thought to be symptomatic, hormonal and anatomic. Women have always thought like mountains. Like Leopold's model of sound ecological thinking many other ecofeminists too plea for an integration of this womanly thinking with linear male thinking. Doubiago himself admits that this 'female trait' is considered an essential part of what constitutes women. There is no question of doubt that most recent ecofeminists are of the opinion that feminists critique gender to be the central. Dinnerstein himself inclines to say that our traditional uses of gender form part of an endemic mental and social disorder, part of taken for granted misuses that is killing our world.

Deforestation is another point of concern of ecofeminism. There is no question of doubt that even in India any form of deforestation tends to be the exploitation and extinction of both females and nature. In her book *Staying Alive* Vandana Shiva herself raises this point. Here Shiva illustrates the instrumentality of a feminine principle of ecofeminism in empowering rural India women and enabling them to sustain their livelihood by interrupting

deforestation. One cannot however deny the upliftment of women-centered environmental activism in communities which has heartily suffered under western initiated maldevelopment. To speak in the language of Shiva, "There informal forestry colleges of the women are small and decentered, creating and transferring knowledge about how to maintain the life of living resources. The visible forestry colleges by contrast are centralized and alienated: they specialize in a forestry of destruction, on how to transform living resources into a commodity and subsequently cash."⁷⁷ We do not however rule out the positive impact of women centered environmental activism, even though it is predominantly based on essentialist notions instead of rigorous conceptual analysis. Ecofeminist criticism, we think, should take seriously the reasons why certain simplistic theories and rhetoric, which does not thoroughly reject the status quo, are able to inspire social change and changes in the ways women interact with each other, their environments and systems of domination.

The goal of ecofeminism is multifaced. It does not simply want to restore the integration of both women and nature, the strength of ecofeminist theory and practice does not aim only towards totalizing theory, but it also engages in a decentered political struggle. That means the objective of ecofeminism can also be justified in context of socio-political standpoint, which at the superficial levels is difficult to realize. Ecofeminism, Quinby holds, is not single issue policy; rather it calls for a plurality of resistance which would target abuses of power on a multiplicity of levels and in many locations. While continually challenging each other and working to create an ecologically feminist ethic, ecofeminism should respect, encourage and learn from a variety of effective methods and theories. In this regard, ecofeminism could then become an alliance of varied theories and methodologies that share common goals and values rather than a unified movement.

⁷⁷ Shiva, V. *Staying Alive*, Published in India by Kali for women, New Delhi, 1989, P-66.

One may however raise a point against ecofeminism by saying that those interested in the integration of feminist and other social issues with radical ecology ought to abandon ecofeminism and thereby turn towards social ecology.

Social ecology, as we have seen, combines an anarchist critique of hierarchy and exploitation with an ethic based on biological interdependence. Some ecofeminists call themselves social ecofeminists identifying their affinity to both ecofeminism and social analysis as propounded by Bookchin. Biehl, a former social ecofeminist, has abandoned ecofeminism because of her disappointment over the seeming lack of influence of the best of social theory on ecofeminism. She severely criticizes most of the ecofeminist concepts such as spiritualism, biological determinism, and antinationalism expressed by a number of ecofeminists. But we think Biehl's observation against ecofeminism is not sound as she lacks or limits her analysis of ecofeminism within a certain standpoint. More specifically, her understanding of ecofeminism is in criticizing ecofeminism. She does not consider the view of widely known ecofeminists such as Warren, Cheney and Plumwood.

We think the theory of ecofeminism as a whole is remarkable in the context of global scenario and it is praiseworthy on many vital contexts. It opens up a new vision in the domain of ethics in particular. By keeping all these things in mind we do not think to say that ecofeminism is beyond criticisms. We have examined and pointed out many possible but may not be tenable negative sides of this theory. But what we would say at this juncture that barring a few bad remarks, this theory in general is sound for many reasons. Truly speaking, alongside the examples of disappointing theory, there is also truly insightful, moving carefully argued work. As for the less promising work, it seems inevitable that some disappointing theory will emerge out of relatively new fields of inquiry. Since ecofeminism is a very young field of inquiry, it is

preferable that some conflicts may arise within it. However, some thinkers may be heartened by the wealth of disagreement or diversity evident within ecofeminism. But ecofeminism as a whole is very much promising in itself. We also think that the essentialist underpinnings of some ecofeminist discourse are less problematic than the simplicity of some of its arguments. To put the anti-essentialist point differently, concepts like women, femininity, motherhood, diversity, unity have been used far simplistically by a number of ecological feminists especially those writing on spirituality. But we think that does not mean to say that there are not important ontological, ethical and political connections among these entities.

Anti Essentialism Criticism

It has been observed that ecofeminism being a key issue of environmental tries to establish essentialism within women and nature by drawing a parallelism in between them. Undoubtedly, the theory of ecofeminism being a global environmental issue draws significant attention not only in the domain of feminism; it equally holds a key position in recent bio-ethics or bio-philosophy. The objective of ecofeminism as we have noted is very precise and clear. It tries to restore the dignity and integrity of the whole biotic community by emphasizing the women-nature relationship as a whole. In this regard, it can be said that the theory of ecofeminism is praiseworthy. This does not, however, make sense to say that ecofeminism is uncritical in its own standard. We think that some ecofeminist effort to build upon connections and thereby articulate feminist environmental ethics, which are supposed to be problematic. One may, however, take a different stance by saying that any attempt to glorify the motherhood or femininity is stemming from reliance on essentializing concepts. It may be extendedly criticized by saying that any attempt of equalizing women with mother, women with feminine, and mother with nature, feminine with

carrying is not at all good idea either theoretically or practically. Ecofeminism holds that women's social position is closer to nature and hence oppression of women in any form is equally oppression of nature. This parallelism of women and nature actually hinges on essentialism. This essentialistic approach of ecofeminism has been criticized by many what we call the anti-essentialist standpoint of ecofeminism.

We think that essentialistic approach of ecofeminism actually goes against anti-essentialist postmodern feminist attack. In discussing women nature connections on the basis of having the same real qualities such as embodiment and fecundity possessed by women and natural world, ecofeminism thereby advocates one dimensional approach of feminism which actually goes against post modernism. Thus, it is obvious that the most forceful attack may arise against ecofeminism from postmodernists' approach. There is no question of doubt that ecofeminist thinkers such as Warren and PlumWood have outlined, though explicitly, more complex, constructivist interpretation of women and nature and the essential connections between them, still ecofeminism is primarily associated with the kind of feminist thinking that is preceded by powerful markers. It is, therefore, criticized by saying that any thinking that hinges on universalizing concepts or gestures towards essentialist notions of women cannot be tenable. By anticipating essentialist approach, ecofeminism, it is claimed, is turning dangerous, historically and culturally bound, universal conception of women. Therefore, ecofeminism is summarily rejected as regressive. Such approach, according to Diana Furs, gives rise to terms of infallible critique. Echols says, "Ecofeminists and feminists pacifists have argued that women by virtue of their closeness to nature are in unique position to avert ecological ruin or nuclear annihilation. This thinking marks a farther departure from radical feminism, which maintained that the identification of women with nature was a patriarchal concept. Radical feminists defined

ecology and militarization as human rather than feminist issues.”⁷⁸ Ecofeminists cannot be detached from radical feminists and even it has been claimed by many ecofeminists that the identification of women with nature is patriarchal.

The chief argument by means of which ecofeminist essentialism has been criticized is called an essentialist argument. It holds that there underlies no essence in context of eternal, universal and hence no truth about women relies on essence. That means women is a fiction and the concept of women and gender are nothing but social constructions and in no sense metaphysical truths, the so-called domination and oppressions that act on or bear upon women are actually enforced through a definition of women and therefore essentially different from man. Since feminisms are based on the notions that there exist essential features of women, hence women are naturally different from men. It holds further that women's universal similarities supersede their differences from each other. Thus the claim that *women are closer to nature than men* attributes essential feature to women. But it has been criticized by saying that to rely on the notion that there is an essential female nature by means of which women are identified with nature is not tenable. Anti essentialists hold that there underlies no essential women's nature and any attempt to equate women's essential nature with nature is not welcomed.

Thus any form of ecofeminist argument, which relies on foundation, or mere nature of women ought to be ruled out. We ought to rule out theories and practices based on false perceptions of women or other distorting ontologies. We think that the concept of essentialism in its true sense is not inherently problematic and specific grounds or reasons should be framed in order to consider it as problematic. Even despite the fact that anti essentialist arguments against ecofeminism are careful and well founded, still the wholesale rejection

⁷⁸ Echol, A. 'Daring to be Bad: Radical Feninism in America', Unjversity of Minnesota Preass, 1989, P-288.

of the ecofeminist project is hard to come by. This is simply for the fact that although ecofeminism pleads for essentialism, yet there we have found some conceptual connections and practical relationships articulated by ecofeminists which are certainly not based upon essentialism. There underlies some connections between women and nature which are not immutable or necessary, and hence are not dependent on the essential features of nature. Even, we have found some social, contingent and contextually embedded specificities of the relationships between women and nature may be compelling, but they are not supposed to be necessary. Women and nature are interwoven through cultural constructions, practices and biological matter.

Ironically there we have seen many feminists' schools currently working to maintain the feminist issue in the face of the demise of universal women. They are willing to rule out the natural attachment between women and nature. Like Aristotle, they incline to say to save the appearance instead of metaphysical reality which is the outcome of essentialism. When ecofeminists hold that women's nature and aspects of femininity are superior to ruling patriarchal systems of thought, they actually commit essentialism which totally falls under the category women. One cannot, however, rule out the spiritualistic approach of ecofeminism in this regard. Here we can particularly mention the name of Charlene Spretnak who inclines to say that "there are many moments in a woman's life wherein she gains experiential knowledge, is a powerful body, mind union of the holistic truths of spirituality.... females are predisposed from a very early age to perceive the connectedness in life, for example, females are more emphatic, and they remain more aware of the subtle, contextual data in interpersonal contacts through adulthood."⁷⁹

⁷⁹ Spretnak, C. *Statics of Grace: The Recovery of Meaning in the Postmodern Age*, New York, Harper Collins, 1991, P-35.

If we are much more careful regarding the apprehension of Spretnak's remark cited above regarding ecofeminism, it appears to us that she too assumes universal, natural, physical and metaphysical aspects of female experience. However, a simplistic anti-essentialist critique misses what is most problematic in Spretnak's view of women, e.g. when they claim that 'women are the mothers of the earth,' they certainly do not take the monolithic stand regarding women; rather they intend to have multiple intentions and meanings. By advocating the above slogan they mean to say that all women are, should be mothers, that mothering is necessarily connected to being female and that the female relationship to the planet and its inhabitants ought to be material. It also blocks the devolution of mothers and their care taking activities. Women are usually mothers who give birth to future generations and also have access to information unlike men who are not mothers. This information is uniquely relevant to taking care of life on earth. This again means that women are socially constructed and to be identified with mothering in most cultures, even perhaps all.

Some feminists, however, tried to make clear through their rejections of essentialist notions of 'women'. They seem to have conceived that there underlies no metaphysical or ontological truths about 'women' and 'nature'. They rather incline to say that people, being and stuff are defined and made meaningful within discourses which name them as among other things women and nature. For them, women and nature are powerful practical categories and constructions that cannot be ignored. This is simply for the fact that the value and treatment of things and beings depend in part on the ways in which they become associated with them. Although anti-essentialists have criticized ecofeminism on its essentialistic standpoint, yet the so-called problem of essentialism in ecofeminism is actually based on a false universalization of

certain conceptions of women. Because, it robs the diversity of women experiences as well as the conceptions of women hood resulting from feminism theorists, racism, and solipsism. Marilyn Frye acknowledges that there are some mistaken generalities that are found in feminist theorizing and hence need to be corrected. Problematic generalizations within ecofeminism are sometimes the result of a theorist situating herself, though such thinking does not necessarily entail a commitment to any essence.

We have examined the view in what sense ecofeminism is at par with Deep Ecology by means of criticizing anthropocentrism and speciesism. The prime objective of comparing ecofeminism with Deep Ecology is to substantiate the point that women have a more intimate and stable relationship with nature and the natural. But at the same time it ignores race and class distinctions in between them. This point actually is pointed out by Stabile. She holds that women have special links with environment as well as with nature by virtue of their anatomical configuration and thereby ignores many ecofeminists attempts connected with various points of political alliance. Stabile criticizes a kind of ecofeminism which is not representative in society. She asks the point why ecofeminist philosophy is not meaningful to working class and poor people in the United States and why ecofeminism and mainstream environmentalism do not address urban ecological issues. Since most ecofeminists theory is written by white women, it is confined to the white women and fails to explore race and class issues which are very much associated with the third world women's movements.

We think that ecofeminism which discusses women and nature should not be apprehended in terms of entities associated with essences. Ecofeminism should not be understood on the basis of essentialism. The women nature relationship is not the outcome of real universals, rather it is historically determined. We think there underlies social and ecological factors subsumed under the

categories. The relationship between women and nature can be apprehended broadly and pluralistically, instead of monolithic manners. Truly speaking, nobody can ignore the relationship between women and nature. Hence, careful attention to the insights and methods advocated by ecofeminists can only enhance discussion of environmental values and potentially lead us to solutions to our environmental crises. If ecofeminists belong on the environmentalists' playing field, perhaps they could become the referees- this could at least minimize the number of fouls that the traditional players are prone to make.

Shyamoli Gupta, a feminist writer of great repute is very apprehensive about the grip of globalization and its possible impact on women and the others. She observes, globalization may affect women economically and culturally through its monoculture and fascist nature. Keeping this in view, in recent times, with the emergence of global environmentalism, women's role in environmental conservation and their close relationship with nature are accepted by all. Whatever the theoretical approaches might be, it is a fact that women are increasingly involved with environmental conservation as they are facing more and more problems due to its degradation. At this juncture, we must admit the ways how subjugating concepts and categories are parasitic and symbolic upon each other. They are enacted upon other and become refined through practices. They even crisscross in and through people's lines, conceptual schemes and political situations. Hence, reconceptualization of knowledge, reality and ethics would help one go ahead with ecofeminists' future agenda.

The intellectual recovery of the feminine principle creates new conditions for women and non-western culture to become principal actors in establishing a democracy of all life, as countervailing forces to the intellectual culture of death and dispensability that reductionism creates.

Ecology movements are socio-philosophical and political movements for a non-violent world order in which nature is conserved for conserving the options for survival. These movements are small, but they are growing. They are local, but their success lies in non-local impact. They demand only the right to survival, yet with that minimal demand is associated the right to live in a peaceful and just world. With the success of these grassroots movements is linked the global issue of survival. Unless the world is restructured ecologically at the level of the world-views and life-styles, peace and justice will continue to be violated and ultimately the very survival of humanity will be threatened. Hence, it makes sense to say that in a world so saturated with anthropocentrism, justifying the domination and exploitation of nature and other passive groups, the philosophy of ecofeminism continues to offer a life-line to those seeking an eco-centric alternative.

