

A Literary Review of Ecofeminism: A Useful Movement or Radical Nonsense?

Introduction

This literary review seeks to provide a wide-sampling of differing perspectives, opinions, and movements within the ecofeminist intellectual and social movement of the 1970s to present. On a whole, ecofeminism asserts itself on the grounds that the domination of women is intertwined with the exploitation of the environment, and the only way to fully fix the current ecologic-crisis is to destroy patriarchal society, dualistic logic, and capitalistic economy, thus “liberating” women across the globe. However, there are multiple theories of ecofeminism that differ in their analyses and solutions for societal issues. Due to many criticisms of its essential and oftentimes spiritual nature, ecofeminism has received a large amount of backlash in the past two decades, and it has been almost completely disregarded as a viable intellectual framework for scholars to embark on. This review thus serves to explore the ecofeminist movement through a number of diverse essays. Each essay’s relevance will be determined to overall assess whether ecofeminism can be considered as a viable movement that should have political influence, or whether it should simply be discarded as many scholars have argued.

Definition of Ecofeminism

A basic account of the ecofeminist movement is given in Howell’s (1997) essay. In it, ecofeminism is argued as the “logical conclusions of feminism,” and acts to produce new intellectual relations between men and women, and humans and nature (p. 232). Ecofeminism is

both a value system, an intellectual movement, and a social movement that makes links between androcentricism and ecological degradation. It especially highlights the reoccurring male domination of both women and nature in Western patriarchal society. Howell (1997) covers four basic ideals of the ecofeminist movement, which include: “social transformation is necessary for the sake of survival and justice,” “social transformation must include an intellectual transformation,” “reforming the way that nature is valued should transform human relationships with nature,” and “what ecology teaches about nature is relevant to humans” (p. 233, 234). Howell (1997) especially highlights the spiritual and religious importance of the movement, in the sense that ecofeminism attempts to integrate religion and science. She further argues of the importance of valuing spiritual and neopagan elements of the ecofeminist movement, such as earth-based Native American spirituality. Ecofeminism, in conclusion, is not just a sociopolitical movement, but a “constructive religious perspective” (p. 236).

The considerable amount of space given to spiritual ecofeminism in Howell’s (1997) overview may be the greatest source for criticism. Oftentimes, the spiritual aspects of ecofeminism are accredited as being the most essentializing aspects, since spiritual ecofeminism works with symbolic language that simplifies women’s roles in the world. For example, women are often associated with being closer to nature than men, yet this is simply not the case for every woman, especially those living in first-world nations. Paying attention to the sources of criticism in ecofeminism in further research may thus be very useful in deciphering whether spirituality is generally the limiting factor in ecofeminism’s intellectual credibility. However, spirituality is by no means the main framework around which ecofeminism theorizes.

Controversies and Applications of Ecofeminism

Debates and Criticisms

Perhaps the best way to understand the different applications of spiritual and material (secular) ecofeminism, and diverse frameworks that exist within the ecofeminist movement is through Sydee and Beder's (2001) essay. Insight is provided into the different analyses of the problems inherent in capitalism and globalization by way of spiritual and material ecofeminism. Capitalism for ecofeminists is defined as the "locus of social and environmental crisis," and globalization as the logical outgrowth of the dominating institutions inherent in capitalism (p. 28). A spiritual ecofeminist works to resolve the issues inherent in capitalism by way of spiritual restructure of society. These ecofeminists believe women's connection to nature is both empowering and liberating, and could possibly end capitalism's exploitation of women as "natural resources" (p. 291). A spiritual ecofeminist is weary of globalization because it destroys diversity and disregards the important webs and connections of life. A material ecofeminist, in contrast, critiques spiritual ecofeminism for endorsing an essential and limited view of the problems inherent in capitalism. A material ecofeminist is more concerned with loss of democracy and self-interest due to the growing power of corporations caused by globalization. Issues involved with neocolonialism, poverty, and loss of equality are also of materialist ecofeminist concern.

Sydee and Berder (2001) ultimately conclude that while ecofeminist theories can provide insights into problems of globalization, ecofeminism ultimately fails when it attempts to describe the causes of globalization since a feminist framework is limited to only women's experiences. Men are affected similarly to women by a globalized world. Perhaps this is yet another reason as to why ecofeminism is often not accepted in scholarly fields: it attempts to explain a diverse

array of issues through a limited lens. Furthermore, Sydee and Berder (2001) do not praise spiritual ecofeminism, in contrast to other scholars (Howell 1997) which further begs the question of the validity and usefulness of spirituality in applying ecofeminist thought to contemporary political and social activism.

Applications

Despite the critiques associated with spiritual ecofeminist theories, they are still provide viable, albeit controversial, patterns to look at the problems associated with a patriarchal society. This is seen in Ruether's (1997) approach. A cultural-symbolic ecofeminist route is taken by Ruether (1997) in an effort to unite all women. Her main argument claims the positive elements of women's identity of being "life-giving" and close to nature (p. 38). Instead of working against this natural connection as a way to move beyond the issues of female oppression, Ruether (1997) argues that women must empower themselves through their affinity with nature. She calls for women to "reclaim the great goddess" to unite all women (p. 38). Women must reconnect with their old cultural roots to provide clues to move into a new, "healing culture" (p. 42). And despite Christianity's typical criticism in ecofeminist thought, Ruether (1997) states that a reconnection with Christian values is essential to this cultural-revolution.

Ruether's (1997) claim that a reaffirmation in society of Christian-values as a solution to the current social, political, and ecological problems could possibly limit the intellectual value of her essay. Ruether (1997) seems to overlook that women in the West are not ethnically homogenous. By calling for women in first world societies (such as the U.S.) to unite under Christianity, she misses the value of celebrating cultural diversity commonly found in ecofeminist thought. Furthermore, ecofeminism is often against Christianity as a historically

oppressive institution of women and nature. Therefore, Ruether's (1997) essay is a contradiction to ecofeminism in its advocacy for Christianity. Furthermore, Ruether (1997) provides vague descriptions, such as women's ability to "commune with nature" (p. 37), which not only essentialize women, but are also simply inaccurate and unscientific. From the standpoint of attempting to incorporate ecofeminism into feasible social and political action, using either Ruether's (1997) or Howell's (1997) work may be ineffective due to their focus on spirituality. Also, these authors' descriptions of women in society is both essential and simplified, which is the largest critique of ecofeminism. For the purpose applying ecofeminist theories to viable sociopolitical and scholarly work, spiritual elements should be avoided.

Societal Position

Gaard's (2011) essay gives a more objective overview of the ecofeminist movement. Unlike the summary of ecofeminism in Howell (1997), Gaard (2011) addresses a basic question: what happened to ecofeminism? First addressed are the noteworthy contributions ecofeminism has provided to many different branches of intellectual thought and social movements; these include social justice, environmental health, postcolonial studies, queer theory, gender studies, environmental studies, environmental racism, and many more. Ecofeminism is regarded as an intersection of a feminist framework with social and environmental justice and is one of the earlier movements to suggest that there is a connection between historical institutions' domination of women and domination of the environment. An explanation is given of the rise and diversifying of ecofeminist thought in the 1980s and early 1990s, until criticism rose of ecofeminism being an essential, ethnocentric, goddess-worshipping, hippy-type movement rather than a profound intellectual movement. Mainstream feminist movements nearly cut ties off with

ecofeminism by denying publications of ecofeminist essays in journals such as “*Ms*,” and “*NWSA*.” The anti-essential backlash fundamentally prevented substantial and unifying growth in the ecofeminist movement throughout the 2000s. Gaard (2011) notes that more commonly are scholars in post-humanism, post-colonialism, eco-criticism, and animal studies are including concepts originally conceived in the ecofeminist intellectual-movement without giving any credit to those predecessors. Gaard (2011) concludes that this ecofeminist backlash might be a type of silent antifeminism; rather than acknowledging the intellectual contributions ecofeminism has provided, scholars are quick to reject ecofeminism on the basis of the spiritual-aspects and essentialism.

Overall, Gaard’s (2011) essay is an extremely useful tool in understanding the intellectual breakthroughs that ecofeminist theories have provided, and why the movement has seemingly disappeared from a political and intellectual stage. While Gaard (2011) does explain the importance of spiritual movements from within ecofeminism, she describes them merely as tools for understanding symbolic relations between women and nature, rather than solutions for overcoming patriarchal society (Howell 1997 and Ruether 1997). And although Gaard, being an ecofeminist scholar herself, is a bit biased in her praise of ecofeminism, she remains objective in her historical account of the movement. Despite her pessimism of ecofeminism’s future as a more prevalent social movement, Gaard (2011) brings attention to how ecofeminist theories are becoming more prevalent in other intellectual pursuits.

Turner & Brownhill (2010) supports Gaard’s (2011) point that ecofeminist theories are gaining prevalence in many current global-social movements. In their essay, Turner & Brownhill (2010) deny the irrelevance of ecofeminism thought by the argument that anti-capitalist movements are growing, and seem to include ecofeminist values. Turner & Brownhill (2010)

claim that humanity's "shared reality" and the need for ecological defense is becoming clearer every year (p. 102). These growing movements against corporations and institutional injustices are predominately lead by women- hence, ecofeminism's connection is clear. Turner & Brownhill (2010) conclude the ecofeminism's place in these growing revolutions is both useful and relevant.

Despite general positivity of the future of ecofeminism, Turner & Brownhill (2010) ultimately neglect to mention that ecofeminism as a movement in itself is severely weak. Their article is simplistic and does not provide an in-depth account of ecofeminism's growing prevalence, and instead makes broad generalizations about different sociopolitical movements. Furthermore, they overlooks mentioning the actual strength of these movements and their accomplishments. While Turner & Brownhill's (2010) essay possibly eludes to a growing popularity of general ecofeminist values, it does not provide a rigorous nor realistic account of the direction of ecofeminism in society as Gaard (2011) does.

Perhaps the reason ecofeminism is not a prevalent social movement is due to its rather large range of theories. As Gaard (2011) noted, ecofeminism incorporates multiple intellectual frameworks that it almost seems impossible for a unified movement. And especially highlighted by Howell (1997), Sydee & Berder (2001), and Ruether (1997), the lines drawn between material ecofeminism and spiritual ecofeminism seem to be deep and enduring. Some scholars see this diversity as a downfall of ecofeminism. Yet others see it more positively.

In her essay, Silvey (1998) acknowledges both the benefits and drawbacks of ecofeminism in not having a singular intellectual framework nor activism effort. Silvey (1998) seeks to analyze whether the diverse range of perspectives in ecofeminism serves or hinders the movement. She notes that ecofeminism is a broad term to encompass all the connections that

exist between social and environmental injustices, and both activists and intellectuals alike surround their work on that basis. However, it is stated that there is a deep divide between activists and scholars best shown by activists' free use of the term ecofeminism, while scholars tend to use the terms feminist environmentalism or feminist political ecology to describe their work. Despite sharing the same basic mindset, this eludes to a long-standing tension between scholars and activists, in which "different audiences are addressed, different language is required, and distinct goals are emphasized" (p. 244). For example, activists may simplify their message in order to reach a large body of people, and hence essentialize women. Scholars (such as Silvey) are critical of this. Although she emphasizes the importance of not marginalizing ecofeminist thought by simplifying women's role in society, Silvey (1998) is overall positive about ecofeminism's diversity as a movement.

Similarly to Silvey (1998), Merchant (2014) acknowledges the diversity of ecofeminist thought, and categorizes it under three main bodies. In her essay, Merchant (2014) describes liberal feminism, radical ecofeminism, and social ecofeminism. While liberal feminism focuses on creating substantial change through new laws and regulations, radical and social ecofeminism argue that the only way to create lasting change is through the overthrowing of the patriarchal society and economy. Radical ecofeminism focuses on social celebrations of women's inherent nature as a source of political empowerment. However, these sources of empowerment are critiqued as reinforcing an identity of women and nature that society currently degrades, and Merchant (2014) suggests that this method could perpetuate problems of women's domination rather than fix it. In contrast, Merchant (2014) describes social ecofeminism which is grounded in a material outlook of life and the economy. Social ecofeminists argue that the domination of women and nature is inherent in a capitalist economy, and thus a total restructure of the economy

is necessary for societal improvement. Despite the fact that Merchant (2014) only raised critiques for the radical ecofeminist movement, her preference for a particular framework remains unclear, and thus her essay merely served as an overview of a few perspectives of ecofeminism.

Ecofeminism as Theory and Its Critics

Is Ecofeminism Postmodernist? Theoretical Similarities

A movement that encompasses a wide variety of theories and intellectual frameworks does not necessarily mean it lacks general coherence. Feminism, for example, is currently a very popular movement that is like ecofeminism in its broad range of topics addressed. However, Silvey (1998) raises an important concern for ecofeminism: the methods used to gain support for ecofeminism that scholars and activists utilize are very different. This emphasizes differing goals between intellectual ecofeminists and activists. Furthermore, as emphasized by Merchant (2014) and Gaard (2011), ecofeminism does not have a single message to unite its followers. Perhaps the reason feminism has experienced success in the past few decades is that it unites under a basic and simple message that people can agree with. The basic goal of feminism adequately umbrellas its other beliefs and methods, so activists as well as intellectuals are not at odds with each other, as much as it appears in ecofeminism.

Yet, perhaps diversity is necessary for ecofeminism. After all, ecofeminism does argue that diversity in ecosystems is necessary for life, and thus diversity in all aspects of social, political, and economic life is extremely important. Without its diversity, ecofeminism could not provide a great range of analyses incorporating different intellectual issues (Murphy 1997; Cuomo 2005; Gaard 1997; Salleh 2003; Field 2000). Because of its diversity, ecofeminism can effectively delve into a great range of intellectual, social, political, and economic issues.

Due to their similarities, ecofeminism and post-modernism can be thought to be in agreement in many respects. However, Murphy (1997) addresses the differences that exist within ecofeminism and post-modernism intellectual frameworks. In his essay, Murphy (1997) notes that although more people are familiar with post-modernism, ecofeminism has a universalized and inclusive global-analysis that the limited framework of post-modernism cannot reach. Post-modernism is focused on the analysis of present conditions in post-industrial societies that does not take into account other global views. While post-modernism can be a helpful tool for understanding present conditions in certain areas of the world, ecofeminism can be much better utilized for understanding global movements towards the future. Ecofeminism breaks from the restriction of capitalism that post-modernism sees as reality, and bases its agency on ecologic relationships. Ecofeminism ultimately provides what post-modernism cannot due to its focus on possibilities of the future, activism based on shared experiences worldwide, and goals to transform the intellectual, political, and social frameworks that persist in the post-modern society. In contrast, post-modernism simply serves as an analysis of the present from the viewpoints of a few.

As Murphy (1997) conducted an analysis of ecofeminism's applicability by comparing it to a post-modernism, Cuomo (2005) compares ecofeminism to the animal rights movement. Cuomo (2005) argues that while ecofeminism challenges the traditional Western view of ethics (the male-dominated, liberal notions of justice), many animal rights movements and theories merely extend Western-based ethical agency towards animals on the basis of the universal qualities that they share with humans (such as the capacity for reason or pain-sensing). Cuomo (2005) argues that this ethnocentric method is severely weaker than the basis on which ecofeminists find ethical agency. Ecofeminists place a deep value in the web of human, non-

human, and even non-living relations as essential for survival of humans. Moral conflicts are thus better understood by taking in the larger picture of these connections, so to speak. Cuomo (2005) gives the example of pig factory farming in a capitalistic society; the problems involved with it are not just based on the pain the pig feels in a confined slaughter-house, but also the environmental issues, the treatment of the workers, the health of the consumers, and countless other latent issues (p. 201). Overall, Cuomo (2005) concludes that the ecofeminist framework towards understanding ethical agency by way of the interconnectedness of different species is incredibly meaningful and a more useful tool than those of animal rights activists.

It is noteworthy that both Cuomo (2005) and Murphy (1997) argue that ecofeminism significantly adds to current intellectual frameworks that have little to do with feminism (namely, post-modernism and animal rights). They both find that applying ecofeminist methods to the aforementioned frameworks improves them by giving a new interpretation to the issues involved (such as viewing ethics in an “ecological way,” or providing a platform on which to make social change in a post-modern society). Cuomo (2005) and Murphy (1997) seem to praise ecofeminism’s broadness, in the sense that it can be applied to many other intellectual pursuits and perhaps challenge the standard views of contentious issues.

There are scholars who want to increase ecofeminism’s theoretical range even further, including Gaard (1997), who argues that ecofeminism must include queer theory in order to be a truly effective movement in destroying patriarchal society. In her essay Gaard (1997) notes that ecofeminism and queer theory share important parallels in Western culture’s devaluation of the erotic and homogenizing sexuality. Surprisingly, Gaard (1997) points out a critical contradiction of Western society in that homosexuality is devalued since it is against nature, yet womanhood has often been oppressed for being close to nature. The standards against what homosexuality

and womanhood are judged against to be considered “good” are social constructions that have roots throughout history. Most importantly, Gaard (1997) remarks that historically Christianity has been a force that subordinates women, nature, indigenous people, and homosexuality. Religious and political institutions- the same that have been accredited to dominating women- have also used homosexual acts as excuses for inquisitions and colonialism throughout history. Thus, in modern-masculinized society, heterosexuality is considered compulsory. Gaard (1997) concludes that ecofeminism must see this link to become truly effective in challenging certain social norms of sexuality and gender.

Similarly to Gaard (1997), Field (2000) argues that ecofeminism must take on theorizing of embodiment to increase its effectiveness. In her essay, Field (2000) claims that while feminists often disregard the body as essential, ecofeminists should recognize the body as an indispensable means to understand existence in a way theories of socialization cannot. Furthermore, Field (2000) notes that since ecofeminists aim to destroy dualistic logic, they should recognize the importance of the body as it is undermined in comparison to the mind. The body, as Field (2000) puts it, breaks the gap between dualistic logic; the body is not separated from the mind, therefore the logic behind the mind being superior does not hold truth. This fluidity between the body and mind could be used to show how dualistic logic is not consistent nor accurate for other binary pairs prevalent in Western thought- for example, men dominate over women, reason dominates over emotions, and the self dominates over the “other.” Field (2000) also argues a theory of embodiment that recognizes the diverse array of differences within bodies- due to ethnicity, gender, sexuality, etc.- is important in ecofeminist theorizing. Paying attention to the multitude of ways in which society and powerful institutions become embodied physically and in daily practices might be of great use to ecofeminists. Overall, Field (2000)

states that the ecofeminist fear of the body as “essentializing” to women overlooks the diversity and plasticity of embodiment, as well as ignores its historic oppression in patriarchy, that could be greatly utilized in a feminist framework.

Both of what Gaard (1997) and Field (2000) propose is extremely relevant and useful to ecofeminism. By including queer theory and accepting a theory of embodiment, new connections of ecofeminism to other aspect of patriarchal society could be made that significantly add to existing ecofeminist perspectives. Sallah (2003) further adds to the diversification of ecofeminism in merging an entire academic pursuit with ecofeminism. Salleh (2003) applies sociological theorizing with ecofeminist methods. Because nature and gender-identity are both socially constructed, sociologic perspectives are both useful and essential to merge with ecofeminist concepts. Salleh (2003) merges a materialist perspective with ecofeminism, in that it utilizes basic concepts of Marxist sociology and interrelates them throughout multiple discourses. Salleh (2003) further argues that because ecofeminism includes concepts that are socially constructed and can be constructed in multiple different ways, it does not essentialize women. Furthermore, the concept of women as embodying “reproduction” methods is an important vantage point for sociological frameworks to analyze and merge with ecofeminism.

Recent Criticisms

Overall, as Salleh (2003), Field (2000), Gaard (1997), Cuomo (2005) and Murphy (1997) have argued, the diverse range of topics ecofeminism can be applied to is one of its sources of strengths, and possibly weaknesses. Although ecofeminism is often criticized for being simplified, universalized, and essentialized, it could be argued that (similarly to Silvey (1998)), ecofeminism is too broad of a movement and intellectual pursuit to ever gain serious momentum

in becoming a substantial political or social movement. Along with that, other criticisms of ecofeminism are dealt with in essays by MacGregor (2004), Sargisson (2001), and Nalunnakkal (2004), that go beyond the ever-popular criticism of ecofeminism's spiritual nature

MacGregor (2004) points to the dangers of ecofeminist theory in celebrating women's caring nature and its application to the political world. MacGregor (2004) notes that oftentimes ecofeminist activism supports a notion of "universal public caring" as a model for a sustainable and harmonious relationship with the environment (p. 57). Yet, MacGregor (2004) argues that associating women with a caring nature is not an intelligent tactic for ecofeminists, since patriarchal society has historically exploited this "universal" aspect of women. Ecofeminists should instead work to challenge this notion, since it is both essentializes and oppresses women. Furthermore, MacGregor (2004) states that limiting women's identity to only "caregivers" overlooks their capacities for anger, rage, and possibility narcissism and selfishness (p. 64). In conclusion, MacGregor (2004) argues that ecofeminists should question why only women are associated with caregiving abilities and not men. Women in politics should thus take on the de-gendered role of citizens, rather than exaggerating their differences from men through simplified and essentialized notions of their character.

While MacGregor (2004) writes to warn ecofeminists about taking on a particular identity in politics, Sargisson (2001) raises a major criticism of all aspects of ecofeminism. Sargisson (2001) roots her criticism of ecofeminism in its visionary, utopian, and oftentimes mystical nature. She argues that it lacks true political grounding, and is "intellectually regressive;" it is a fluffy-utopian dream rather than actual intellectual agency (p. 52). Furthermore, Sargisson (2001) finds that ecofeminist analyses tend to be weak and are often based off comparing political and social institutions to things such as menstruation, theology, or

other bodily cycles- which she sees as irrelevant connections. And finally, Sargisson (2001) criticizes ecofeminism's essentializing nature and simplistic viewpoints of women that provide limited analyses of complex sociopolitical and ecologic issues. Overall, ecofeminism fails in providing firm grounding for legitimate explanations and analyses of modern societal problems.

As it has been proved previously that ecofeminism is an extremely broad movement and encompasses a great deal of topics, Sargisson's (2001) criticism may not apply to every ecofeminist theories. For example, one of the underlying principles of ecofeminism is that the degradation of the environment and the oppression of women is historically linked to a series of institutions (religious, colonial, capitalistic). This is not a "fluffy" connection: it is a legitimate assessment of the historical placement of women in society. The action that should be taken to solve the oppression of women and/or the degradation of the environment is where ecofeminists often diverge. Some might argue that spirituality, or a total cultural upheaval is required to fix society. And this is where Sargisson (2001) finds her source of criticism, failing to mention that social ecofeminists, as mentioned in Merchant (2014), do not believe in this sort of action. Sargisson (2001) seemed to overlook what Gaard (2011), Silvey (1998), and others have explained in that ecofeminist methods are inherently diverse.

Other criticism may be applied to ecofeminism in that it does not provide what some women in different cultures may need. For example, Nalunnakkal (2004) notes that ecofeminism does not serve many of the lower castes and tribes in India (particularly noting the Dilat caste). Nalunnakkal (2004) sees ecofeminism as oftentimes having an elitist (or upper-caste Brahmanic) slant. Even Indian ecofeminist-activist Vandana Shiva, one of the most celebrated women of the movement, overlooks Dalit environmental and social injustices. Thus Nalunnakkal (2004) moves to propose the perspective of organic womanism- which is opposed to what he calls a "Western,

middle class, elitist brand of ecofeminism” (p. 58). Organic womanism was popularized by African feminists and focuses on troubles regarding ownership of land and power relations that directly affect the organic interaction of tribal/lower class women with nature throughout the world (p. 62). It argues that ecofeminism only serves those women living in a post-modern, postindustrial society, and does not ground itself in concrete socio-political movements, but rather intellectual thought. Nalunnakkal (2004) is clearly supportive of organic womanism for addressing the concerns of the women whose issues are often overlooked.

Future Directions of Ecofeminism

Criticisms such as the one Nalunnakkal (2004) provides are helpful to ecofeminism; rather than disregarding ecofeminism as “mystical” as Sargisson (2001) has, Nalunnakkal (2004) provides explicit ways in which ecofeminism does not serve lower-caste women in India. Furthermore, he provides a new intellectual and social framework that ecofeminism may be able to gain from. More research could be conducted to understand whether ecofeminism and organic womanism are at odds, or whether they could unite together to be an even more encompassing movement (as Gaard (1997) argues for ecofeminism to unite with queer theory). An important still question remains: can all women from all cultures and all classes unite under one social theory, as ecofeminism proposes? Or will other movements grow out of ecofeminism, such as organic womanism, and diverge on different paths?

Only time will tell the fate of ecofeminism. Well some scholars are inevitably waiting for its demise (Sargisson 2001, Nalunnakkal 2004), others seem to believe that ecofeminism is gaining popularity (Turner 2010). And although some may believe ecofeminism is a useful tool of theorizing, its applicability in the political world is not realistic (Gaard 2011, MacGregor

2004). However, despite its lack of representation, some scholars believe ecofeminism's diversity thrives in a number of different intellectual fields (Gaard 1997, Cuomo 2005, Murphy 1997). And perhaps that will be the fate of ecofeminism: it will remain as a tool for analyzing different social, political, economic, and ecologic aspects of the post-modern world, and perhaps provide a few ideas for improvements to act on. However, the likelihood of ecofeminism becoming a singular social platform for people to unite on seems to be diminishing, as Gaard (2011) argues. But that does not undermine its validity nor usefulness in analyzing and addressing modern social and ecological problems as they are unveiled in the upcoming century. And this trend is already happening: more than ever are social and environmental movements beginning to realize their interconnectedness. Perhaps ecofeminism can play a role in merging these movements together.

References

- Cuomo, Chris. 2005. "Ethics and the Ecofeminist Self." *Environmental Philosophy: From Animal Rights to Radical Ecology*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education Inc.
- Field, Terri. 2000. "Is the Body Essential for Ecofeminism?" *Organization Environment* 13(39):39-60.
- Gaard, Greta. 2011. "Ecofeminism revisited: Rejecting Essentialism and Re-placing Species in a Material Feminist Environment." *Feminist Formations* 23(2):26-53.
- Gaard, Greta. 1997. "Towards a Queer Ecofeminism." *Hypatia* 12(1):114-137.
- Howell, Nancy R. 1997. "Ecofeminism: What One Needs to Know." *Zygon* 32(2):231-240.
- MacGregor, Sherilyn. 2004. "From Care to Citizenship: Calling Ecofeminism Back to Politics." *Ethics and the Environment* 9(1):56-84.
- Merchant, Carolyn. 2014. "Ecofeminism and Feminism Theory." *Environmental Ethics*. Chichester, England: Wiley Blackwell.
- Murphy, Patrick D. 1997. "Ecofeminism and Post-modernism: Agency, Transformation, and Future Possibilities." *NWSA Journal* 9(3):41-59.
- Nalunnakkal, George Matthew. 2004. "Towards an Organic Womanism: New Contours of Ecofeminism in India." *Asia Journal of Theology* (18)1:51-61.
- Ruether, Rosemary Radford. 1997. "Ecofeminism: First and Third World Women." *American Journal of Theology and Philosophy* 18(1):33-45.
- Salleh, Ariel. 2003. "Ecofeminism as Sociology." *Capitalism Nature Socialism* 14(1):61-74.
- Sargisson, Lucy. 2001. "What's Wrong with Ecofeminism?" *Environmental Politics* 10(1):52-64.

- Silvey, Rachel. 1998. "Ecofeminism in Geography." *Ethics, Place and Environment* 1(2):243-249.
- Sydee, Jasmin and Sharon Beder. 2001. "Ecofeminism and Globalisation: A Critical Appraisal." *Democracy and Nature* 7(2):281-302.
- Turner, Terisa E. and Leigh Brownhill. 2010. "Ecofeminism and the Global Movement of Social Movements." *Capitalism Nature Socialism* 21(2):102-106.