



The Critique of Heideggerian Environmentalism on Ecological Feminism

Naito, Emi F.
De La Salle University – Manila
emi_naito@dlsu.edu.ph

Abstract: Martin Heidegger in this paper serves as the critique in understanding feminist ecological restoration. Ecological feminism starts with the premise that the ultimate cause of environment degradation is linked to women's oppression; the dualistic and androcentric principles. Patriarchal centered beliefs then are the cause of nature's objectification. The ecofeminist solution to environmental issues is to adapt feminine values of nurturance and care. Heidegger answered environmental crisis by critiquing the materialism of science and technology. More than its benefits, science becomes the tool of alienation. He identified scientific thinking as calculative, where everything falls into quantification. The antidote to calculative thinking is to replace it with meditative thinking. A kind of thinking that criticizes, questions, and reflects.

The study concluded that ecological feminism embraces a part of Heidegger's environmentalism. Both criticized science and technology of over machination, technocracy and gigantism. Both also considered the spiritual and feminine method of earth's restoration. However, ecological feminism missed certain ideologies. The inadequacy of ecological feminism to account if technology was to removed or controlled deviate away from Heidegger's particular take on technology's position in the world.

Keywords: Ecological feminism; women; Martin Heidegger, meditative and calculative thinking, science and technology;

INTRODUCTION

Feminism resulted as a reaction to patriarchal society. The women narrative is central work of feminists in creating an egalitarian society. Feminist arguments are not only for understanding women as part of society but also as part of the environment. The feminists' principles are also extended to understanding nature and its linkage to women. Various ecofeminists then have worked on the liberation of women and the environment from objectification. Early ecological feminists such as Susan Griffin, Mary Daly, Ynestra King, Karen Warren and Virginia Plumwood have provided groundwork in understanding the relationship of women and nature. Their work focuses on the logic of domination, dualistic, androcentricism and how these Western



principles affect the environment and women. Shiva, Mies and Lorentzen focused on the effects of capitalism, science and technological advancements on women and the environment. Ecological feminists differ on theoretical backgrounds, exposition of women's relationship with nature, on its approaches and methodologies. They may be liberal, Marxist, socialist, cultural, radical, postmodernist, or ecowomanist. They may advocate environmental resource management, deep ecology, social ecology, or new cosmologies in their ecological frameworks.

This paper critiqued the position of ecological feminism by applying Heideggerian environmentalism on science and technology. It is analyzed the premises and the arguments of ecological feminism towards its definitive way of restoring the earth. The paper's focus is on the main tenets of feminist values as a form environment cure. My research would not comprehensively account the agricultural effects on environment degradation on women and minorities. The research highlights values as a point of analysis not male or female per se. It is not a male versus female gender study rather it is focused on feminine and masculine values. The effects and possible of these values to the environment are part of this study. The methodology for this paper is critique of ecological feminism in the lenses of Heideggerian environmentalism. The paper discussed the primary principles of ecological feminism – the questions that it seeks to answer and the solutions it has to offer. It also analyzed Heidegger's theory on the dangers of science's materialism. For the critique, I applied Heidegger's response to nature's crisis in analyzing feminists' arguments on the same matter. I reevaluated ecofeminists response on environmental restoration by setting Heidegger's solution as the standard for the critique. This study also applied initial and central ecofeminist arguments. It excluded extended types of ecofeminist principles such as the approach of Marxist ecofeminist and the likes. Heideggerian environmentalist is used as a standard if ecological feminism indeed a flight away from calculative thinking and flight towards meditative thinking. Furthermore, this research aims to contribute to current issues of ecological feminism, a possible methodology of restoring the environment and in showing the importance of a feminist narrative.

MAIN CLAIM

My main claim for this paper is that ecological feminism is a successful attempt in revitalizing environmentalism. For starters, ecofeminism shows promising methodology in understanding environment in linkage to women's narrative. The initial argument of feminist values centered way of earth's restoration is a notable answer to the aggressive and objective treatment of nature. However, in Heideggerian environmentalism, ecofeminism didn't extensively account the participation of science and technology. It is successful but lacks comprehensive account on science and technology. Ecological feminism is successful in its own merit, but fails to account the area of science and technology in comparison to Heidegger's environmentalism

WHY NATURE IS A FEMINIST ISSUE?

The destruction of the environment affects everyone – regardless of their gender and position in life. The destruction of humankind's homeland is destruction of humanity. Nature, then, is subject to everyone's concern and attention. But what do such environmental issues have to do with women? As Warren (2000) asked "why nature is a feminist? What makes nature a concern particularly for women? Why it is gendered?"

The word ecology derives from the Greek word "oikos," meaning house. Ecology, then, is the science of the household—the Earth's household (Sandilands, 1999). A house or a home is managed by wives – women. Though women is not destined nor assigned to be the manager the household naturally – it appears to be so. The imprint of patriarchal values marked women's presupposed destiny – to embrace feminine qualities. The



connection between the Earth and the house has been in close association with women. If nature is essentially feminine, women, then, have stronger connection to the environment. Motherhood and other feminine values are imprinted and readily accessible from consciousness. Thus, women have somewhat direct link to the environment. While women are supposed to look to nature for knowledge, they may find that such knowledge of nature isn't too deeply buried; nature is, at the very least, a sister with whose language women are intimately acquainted (Sandilands, 1999). Ontario Advisory Council on Women's Issues, *Women and the Environment* states that:

Women's concern for the natural environment is rooted in our concern for the health and well being of our family and community. Because we have traditionally been mother, nurse, and guardian for the home and community, women have been quick to perceive the threat to the health and lives of our families and neighbours that is posed by nuclear power proliferation, polluted waters, and toxic chemicals (Warren, 2000).

Warren (2000) states that trees, water, food production, animals, toxins, and more are feminist issues because understanding them helps one understand the interconnections among the dominations of women and other subordinated groups of humans and the domination of nonhuman nature. Women are closer in a sense that the domination of nature is somewhat similar to the experiences of women as inferior sex. Environment is used incessantly because it is treated as an entity undeserving of protection, equality and life. It is a mere means to satisfy human needs. It is not capable of reasoning and dependent on the existence of human beings. In the light of patriarchal perspective, women are secondary because they have lesser qualities than men. These "lesser qualities" made women subordinated to the power of men. Women and nature, then, share a sense of commonality – both are exploited, used and treated as means but never as an end. Both is uncovered and naked, stripped off, vulnerable and dependent.

Women, they asserted, need to look to their nature, which is part of (and therefore equivalent to) nature in general, in order to achieve women's and the planet's liberation (Cuomo, 1998). Because history has made the nonhuman environment invisible, we do not understand the ecological impact of our social choices, nor how they will come back to haunt us. The invisibility of entire human and animal communities and cultures permits exclusionary and oppressive practices and projects, causing unnecessary and unacceptable suffering (Lahar, 1993).

It is a feminist issue because in patriarchal thought, women are believed to be closer to nature than men. That gives women a particular stake in ending the domination of nature – in healing the alienation between human and nonhuman nature (Rutherford, 1938). Ecological crisis is a crisis for women. Deforestation, wars, militarization and the socio-economic impoverishment of many of the globe's women challenge all who hope for a more humane world. How best to respond to ecological crises, gender concerns, and increased violence?

ECOLOGICAL FEMINISM

Ecology, then, is the science of the household—the Earth's household. In 1974, French feminist Françoise d'Eaubonne, published the word *ecoféminisme* for the first time to refer to the movement by women to restore and heal earth. She celebrated it as a means of revaluing those aspects of life degraded and distorted through centuries of patriarchal cultural and economic domination. According to ecofeminists, Euro-western cultures developed ideas about a world divided hierarchically and dualistically. Genderized human beings –



traditionally of men and women – are created. This dualism pushed the hierarchy of men as the first sex and women as the second sex. He is superior, she is inferior. Binomial opposites identify women with femininity, the body, sexuality, earth or nature and materiality; and men with masculinity, the mind, heaven, the supernatural and disembodied spirit. Dualisms such as reason/emotion, mind/body, culture/ nature, heaven and earth give priority to the first over the second (Eaton et. al, 2003). The inferior vs. superior complex translated into nature oppression; nature as passive and men as active. However, these dualisms does not necessitates that it is men who dominate the nature but rather male values as precursor of degradation. Women and men respond differently to environmental issues, in particular that women are more responsive to nature due to her societal association with it. It rests on the idea that, inasmuch as men and women have different life experiences, they have different environmental experiences (Mellor, 1993). Another claim why nature has a female orientation is due to its epistemological roots. The shared experience of women and nature in oppressive chains of patriarchal values creates an accessible consciousness for women to understand and nurture environment. Since environmental problems affect women, isn't it possible that women possess greater knowledge and expertise that could help the environment?

Ariel Salleh in (Shiva & Mies, 2014) states that:

Ecofeminism is the only political framework I know of that can spell out the historical links between neoliberal capital, militarism, corporate science, worker alienation, domestic violence, reproductive technologies, sex tourism, child molestation, neo colonialism, islamophobia, extractivism, nuclear weapons, industrial toxics, land and water grabs, deforestation, genetic engineering, climate change and the myth of modern progress.

Ecofeminist is a universal movement; it encompasses the diversity of women and so as the issues to address and to resolve. Ecofeminism now reflects the concerted efforts of women trying to integrate their personal, ecological, and sociopolitical concerns (Eaton et. al, 2003). Social and environmental problems are sought to be answered and clarifies by ecological feminism. Since nature is the root of humanity, the home of millions and the source of life, curing its disease will solve one problem to another. Thus, the sharedness of nature and women oppression will create a chain of solution to various problems. Ecofeminism encompasses a variety of theoretical, practical, and critical efforts to understand and resist the interrelated dominations of women and nature.

It is a value system, a social movement, and a practice, but it also offers a political analysis that explores the links between androcentrism and environmental destruction. Ecofeminism is also a reaction against dualism. It is "an awareness" that begins with the realization that the exploitation of nature is intimately linked to Western Man's attitude toward women and tribal cultures or, in Ariel Salleh's (1985) words, that there is a "parallel in men's thinking between their 'right' to exploit nature, on the one hand, and the use they make of women, on the other."

In other words, solutions to environmental problems are dictated by "masculinist" terms (for example, control, choice, and change), rather than the "feminist" concerns of relationship, communication, and caring that are requisite for living in harmony with nature (Birkeland, 1993). The prevalence of science as the source of all standards created and celebrated – male values - the objectiveness, rigorousness and aggressiveness in uncovering the world. The sense of spirituality is replaced by calculations. Gilligan and Chodrow's (1993) study has noted that while both sexes have the ability to access both types of moral reasoning, the "focus" phenomenon is particularly gender-based: that is, men tend to focus on rights, whereas women tend to focus on

Presented at the 11th DLSU Arts Congress
De La Salle University, Manila, Philippines
February 7 and 8, 2018



responsibilities. Here one of the organizers of the Women's Pentagon Action, Donna Warnock in (Cuomo, 1998,) writes,

Thus man has come to deify 'rational' thought, also known as mechanistic thinking, in which each component of a problem to be solved is analyzed independently, mechanistically, isolated from its environment. Ecological and human consequences are overlooked. Emotion is absent.

New Earth, theologian Rosemary Radford Ruether (1975) wrote:

Women must see that there can be no liberation for them and no solution to the ecological crisis within a society whose fundamental model of relationships continues to be one of domination. They must unite the demands of the women's movement with those of the ecological movement to envision a radical reshaping of the basic socioeconomic relations and the underlying values of this society.

To ecofeminists, values and action are inseparable: one cannot care without acting (Birkeland, 1993). One cannot care and nurture without acting. Feminine values then is active, it is serve as the medicine to heal the earth's wound and fragments. The movement, ecological feminism, moves, acts and participates in uprooting not only women but humanity from the oppressive states of anthropocentrism and dualism. It seeks to restore nature for the benefit of everyone, to extend the longevity of non-human entities and to co-exist with ecosystem peacefully and harmoniously. The glorification of what have traditionally been seen as "masculine" values and the drive for power and control are simply maladaptive in an age of toxic waste and nuclear weapons (Birkeland, 1993). If patriarchal methodologies are not working, it is time then to give back the nature what it is – the female consciousness.

Ynestra King (1981) extends the ecofeminists argument:

We believe that a culture against nature is a culture against women. We know we must get out from under the feet of men as they go about their projects of violence. In pursuing these projects men deny and dominate both women and nature. It is time to reconstitute our culture in the name of that nature, and of peace and freedom, and it is women who can show the way. We have to be the voice of the invisible, of nature who cannot speak for herself in the political arenas of our society.

In this alternative, women are not seen as purely part of nature any more than men are; both men and women are part of both nature and culture (Warren, 1987 & King, 1989). Both men and women can stand with nature (King, 1989) and work for breaking down the dualistic construction of culture, but in doing so they will come from different historical places and have different things to contribute to this process. Ecological feminism embraces feminine values and abolishes oppressive patriarchal principles in nature's restoration. It is wrong to assume that it abolishes men as a gender and as individual. Rather, it questions the masculine values assigned in understanding nature.



THE ENVIRONMENTAL TOIL OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

Griffin (1978) writes that it is put forward that science might be able to prolong life for longer periods than might be accomplished by nature. And it is predicted:

that machines for navigation can
be made without rowers so that the
largest ships on rivers or seas will
by a single man be propelled with
greater velocity than if they were
full of men
that cars can be made to move with
out the aid of animals at an un
believable rapidity
that flying machines can be constructed
that such things can be
made without limit.

Science and technology in post modern era is both highly valued and indispensable. Individuals from all walks of life functions efficiently because of the technological advancements around us. Life is convenient, information readily accessible and almost everything's worth is quantifiable. Slowly, individuals are consumed by an instrument. The distinction between technology and a human being is hardly recognized. Science is unstoppable, the earth as the sacrificial lamb. Science is limitless, sometimes missing ethical principles. Technology and sciences causes a wide array of environmental problems – pollution to nuclear power plants. The powerful seduction of scientific advancement ideology of wonderworld is, in fact, creating a waste world (Thiel, 1995). Antolick (2003) says that control, mastery, clear-cut-rigidity, pre-formed knowledge frameworks: all are strands in the web called “technological mastery.” Technology appears to be about human power, but over what?

Nature and science shapes individuals – forces that make us who we are. Our lived experiences are rooted to our homes, to the forests and seas – the earth as the very ground of human existence. Science continually enhances society, creating technologies that aids in our everyday lives. Supposedly, these two forces should work together in egalitarian sense – one should not dominate the other. However, science continuously stretches nature to its limits. Pollutions of various kinds, diseases caused by toxic chemicals, militarization, and unnecessary conversion of lands into commercial spaces are the outcomes of scientific “improvements.” What is alarming to these occurrences is the apparent approval and justification of science residuals. Plumwood (2003) states that nature, as the excluded and devalued contrast of reason, includes the emotions, the body, the passions, animality, the primitive or uncivilised, the nonhuman world, matter, physicality and sense experience, as well as the sphere of irrationality, of faith and of madness. She argued that the mechanistic world-view means that the master rationality is unable to see the life that envelops earth. Science sees a machine, a physical matter, it demands more that what nature can give.

For Shiva (2014), male-dominated destruction has been twofold the global capitalist market system has systematically destroyed more sustainable ways of life that were associated with subsistence economic systems, and the inappropriate application of western science and technology has destroyed biological diversity and caused catastrophic ecological damage. Science and capitalism are forces that extend the ecological problem



further. The world today, characterized by a profit motive without a community ethic and by a lack of concern for marginalized persons and their natural environment, is on the verge of self-destruction (Gerbara, 2013).

Shiva (2014) states that:

If we continue to understand our role as rooted in the old paradigm of capitalist patriarchy – based on a mechanistic world-view, an industrial, capital-centred competitive economy, and a culture of dominance, violence, war and ecological and human irresponsibility we will witness the rapid unfolding of increasing climate catastrophe, species extinction, economic collapse, and human injustice and inequality.

Turning the living wealth of the planet into the property of corporations through patents is a recipe for ecological disaster. Nature is our source of life. It symbolizes growth and decay, birth and death. It is a cyclical process. But turning nature as a fuel for economic advance, we are creating a linear process. Nature will not give birth anymore; it will be continually dying until everything is dead. Capitalist orientation in exploiting nature is a one way street – there’s no turning back but to the bottom of the pit. We are part of nature, not her masters and owners. Bestowing intellectual property rights on life forms pervasive (Shiva, 2014).

Science and technology adapted the masculine methodologies in understanding and uncovering the world. Shiva (2014) repeatedly stressed that the rape of the Earth and rape of women are intimately linked – both metaphorically, in shaping world-views, and materially, in shaping women’s everyday lives. Heidegger (1996) asks, “Does man still dwell calmly between heaven and earth? Does a meditative spirit still reign over the land? Is there still a life-giving homeland in whose ground man may stand rooted, that is, be autochthonic?”

HEIDEGGER’S ANTIDOTE

An environment is the complex set of physical, geographic, biological, social, cultural and political conditions that surround an individual or organisms and that ultimately determine its form (Alawa, 2016). In continuation Barbier (2013) remarks: “Any unfavourable change or degeneration in the environment is regarded as environmental pollution”. Heidegger’s (1996) writings which are ontological and phenomenological in nature, surprisingly, he addressed the problem of technology in his essay *“The Question of Technology”* and a recommended antidote to the problem of science and technology in *“Discourse on Thinking.”* Heidegger unfolded the ontology of science and technology and offered a prescription to the continual ecological degradation. After the second world war, Heidegger re-evaluated the progress of science and technology. This is because of the devastating effects of science and technology on human beings and non human beings alike. We are now slaves to what we have produced. We are consumed by what we consume. Technology had enslaved not only human but also nature. We are now annihilated human beings, strangers to ourselves and to our land. We are alienated.

According to Heidegger (1993), some philosophers such as Francis Bacon, Thomas Hobbes believe that nature should be exploited; saying that, “One should twist the tail of the tiger to see the reaction”. Baconian scientific principles fueled the ideology of nature as a tool or thing to be used and consumed of. Heidegger didn’t agree with this kind of thinking – he had foreseen the threat of this mode of thinking and offered a solution to change it.



Machine technology remains up to now the most visible outgrowth of science and technology (Hodge, 1995). Machination is unconditional controllability, the domination of all beings, the world, and earth through calculation, acceleration, and technicity. Calculation represents a reduction of knowing to mathematics and science and a reduction of the world and earth to what is calculable (De Luca, 2005). No enchantment. No mystery. The objectification of nature as calculable brought dangerous implications. Modern humanity began defining itself in terms of scientific naturalism. Science is celebrated at the cost of nature's excavation. Heidegger (1997) prophetically predicts that machination will produce "a gigantic progress of sciences in the future. These advancements will bring exploitation and usage of the earth as well as rearing and training of humans into conditions that are still inconceivable today" (Heidegger, 1999, 108).

In the technological age, all of nature and even the human subject itself begin to be disclosed as nothing but raw material for the production-consumption process. Indeed, Heidegger's fundamental critique of modern technology is not directed at the world it reveals but the world it erases. It erases home – the nature, the soil and the earth and introduces gigantic technological advancements. According to Heidegger (1999), this arrogant anthropocentric humanism, not only diminishes humankind, but also wreaks havoc on nature. As power and control lies in the hands of humanity, the amount of restrictive power also reduces. We are in an era of machination – scientific machineries are evidently making life easier. This machination not only helps but also destroys in certain degrees. Human efforts to reform existing practices cannot succeed and in fact will make matters worse, because widespread cultural, social, and ecological crises are symptoms of modern humanity's obsession with control (Zimmerman, 1993).

Today nothing is developing anymore. Science is developing but the very ground which science is planted on is degenerating. In the hands of machination, nothing is sacred nor mysterious, nature is an open pit. Why? Because the possibilities for a thoughtful conversation are absent, but instead of our speaking is directed into electronic thought and calculation machines, a process which will lead in modern technical relations and science to completely new modes of procedure and to consequences which are not anticipated (Heidegger, 1996). Heidegger expresses his distress on science and technology;

Humanity is never a subject over and against or above the world apart from the world; rather, the subject is always in the world, a part of the world, and, indeed, is constituted by relations in the world. Further, in an important point that is not so clear in *Being and Time* but that becomes evident in later writings, "I am in the world" on earth, that Being-in-the world is always already Being-in-the-world on earth. Earth is "that on which and in which man bases his dwelling. . . . Upon the earth and in it, historically man grounds his dwelling in the world. . . . The world grounds itself on the earth, and earth juts through world" (1999, 169, 171, 172).

The pertinent danger of calculative thinking of scientific orientation is what Heidegger's primary concern. To address the issue, he offered to go back to where we are once rooted – the earth. In order to reflect and remodel our calculative thinking, it is necessary where human beings are destined; to think meditatively. Man has the ultimate weapon against the quantification of the world – that is to think. Thoughts should not remain as mere thoughts rather thinking creates questions, criticisms and reflections.

Heidegger envisioned the possible thinking that science might create. This possibility is a threat to humanity and to the environment. Heidegger starts to trace this problem from man's flight from thinking. Thoughtlessness is an uncanny visitor who comes and goes everywhere in today's world. For nowadays we take in everything in the quickest and cheapest way, only to forget it just as quickly, instantly. The instantaneous



power that science created separates man from his very being, from his potential; that is, to think, to reflect and to question. Heidegger (1977), in *Questioning Technology*, illustrates the disappearance of scholar and emergence of scientific, a researcher.

The scholar disappears. He is replaced by the research man who is engaged in research projects. This, rather than the pursuit of scholarship, gives his work its keen atmosphere. The research man no longer needs a library at home. Besides, he is always moving about. He does business at meetings and gets information at congresses. He contracts to work for commissions from publishers, who now help to determine what books, must be written. The research worker forces himself automatically into the orbit of the technologist in the form essential to his work. Only in this way does he remain effective and thus, in the sense of his age, real. Alongside him, for some time and in a few places there will continue an increasingly thin and empty romanticism of scholarship and of the university.

The lack of genuine scholarship leads to the triumph of science. A scientist presents, exhaust and research quantifiable data. He observes, hypothesizes and calculates to arrive at definite results. He is keen and sharp. He interprets the data with objectiveness and preciseness. Natural phenomena are reducible to numbers and facts. It can be interpreted using equations and graphs. Nothing is mysterious. Everything is possible to science. Whatever the number represents, it is the truth, it is valid by the method of science. The scholar, who is critical and reflective about the world, is slowly moving out of the picture. He is no longer needed; his questions, his criticisms are outnumbered by scientific facts. Heidegger (1977) argued that for this battle of world views, and in accord with the significance of this battle, man brings into play the unlimited power of calculation, planning, and cultivation of all things. Science as research is an indispensable form of this adjustment in the world, one of the paths on which the modern age races to the fulfillment of its nature with a velocity unknown to the participants.

Calculative thinking computes. Calculative thinking races from one prospect to the next. Calculative thinking never stops, never collects itself. Calculative thinking is not meditative thinking, not thinking which contemplates the meaning which reigns in everything that is. The world now appears as an object open to the attacks of calculative thought, attacks that nothing is believed able any longer to resist (Heidegger, 1996). Heidegger therefore associates technology with a distinctive sort of thinking, namely, calculative thinking, a thinking that 'computes ever new, ever more promising and at the same time more economical possibilities' (Thiel, 1995). Heidegger's fear is that the 'gigantic' technological will might eventually come to extinguish all other modes of revealing, that it might come to impose itself as 'the presumed unique mode of disclosure', and that 'calculative thinking may someday come to be accepted and practiced as the only way of thinking' (James, 2001). As we cease to share the world, but share only a desire for its control and conquest, the prospect of finding a common home evaporates (Thiel, 1995). One must go back to the very core of the universe – it's very Being. To understand the Being, that is to respect and let it unfold on its own. It is an in depth understanding of "Being" that can aid human beings live above all these ills in the society and the environment (Alawa, 2013).

Reflection is individual's capacity to reflect his/her presuppositions and criticize it. It is the availability to question the ideologies offered to us. Heidegger (1977) states that because man is a thinking and meditative being, it is essential to meditate and question what is closest to us –our home – the earth. Rootedness is particularly important in Heideggerian meditative thinking because this is what connects us to the environment, giving us sense of urgency and concern to respond on environmental crisis. Heidegger (1996) writes that "the poet means to say: For a truly joyous and salutary human work to flourish, man must be able to mount from the depth of his home ground up into the ether." To rise above the chains and slavery of



machination, one must go back to the ether – the ground, the soil, his roots, and his home – the earth. In reclaiming nature, it is important to be conscious and recognize our interconnectedness to it.

Meditative thinking demands of us not to cling one-sidedly to a single idea, nor to run down a one-track course of ideas. Meditative thinking demands of us that we engage ourselves with what at first sight does not go together at all (Heidegger, 1996). He did not endorse eradication of technology. Science and technology is not an enemy; it is essentially anti nature. He wrote (1996) “we depend on technical devices; they even challenge us to ever greater advances. But suddenly and unaware we find ourselves so firmly shackled to these technical devices that we fall into bondage to them.” We can use technical devices in limit and control. Technology should not consummate human being. We created science and technology; it is also in our capacity to take control, to question and to criticize what these advances are offering to us. Humans are equipped with thinking; we can fly away from thoughtlessness and calculations. Heidegger (1996) states that;

We can use technical devices, and yet with proper use also keep ourselves so free of them, that we may let go of them any time. We can use technical devices as they ought to be used, and also let them alone as something which does not affect our inner and real core.

Heidegger (1996) allow technological instruments to enter our daily lives and at the same time leave them outside, that is, let them atone, as things which are nothing absolute but remain dependent upon something higher. Yes, we allow technology to take part and aid us and no, we don't allow it to consummate and alienate us from our very being and from the nature. Heidegger calls this yes-no relationship as openness to mystery. Science and technology can take part in the progress of the world but nature should remain as something mysterious and sacred. Releasement towards things is the capacity to recognize and reflect when to accept or critique the proposals and principles of scientific community. Heidegger (1996) visions his dilemma as “the approaching tide of technological revolution in the atomic age could so captivate, bewitch, dazzle, and beguile man that calculative thinking may someday come to be accepted and practiced as the only way of thinking.” But there is hope if mankind will shift from scientific induced paradigm to meditative reflections. Heidegger (1996) continues that “the issue is the saving of man's essential nature. Therefore, the issue is keeping meditative thinking alive.”

ECOFEMINISM: MEDITATIVE OR CALCULATIVE THINKING?

The small planet, Earth, which may not be the center of the universe, galaxy, or solar system, but it is the bearer of life and the temporary home of human culture (Skowlimoski, 1992). The importance of humanity's participation in nature arguments is necessary. The soil that we step in everyday is our home. The relinquishing of our home is also the erasure of humanity from the map. Marx supports this idea as he wrote;

Nature is man's inorganic body – nature, that is, in so far as it is not itself the human body. Man lives on nature – means that nature is his body, with which he must remain in continuous intercourse if he is not to die. That man's physical and spiritual life is linked to nature means simply that nature is linked to itself, for man is a part of nature.

(1844/2007:74)

Ecofeminists argue that science and technology are imprints of male values; power, domination, aggression, calculation and quantification. It treats nature as something objective, subject for research,



validation and quantification and disembodies nature's mystery. Nature, passive like women, cannot defend itself against gigantism and technocracy. Shiva argues that both nature and women have been turned into resources and passive objects to be exploited by men (Shiva 1990:191; Shiva 1989:6).

Ecofeminism and Heidegger's environmental revitalization shares commonality. Both are rooted on the treatment of earth as a home. Human emancipation lies at the ether of the earth, at the roots of nature. Women emancipation is freeing from male oriented values; nature's emancipation is the flight from and control of scientific values. The 'turn' away from seeing nature as enchanted, mysterious, and fecund, enabled the development of scientific systems that regarded natural entities and phenomena as under the jurisdiction of man (Cuomo, 1993). As a result, technology, science, and other material practices and institutions instrumentalized nonhuman entities. To heal nature, Heidegger introduced meditative thinking. A kind of thinking that reflects, questions, and analyses the problems brought about by science. Ecofeminism is a movement seeking to change the scientific/male oriented values in treating nature. Meditative thinking then, also involves working as co-creators and co-producers with the Earth. This demands using our intelligence to conserve and heal, not conquer and wound (Shiva, 2014).

In Carol Christ's (2007) words, "[w]e needs to recognize that every technological intervention brings life for some persons or beings, death for others. We must weigh each of our technologies in a scale that includes all beings in the circle of life." Heidegger, at the height of technological progress after World War II, realized the danger of science. Machination of the world is also the machination of human thinking. Values are quantified and measured. Man is getting farther and farther from his homeland – earth. As intrinsic values become measurable, nature suffered as it is machinated by science. Ecofeminism and Heidegger point the culprit of ecological suffering to obsessive and uncontrollable progress of science and technology. Ecofeminism opposes calculative thinking because it represents the patriarchal traces of gender oppression. Calculative thinking is the mindset of male oriented values. Thus, ecofeminists offer a meditative like thinking; that is to restore nature patterned on feminine values. The movement itself is a critique and a reflection of the logic of domination of science and technology.

Ecofeminism critiques over consumptive technologies resulting to multiple environment hazards. Technology is important but it has to be controlled and confronted. Heidegger's shares similar line of thought in his concept of releasement towards things and openness to mystery. It is the ability to take the lead, when to accept or to question the uses of technology of science. Also, nature is not an object to be exhausted and exploited; nature has its own mystery than human beings cannot fathom. Ecofeminism is a call to restore the nature in its very own place, a call to genuine advocacy, a call to go back where the soil is and a call to rebuild what once our home – the earth. Heideggerian environmentalism is a spiritual take on understanding nature; to restore it, man must go back to his home, think and reflect the world has become.

To clarify, ecofeminism negates the idea that men are naturally or inherently rapists of earth. Rather, the values assigned to males are the one causing earth's downfall. But violence of men against women and other 'enemies' is not determined by our genes. Men are not rapists by nature, nor are they genetically programmed to be killers of our Mother Nature, the origin of all life (Shiva, 2014). The only way to establish harmony again is to create a sphere of nurturance and care for both sexes towards nature. Humanity, given with the capacity to think, is the answer to nature's cry for help. Attributes towards non-human entities should be closer to itself and farther from the technocracy and objectiveness obsession of science. A new science should recognize the fact that the earth and its resources are limited, that our life is limited, that time is limited. In a limited universe,



therefore, there can be no infinite progress, no infinite search for truth, no infinite growth unless others are exploited (Mies, 2014).

Just as we can grow deaf only because we hear, just as we can grow old only because we were young; so we can grow thought-poor or even thought-less only because man at the core of his being has the capacity to think; has "spirit and reason" and is destined to think (Mies, 2014). Griffin (1978) summarizes ecological feminists' narrative;

And time does not flow universally. The universe is amorphous, without fixed design, always subject to change. There is no absolute space. Time and space are one. We are the rocks, we are soil, we are trees, rivers, we are wind, we carry the birds, the birds, we are cows, mules, we are horses, we are matter. We are flesh, we breathe, we are her body: we speak.

CONCLUSION

Ecofeminists principles embrace Heidegger's methodology in understanding nature. Both share the same dilemma – the rapid progress of science and technology. Heideggerian environmentalism as the standard of critique, ecological feminism is on agreeable terms with meditative thinking. Both promote the importance of nature's mystery and rootedness. However, Heidegger didn't particularly endorsed feminine values in restoring nature. He remained neutral, sticking to his differentiation of calculative and meditative thinking. Nevertheless, the way he presented meditative mindset is also the argument of ecological feminists. While ecological feminists criticized technology, the movement didn't offered a comprehensively account if technology was to be controlled or eradicated. It simply pointed out the danger of machination but didn't claim what to do with technology. Heidegger presented the importance of technology and methods how not to be alienated from our very being and not be consumed by technology. I think this is the part where ecofeminists missed; inadequate understanding of putting science and technology in place. The movement started with a number of counter-arguments but didn't provide a reasonable argument for technology. If we're to eradicate sciences and it's by products, the society will suffer – then, how ecofeminist account that? Or if technology were to be regulated, how? Heidegger answered these questions and ecofeminists were not able to. In general, ecological feminism is a successful attempt in revitalizing nature in Heideggerian standard.

Ecological feminism also faces various criticisms. First is the charge of essentialism for women. If the very nature that made women passive and tied reproductive responsibilities are going to be celebrated, isn't it contradicting to what majority of feminists seeks? Ecological feminism is also criticized for genderization, it contradicts dualism and hierarchy yet it is exactly doing what it is against for. By appropriating women like methodology, it also genderizes and dualizes nature. Women belongs to the earth, men are not. It also puts women as an authority and men as the destructive persona. Lastly, ecological feminism and Heidegger's environmentalism are also charge with romanticism. The idea or solution is high above reality, unreachable and impossible to apply to the human worlds.

But one thing remains, nature is on the verge of destruction. It is evident by different environmental problems that we experience every day. It's time to rethink science and technology. It's time to implement new and holistic approach in understanding nature. Maybe ecological feminism will bring forward to progress we're looking for.



REFERENCES

- Alawa, P. (2016). *Kant and Heidegger on environmental ethics: A comparative study*. Quest Journals, Journal of Research in Humanities and Social Science Volume 4 ~ Issue 9 (2016) pp: 01-05. Retrieved from www.questjournals.org last November 15, 2017.
- Alawa, P. (2013). *Martin Heidegger on science and technology: It's implication to the society*. OSR Journal Of Humanities And Social Science (IOSR-JHSS) Volume 12, Issue 6 (Jul. - Aug. 2013), Retrieved from www.Iosrjournals.Org last November 15, 2017.
- Antolick, M. (2003). *Deep ecology and Heideggerian phenomenology*. Retrieved from www.b-ok.org on November 15, 2017.
- Barbier, M. (1979) Introduction to chemical ecology. In Richard Clay & Chauser Publishers. Guignon, C. (1999) *The Cambridge companion for Heidegger*. London: Camabridge University Press.
- Birkeland, Janis (1993). Ecofeminism: linking theory and practice. In Gaard, Greta *Ecofeminism : Women, Animals, Nature*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Cuomo, Christine (1998). *Feminism ecological communities: An ethic of flourishing*. New York and London: Routledge.
- De Luca, K (2005). *Thinking with Heidegger: Rethinking environmental theory and practice*. Ethics & the Environment, Volume 10, Number 1, Spring 2005, pp.67-87 (Article). Published by Indiana University Press. DOI: 10.1353/een.2005.0013.
- Eaton, Heather & Lorentzen (2003). *Ecofeminism and globalization: Exploring culture, context, and religion*. USA: Rowman and Littlefield Publisher.
- Eaton, Heather (2003). Can Ecofeminism withstand corporate globalization? In Eaton, Heather & Lorentzen *Ecofeminism and globalization: Exploring culture, context, and religion*. USA: Rowman and Littlefield Publisher.
- Eaubonne, F (1981). Ed. by Elaine Marks and Isabelle de Courtivron *New French Feminisms: An anthology*. New York: Schocken Books, 64–67, 236.
- Gerbara, Ivone (2003). Ecofeminism: “An ethics of life”. In Eaton, Heather & Lorentzen, Lois Ann. *Ecofeminism and globalization: Exploring culture, context, and religion*. USA: Rowman and Littlefield Publisher.
- Gaard, Greta. Ecofeminism (1993). *Women, animals, nature*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Griffin, Susan (1978). *Woman and nature: The roaring inside her*. San Francisco: Harper and Row.
- Griffin, Susan (1982). *Made from this earth: Selections from her writing*. London: Women’s Press, 82.
- Heidegger, Martin (1996). *The principle of reason*. Trans. by Reginald Lily. USA: Indiana University Press.

Presented at the 11th DLSU Arts Congress
De La Salle University, Manila, Philippines
February 7 and 8, 2018



- _____, _____. (1962). *Being and Time*. San Francisco: Harper and Row.
- _____, _____. (1977). The Age of the world picture. In *The question concerning technology and other essays*. New York: Harper Torchbooks.
- _____, _____. (1993). The end of philosophy and the task of thinking. In D. F. Krell (ed.) *Martin Heidegger: Basic writings*. San Francisco: Harper Collins, 431–49.
- _____, _____. (1999). *Contributions to philosophy*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- _____, _____. (1976). *The age of the world view*. Translated by Grene, M. Vol. 4, No. 2, *Martin Heidegger and Literature* (Winter, 1976), pp. 340-355 : Duke University Press. Retrieved from [://www.jstor.org/stable/302139](http://www.jstor.org/stable/302139) last November 15, 2017.
- _____, _____. (1977). *The question concerning technology and other essays*. Translated by Lovitt, W. New York & London: Garland Publishing Inc.
- _____, _____. (1996). *Discourse on thinking*. Translated by Anderson J. New York: Harper & Row Publishers.
- James, Simon Paul (2001). *Heidegger and environment ethics*. Durham theses, Durham University. Retrieved from <http://etheses.dur.ac.uk.3958/> last November 15, 2017.
- King, Ynestra (1993). *The Eco-feminist imperative. In reclaim the Earth: Women speak out for life on Earth*, ed. Leonie Caldecott and Stephanie Leland. London: Women's Press.
- _____, _____. (1990). Healing the wounds: Feminism, ecology and the nature/culture dualism. In Irene Diamond and Gloria Orenstein, *Reweaving the world: The emergence of Ecofeminism*. San Francisco: Sierra Club Books, 110.
- Hodge, Jenna (1995). *Heidegger and Ethics*. New York: Routledge.
- Lahar, Stephanie (1993). Roots: Rejoining natural and social history. In Gaard, Greta. *Ecofeminism : Women, animals, nature*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Lorentzen, Lois Ann (2003). Indigenous feet: Ecofeminism, globalization, and the case of Chiapas. In Eaton, Heather & Lorentzen *Ecofeminism and globalization: Exploring culture, context, and religion*. USA: Rowman and Littlefield Publisher.
- Marx, Karl (1844/2007). *Economic and philosophic manuscripts*. New York: Dover.
- Merchant, Carolyn (1980). *The death of nature: Women, ecology and the scientific revolution* San Francisco: Harper and Row.
- _____, _____. (1995). *Earthcare: women and the environment*. New York: Routledge.
- Mellor, Mary (1993). *Eco-Feminism and Eco-Socialism: Dilemmas of essentialism and materialism*. Society and Nature 2, no. 1, 111.

Presented at the 11th DLSU Arts Congress
De La Salle University, Manila, Philippines
February 7 and 8, 2018



- _____, _____. (1997). Gender and the environment. In *The International Handbook of Environmental Sociology*, ed. Michael Redclift and Graham Woodgate. Cheltenham, UK Edward Elgar Publishing Ltd, 195-202.
- Mies, M. & Shiva, V. (2014). *Ecofeminism*. UK-NY: Zed Books Ltd.
- Mies, M. (2014). Feminist research: Science, violence and responsibility. In Mies, M. & Shiva, V. *Ecofeminism*. UK-NY: Zed Books Ltd.
- _____, _____. (2014). The myth of catching-up development. In Mies, M. & Shiva, V. *Ecofeminism*. UK-NY: Zed Books Ltd.
- _____, _____. (2014). Who made nature our enemy? In Mies, M. & Shiva, V. *Ecofeminism*. UK-NY: Zed Books Ltd.
- Plumwood, V. (2003). *Feminism and the mastery of nature*. London – New York: Routledge.
- Salleh, Ariel. (1985). *The liberation of nature: A circular affair*. *Environmental Ethics* 7 (summer 1985), 9.
- Shiva, V. (2014). Reductionism and regeneration: A crisis in science. In Mies, M. & Shiva, V. *Ecofeminism*. UK-NY: Zed Books Ltd.
- _____, _____. (2014). Homeless in the 'Global Village'. In Mies, M. & Shiva, V. *Ecofeminism*. UK-NY: Zed Books Ltd.
- _____, _____. (1987). Staying alive: Women, ecology and development. In Karen Warren, *Feminism and Ecology: Making Connections*, *Environmental Ethics* 9, no. 1 (spring 1987).
- Skolimowski, H. (1992). *Living philosophy: Eco-Philosophy as a tree of life*. London: Arkana.
- Thiel, Leslie Paul (1995). *Timely meditations: Martin Heidegger and postmodern politics*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Ruether, Rosemary Radford (1975). *New woman/New earth: Sexist ideologies and human liberation*. New York: Seabury Press.
- Ruether, Rosemary Radford (1979). Mother earth and the megamachine. In *Womanspirit Rising: A Feminist reader in religion*, ed. Carol Christ and Judith Plaskow. San Francisco: Harper and Row, 44.
- Sandilands, Catriona (1999). *The good natured Feminist: Ecofeminism and the quest for democracy*. USA: University of Minnesota Press.
- Warren, K. (2000). *Ecofeminist philosophy: A Western perspective on what it is and why it matters*. USA: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers Inc.
- Zimmerman, Michael (1993). *The Cambridge companion to Heidegger* edited by Charles Guignon. USA: Cambridge University Press.