

# Summarizing the Ecofeminist Debate in Japan in the 1980s: Five Points of Contention Emerged in the *Aoki-Ueno Debate*<sup>(1)</sup>

MORITA Keitaro  
Adjunct Lecturer/Researcher  
Rikkyo University

## 1. Introduction

The author's previous article (Morita, 2022) reviews the 40-year history of ecofeminism in Japan. It divides the genealogy into the following four waves:

[First Wave] (1983-1986): Ivan Illich, Feminist Anthropology, and the Aoki-Ueno Debate

[Second Wave] (1987-1994): From the "Lost Decade" to the European Women's Study Tour for Environmental Issues

[Third Wave] (1995-2011.3.10): Practical Research and Study, Participation of Male Researchers, and Ecofeminist Literary Criticism & Religious Studies

[Fourth Wave] (2011.3.11-present): Ueno's Reflections, Reconsideration/Revival of Ecofeminism, and Disaster and Women's Studies

Subsequently, the author was given the opportunity to conduct a research project as a visiting researcher, entitled "A Genealogy of Japanese Ecofeminists," with the Kitakyushu Forum on Asian Women (KFAW) during FY2022-2023. It was an opportunity to rethink the four waves as established above. This paper focuses on the first wave, which was extensively reconsidered as part of the research.

The first wave of ecofeminism in Japan is defined mainly by the *Aoki-Ueno debate*, in which the late ecofeminist Aoki Yayoi and the Marxist feminist Ueno Chizuko (who held an anti-ecofeminist stance at the time) clashed intensely in academic journals and at a 1985 symposium, where Ueno emerged victorious. Even in the 2020s, ecofeminism continues to be misrepresented to others and understood only one-sidedly or inaccurately.

The feminist scholar Sakurai Yuko's (1990) analysis of the debate is excellent but was written only five years after the culmination of the debate. More recently, the feminist scholar Tooyama Hideya's (2023) article summarizes the Aoki-Ueno debate in four points; unlike this paper, however, it focuses on presenting a history and facts of the debate, rather than the points of contention. This paper aims to reexamine the Aoki-

Ueno debate from the current academic horizon—40 years after the debate—discursively, historically, and genealogically by distilling it into five points of contention and, by extension, reevaluating the significance of ecofeminism in the current environmental crisis of the *Anthropocene*.

## 2. A History of the Aoki-Ueno Debate

It is fair to say that ecofeminism in Japan began in 1983 when the anthology *Feminizumu no Uchû* [The Feminist Universe] was published. In addition to serving as the volume's chief editor, it includes Aoki's (1983) article "Joseisei to Shintai no Ekorojî [Femininity and the Ecology of the Body]." Also included is "Ekorojî to Feminizumu [Ecology and Feminism]" by Françoise d'Eaubonne (1983), the French feminist who coined the term *ecofeminism* in 1974.

Aoki (1985/1994b) conceived of a rather unique ecofeminism that deviated from mainstream ecofeminism to the extent that it could be called "Aoki-style ecofeminism." First, Aoki posited what she calls "the proposition of modernity," namely: "civilization = the suppression of nature = the alienation of the body = contempt for sexuality"<sup>(2)</sup> (p. 58). Aoki (1985/1994c) defined ecological feminism as "a cultural revolution that seeks a breakthrough through the female principle in the concrete jungle of modernity, which has been painted only with the male principle" (p. 205) and called for "the restoration of the 'female principle'" (Aoki, 1985/1994a, p. 231), which she said, had been marginalized by civilization.

This unique Aoki-style ecofeminism was equated with "Ivan Illich-style ecofeminism" in the Aoki-Ueno debate. Ueno attacked Aoki in an article within an academic journal as "an Illichian feminist represented by 'ecological feminism'"<sup>(3)</sup> (Ueno, 1985, p. 80). More specifically, in 1985, Ueno and Aoki both debated in the academic journal *Gendai-shisô* [Contemporary Thought], with Ueno (1985) in the January issue criticizing Illich-Aoki, or "a criticism of 'ecological feminism'" (p. 84), and Aoki (1985/1994a) in the April issue responding to Ueno's criticism. It is in the January issue that Ueno (1985) identified Aoki as being part of the Illich school, stating that Ueno wanted to "rescue Illich-school feminists [including Aoki] from the trap of Illich" (p. 81). At the time, however, Aoki (1985/1994a) "has not even read [Illich's book] *Gender*" (p. 235), and "in general, my [Aoki's] concept of gender was not influenced by Illich, but something completely different" (Shinhyoron-henshubu, 1986, p. 174).

In his book *Gender*, Illich (1982) presented the pre-modern *vernacular gender* and the modern *economic sex* as two opposing concepts that overturn and "twist" the

customary categorizations, in gender studies, of gender (socially and culturally constructed “sexual” differences) and sex (biological sexual differences). Then he idealized vernacular gender as an asymmetrical but complementary relationship between men and women from the pre-modern era. The feminist scholar Hagiwara Hiroko (1985/1988) criticized Illich’s twist to the hilt, calling his *Gender* “a book of perversion filled with careful fraud” (p. 70). However, Illich-style ecofeminism (or gender theory) was for a time very well circulated in Japan. The radical feminist scholar Ehara Yumiko (1985) offers the following analysis of why it took hold:

Despite the fact that Illich’s gender theory was mounted a full-scale attack by American feminists, it was widely accepted in Japan. This is because in Illich’s theory one can detect antipathy toward industrial society, antipathy toward “male”-oriented feminism, and antipathy toward “sexual liberation.” These concepts seem to align with the community-oriented, *anti-modernist*, *anti-individualist* tendencies that women’s liberation theory in Japan has traditionally had. (p. 22)

The Aoki-Ueno debate reached its climax on May 12, 1985, when a symposium was held in Kyoto by the Women’s Studies Society of Japan, entitled “Feminizumu wa Dokoe Yuku—Josei-Genri to Ekorōjī— [Where Is Feminism Heading?: The Female Principle and Ecology].” Overall, Aoki, who did not deny the dualism of male (principle)/female (principle), was considered a maximizer/maximalist who maximizes sex/gender differences, while Ueno was regarded as a minimizer/minimalist who minimizes sex/gender differences, the opposite of Aoki. As mentioned above, Aoki was identified with Illich (who was taken to task by a number of feminists at least in Japan and the U.S.A.<sup>(4)</sup>) and beaten by Ueno “hands down” (Nishikawa, Ueno, & Ogino, 2011, p. 106 [Ueno’s remark]) in the debate, resulting in an “overwhelming victory” (Senda, 2009, p. 108) by Ueno. Consequently, Aoki was shut out of the critical and academic circles and local governments that used to invite her as a lecturer.

At that time, in addition to Aoki’s ecofeminist works, a Japanese translation of the book *The Death of Nature: Women, Ecology, and the Scientific Revolution*, authored by the renowned American ecofeminist Carolyn Merchant (1980/1985), was published, and feminists such as the feminist economist scholar Adachi Mariko (1986) and the feminist literature scholar Shimizu Kazuko (1986) expressed their expectations for ecofeminism. Nevertheless, in 1986, Aoki’s argument was published as the book *Feminizumu to Ekorōjī* [Feminism and Ecology] (Aoki, 1986) and Ueno’s argument as the book *Onna wa Sekai wo Sukueru ka* [Can Women Save the World?] (Ueno, 1986b), which was

“written to criticize those who advocated ecofeminism” (Ueno, 2013, p. 107), with both works serving as the final word within the Aoki-Ueno debate for their respective sides.

Nearly twenty-five years after the debate, Ueno stated in an interview that she “did her best to criticize [Aoki’s] work out of respect” (Nishikawa, Ueno, & Ogino, 2011, p. 107). By contrast, about 8 years prior to that interview, Aoki (2003a) expressed her anger at Ueno’s identification of Aoki with Illich and characterized Ueno’s criticism against both scholars as “completely wrong” and “a character slander against Illich as a thinker and also an injury to my character” (p. 328).

In the Aoki-Ueno debate, “those who criticized ecofeminism made no attempt to respond to this global [environmental] crisis” (Sakurai, 1990, p. 121). As a result, “it is regrettable that even the circuit of how feminism should relate to ecology seems to have been closed” (Senda, 2009, p. 108). It was indeed “an unhappy marriage of ecology and feminism” (Hagiwara, 2001, p. 56).

Sakurai (1990) states that in the Aoki-Ueno debate, Ueno and her followers “deny ecofeminism but offer no alternative theory to it” (p. 121). While the “Ueno school” may not have proposed any alternative theory, looking back from the academic horizon of 2024, the debate was in fact a polemic with five contentious turns. In the next chapter, the author will provide a detailed summary of each of the five points of contention in turn:

1. Sex/Gender Maximization vs. Sex/Gender Minimization—Difference or Equality?
2. Maternalism vs. Anti-Maternalism—A “Historical Debate” over *Motherhood*
3. Essentialism vs. Constructionism—“Feminist Flights from Nature”? Or Confusion Between *Nature* and *Naturalness*
4. Structuralism vs. Post-Structuralism—Losing Sight of the Structuralist Insight
5. Anti-Modernism vs. Modernism—An Invented Opposition?

### **3. The Five Points of Contention Raised by the Aoki-Ueno Debate**

#### **3-1. Sex/Gender Maximization vs. Sex/Gender Minimization—Difference or Equality?**

As Aoki (1982/1987) recalled after the controversy, the original point of contention in the Aoki-Ueno debate was precisely “sex/gender differences” (p. 248). Ueno (1985, p. 98), using Maggie McFadden’s (1983) classification, assigns the sex/gender difference maximizer to Aoki and the sex/gender difference minimizer to herself (Ueno). The former is a view that seeks fairness between men and women while

acknowledging sex/gender differences, while the latter is a view that seeks equality between men and women while minimizing sex/gender differences (and ultimately deconstructing the male/female and man/woman dichotomies *per se*, depending on the proponent).

Aoki (1985/1994c, p. 193) affirms the male/female boundary in principle, though she hesitates to declare that the boundary is as clear-cut as generally thought. Ueno (1986a), on the other hand, takes the direction of minimizing sex/gender differences, as exemplified by her statement, “What a man can do, a woman can do, and what a man cannot do, a woman cannot do” (p. 173). This difference in direction can be considered to have been greatly influenced by their own feminist origins. Aoki said in one interview, “My feminism was nurtured by my early involvement in grassroots movements” (Buckley, 1997, p. 17), and even in the U.S.A., many ecofeminists were grassroots activists, while many of the Marxist feminists, on the other hand, were sex/gender minimizers and scholars.<sup>(5)</sup> Indeed, Ueno is a renowned Marxist feminist whose career has been centered in academia.

But was Aoki truly a sex/gender difference maximizer? Let us start with a look at the following excerpt from Aoki (1983): “The exploration of femininity by no means runs counter to feminism. It seeks to integrate women’s sexual identity, which has been divided into the one who gives birth and the other who works, while simultaneously bringing to light the deceptions of modernity and the contradictions of industrial society. In this sense, it aims at a more radical horizon than the feminist movement’s goal of ‘full equality’ between men and women within the current social framework” (p. 244). Furthermore, Aoki (1990, p. 23) expresses concern about egalitarian feminism. She explains that modernist feminism has argued for equality between men and women, but that by erasing physical differences it ignores not only the physical differences between men and women but also between the able-bodied and disabled, middle-aged and senior, and between each individual. These discourses can make Aoki a maximizer of such differences.

On the other hand, while Aoki (2003b) acknowledges the differences in biological *sex* between men and women, that is not essentialism, according to her—acknowledging differences in *gender roles* is essentialism.<sup>(6)</sup> Furthermore, as early as 1984, Aoki had already said, “I think that the structure in which both men and women can live convivially does not lie in the direction of some form of re-division of men’s work and women’s work . . . but rather in making possible the interchange of both men’s and women’s daily work” (Tamanoi et al., 1984, p. 234 [Aoki’s remark]). Moreover, as mentioned above, she is hesitant to declare that the line between man and woman is as

clear as generally thought, so one would hesitate to lump her together with other sex/gender maximizers, as opposed to Ueno's identification of Aoki as such.

The feminist philosopher Nancy Fraser (1990/1997, pp. 259-260), referring to the feminist poet and philosopher Denise Riley (1988), defines "gynocentric-maternalist essentialism" as overfeminizing women and framing them as maternal beings, while "postfeminist antiessentialism" underfeminizes women and asserts that "women" do not exist. She then argues that joining the two does not overcome the limitations of either. Fraser also positions the former as a structuralist model and the latter as an abstract negation of structuralism.

The gynocentric-maternalist essentialist-structuralist model described by Fraser is close to Aoki's thoughts, while postfeminist antiessentialism, or the abstract negation of structuralism, is close to Ueno's thoughts. With this, in what follows, the author would like to review the issues of "maternalism vs. anti-maternalism" in Section 3-2, "essentialism vs. constructionism (anti-essentialism)" in Section 3-3, and "structuralism vs. post-structuralism" in Section 3-4, before discussing the issue of "anti-modernism vs. modernism" in Section 3-5.

### **3-2. Maternalism vs. Anti-Maternalism—A "Historical Debate" over *Motherhood***

The second point of contention in the Aoki-Ueno debate was revolved around *motherhood*. In the debate, Aoki was positioned as a *maternalist* and Ueno as an *anti-maternalist*. Aoki (1985, p. 31) herself, in her speech at the symposium in May 1985 as mentioned in Chapter 2, posited a cosmological maleness/femaleness where the paternal/maternal principles are at its symbolic level, which if projected onto the real world are the male/female principles. Therefore, she explains that the female principle does not necessarily correspond with the maternal principle or motherhood, maintaining that both men and women can have the female principle. In her discussion with the psychologist Kawai Hayao on motherhood and fatherhood, Aoki again recognizes that the "maternal principle" and the "female principle" are different, stating, "I would like to make a clear distinction between the 'maternal' principle and the 'female' principle" (Kawai & Aoki, 1986, p. 27). However, in the Aoki-Ueno debate, Aoki-style ecofeminism seems to have been misunderstood as being based on the "maternal principle," rather than on the "female principle." The late feminist scholar Ogoshi Aiko puts the blame on Ueno, saying, "Ueno . . . led us into the trap of shortsightedly connecting maternalism and eco-feminism" (Ogoshi, 1994/1996, p. 257), and as a result, "the feminine principle was replaced for the maternal principle beyond Aoki's intention, and the risk [of Aoki's ecofeminism] to become a hotbed for a new maternalist feminism" (Ogoshi, 1991, p. 93) was considered

problematic.

It is true that the late structuralist Kitazawa Masakuni, Aoki's lifetime partner, positions the Aoki-Ueno debate as centered around motherhood:

In the Taisho era [1912-1926], the “motherhood protection controversy” between Hiratsuka Raicho and Yosano Akiko has been considered one of the most prominent debates in women's modern history in Japan. [But] the “feminist debate” between Aoki Yayoi and Ueno Chizuko that developed in 1985 is a historical controversy that rivals or even exceeds it [the Hiratsuka-Yosano controversy]. (Kitazawa, n.d.)

The author likewise regards the Aoki-Ueno debate as one of the defining historical debates in Japanese feminism, but to this day it is either underestimated in its history or registered/remembered only as a debate wherein ecofeminism was denied.

Aoki (1990) defines maternalism as “the tendency to value a woman only in terms of her ‘mother’ characteristics, rather than seeing her as an individual with her own personality and character” (p. 26), implying her support for individualism and denial of maternalism. Looking back on the Aoki-Ueno debate, Aoki (2003b) suggested that she was not a maternalist, stating, “I was *labeled* an ‘Illichian feminist’ and ‘maternalist’” (p. 54 [emphasis added]). With these, it was a mistake for Aoki to be considered a maternalist, or at least a deviation from her intentions.

### **3-3. Essentialism vs. Constructionism: “Feminist Flights from Nature”? Or Confusion Between *Nature* and *Naturalness***

Seen from the current academic horizon, the Aoki-Ueno debate can also be viewed in terms of “essentialism (Aoki) vs. constructionism (Ueno)” (Morita, 2022, p. 70). The latter's “constructionism” can be paraphrased as “anti-essentialism,” or in Ueno's words, “the deconstruction proposed by [Judith] Butler and others that ultimately dismantles ‘female essentialism’” (Ueno et al., 2012, p. 29). This is because what can be and what has been constructed can also be deconstructed.

In an interview a year after the 2011 Great East Japan Earthquake, also known as 3.11 in reference to the date when it occurred, Ueno (Ueno et al., 2012) recalls that she criticized ecofeminism in the Aoki-Ueno debate because of her opposition to motherhood, or “opposition to the essentialization of women as ‘mothers’” (p. 29). Ueno, who even edited the book *Kôchiku-shugi towa Nanika* [What is Constructionism?] (2001), avoids essentialism seemingly based on her Marxist feminist origins—socialist-materialist (eco)feminists take a constructionist approach (Mellor,

1997, p. 46)—as well as from the present academic perspective, by borrowing a label from Stacy Alaimo (2016), based on Ueno’s “feminist flights from nature” (p. 533). Indeed, essentialism is roughly equivalent to naturalism.

With regard to naturalism, the word *nature* is tricky because it contains multiple meanings. According to the translated word scholar Yanabu Akira (1977/1982), “nature” in Japanese has two meanings: One is the meaning of “jinen” (naturalness), a Buddhist term with a long history before the modern era, and the other is “shizen” (nature or the natural environment), a translation of nature that emerged in the modern era. Currently, these two meanings are used interchangeably, “making it difficult for the word user to clearly differentiate [them]” (p. 128). Toho Sayuri (2018, p. 34) points out that in the Aoki-Ueno debate, the double meaning of “nature” created confusion, with Aoki defending nature in reference to the natural environment while Ueno attacking nature by equating naturalness with essentialism. In addition, Aoki used the word “ecology” in the senses of both “outer nature” (the natural environment) and “inner environment” (the [female] body). Plus, according to the feminist historian Yamashita Etsuko (1986, p. 6), Aoki’s “nature” is thought to have referred to the Western conception of “nature.” Such multilayered meanings of nature are also thought to be a factor in the ecofeminist debate that led to miscommunications and misunderstandings.

After essentialism was negated by constructionism, there has been a turn to reconsider essentialism. This essentialism may be called “anti-anti-essentialism” (Clifford, 2000/2003) in the sense that it is essentialism after having gone through constructionism, or anti-essentialism. Bonnie Mann (2006, p. 13) argues that the term *essentialism* has a disciplinary function, and that the remark “It is essentialist!” is a performative speech act, tending to lead to a cessation of thought and closing the door to thoughtful scholarship. It is also pointed out that there is a patriarchal bias latent in constructionism as a concept that was created via patriarchal logical thinking (Tokuyama & Tokuyama, 2013, p. 173). It is implied that “motherhood” and “nature,” which were rejected as essentialist in the Aoki-Ueno debate, need to be reexamined in more minute detail, rather than being dismissed out of hand as such.

### **3-4. Structuralism vs. Post-Structuralism—Losing Sight of the Structuralist Insight**

As we have established, Aoki was a structuralist in the sense that she maintained the dichotomy of male/female principles, with some reservations, while Ueno was a post-structuralist in the sense that she attempted to deconstruct the dichotomy, hence minimizing sex/gender differences. Aoki (1978) mentioned, “The distortion of this



‘civilized society’ that has developed solely through the culture of ‘masculinity,’ that is, the structural basis of society that has produced the devastation of the human mind and environmental destruction . . . is still the basis of my theory of women’s liberation” (p. 88). It is a statement from which we can see the structuralist formula of “masculinity : femininity : : environmental destruction : environmental protection,” which reads that “masculinity is to femininity what environmental destruction is to environmental protection.”

According to Greta Gaard (2011, p. 31), poststructuralist feminism in the U.S. has considered various forms of ecofeminism, including non-essentialist ones, to be essentialist, ignoring its diversity. However, as noted by Charis Thompson (2006), to whom Gaard refers: “poststructuralist feminism somehow lost sight of the structuralist insight of ecofeminism that yoked together world patterns of environmental degradation and women’s oppression” (p. 511). This situation is applicable also to Japan, or the Aoki-Ueno debate, with Aoki as a structuralist ecofeminist and Ueno as a post-structuralist feminist.

### **3-5. Anti-Modernism vs. Modernism—An Invented Opposition?**

As Sakurai (1990) sums up, another major point of contention in the Aoki-Ueno debate was “anti-modernism (Aoki) vs. modernism (Ueno).” Ehara (1985, pp. 52-53) positions both the Hiratsuka-Yosano controversy (See Section 3-2) and the Aoki-Ueno debate as a battle over “anti-modernism vs. modernism.”

Overall, Ueno was regarded as a modernist. However, at the symposium “Onna wa Sekai wo Dou Kaeru ka [How Will Women Change the World?]” held in October 1985, Ueno (1986a) had a “direct confrontation” with Ivan Illich and stated at the end of her speech that although feminism is a late-coming modernist ideology born out of modern thought, its goal is “to remake the framework of society after passing through modern industrial society” (p. 107), clarifying that de-modernism = ultra-modernism is the goal of Ueno’s feminism. Sakurai (1990) also concludes that, “Although Ueno is a modernist, she is oriented toward de-modernism by deviating from it [modernism]. This orientation is different from Aoki’s anti-modernism” (p. 134).

An *anti*-modernist can be either a “backward-looking” *pre*-modernist or a “forward-looking” *de*-modernist, both of whom are against modernism. In reading Aoki’s essays, it seems that her anti-modernism = anti-industrialism refers rather to de-modernism; in fact, Aoki (1984) states that “ecological feminism . . . is a transformation of women’s sense as someone deeply involved in ordinary life and their own femininity that has been symbolized as a negative sign, into positive ones . . . achieving a different kind of

deindustrialized affluence by working less and consuming less” (p. 4). Thus, it is highly possible that Aoki and Ueno, who were caught in the framework of “anti-modernism vs. modernism,” were actually facing the same direction, namely, de-modernization.

The feminist scholar Sakamoto Kazue (1992/2005) looks back at the Aoki-Ueno debate from the anti-modernism vs. modernism angle on a meta-level and wonders if the question that should have been raised through this debate was “not whether feminism is modernist or anti-modernist, but rather whether feminism must discuss ‘modernity’ and, if so, what kind of ‘modernity’ and why it should be discussed” (p. 251). However, she observes that “by trying to discuss ‘modernity’ right away without discussing the fundamental question of what exactly ‘modernity’ is” (p. 290), the Aoki-Ueno debate created a situation in which many social problems caused by sex/gender differences, which feminism was supposed to address, were skipped over and society as a whole was instead discussed.

Ehara (1985) is even more radical than Sakamoto. She asserts that the opposition of “anti-modernism vs. modernism” is itself an opposition constructed in modern society, or “an invented opposition” if the author parodies it based on the concept of “the invention of tradition” coined by the historians Eric Hobsbawm and Terence Ranger (1983), and that “the task of feminism is to completely deconstruct the discourses of both modernism and anti-modernism in the context of women” (Ehara, 1985, p. 57). For Ehara, “the opposition between modernism and anti-modernism is not simply resolved by tentatively interpreting for women one [modernism] as *strategic* and for the moment and the other [anti-modernism] as *essential*” (p. 57).

The feminist writer Miyasako Chizuru (1985) reframes the Aoki-Ueno debate as “an escape from sexualized modernity (Aoki) vs. deconstruction of sexualized modernity (Ueno).” If there is any difference between Aoki’s escape and Ueno’s deconstruction, it is that Aoki may have aimed at a literal escape from modernity, while Ueno may have been aiming at de-modernization by/after deconstructing modernity.

#### **4. Coda**

This paper has reviewed the Aoki-Ueno debate, an ecofeminist debate that transpired in Japan in the 1980’s, and summarized it into the following five points of contention:

1. Sex/Gender Maximization vs. Sex/Gender Minimization—Difference or Equality?
2. Maternalism vs. Anti-Maternalism—A “Historical Debate” over *Motherhood*
3. Essentialism vs. Constructionism—“Feminist Flights from Nature”? Or Confusion Between *Nature* and *Naturalness*

#### 4. Structuralism vs. Post-Structuralism—Losing Sight of the Structuralist Insight

#### 5. Anti-Modernism vs. Modernism—An Invented Opposition?

It is unfortunate that the Aoki-Ueno debate has muted the potential for the development of ecofeminism in Japan. Indeed, the year of 2024 marks the 50th anniversary of Françoise d'Eaubonne's coining of the term *ecofeminism* in 1974.<sup>(7)</sup> Now is the time to reconsider the Aoki-Ueno debate and the significance of ecofeminism in this age of the Anthropocene<sup>(8)</sup> and the United Nation's SDGs (Sustainable Development Goals), the latter of which include both environmental and gender goals. Through such reconsideration, Japan will have a happy reunion with ecofeminism. The author is convinced that Japan is poised to overcome the lingering legacies from the Aoki-Ueno debate and seek ecofeminist solutions to both environmental and gender issues still existing in society.

#### Acknowledgements

This research is funded and supported by the Kitakyushu Forum on Asian Women (KFAW), without which the author would have been unable to complete this study. With this, the author would like to express their sincere gratitude to the KFAW. Special thanks go to Dr. Hagiwara Natsuko, professor emerita of Rikkyo University, who initiated me into ecofeminism as a doctoral dissertation advisor, which laid the foundation for this research. I also thank Mr. William Paul Baptist for his incisive and astute comments on an earlier draft.

#### Notes

(1) This is a summarized English version of my previous paper in Japanese (Morita, 2024). The names of Japanese scholars and writers in this paper follow the Japanese convention, in which the last names precede the first names, excluding those listed in the References that follow the APA (American Psychological Association) style. Please be noted that all the citations are translated from the original Japanese by the author and that in the case of Japanese books and papers, their English titles are shown in square brackets.

(2) Aoki first presented this proposition in her 1982 paper (Aoki, 1982/1982).

(3) This statement was later revised to “some ‘female principle’ feminists sympathetic to Illich” (Ueno, 1985/1986c, p. 118) when the article was reprinted in Ueno's book (1986b) *Onna wa Sekai wo Sukueru ka* [Can Women Save the World?].

(4) For feminist attacks against Illich in the U.S.A., see 1983's *Feminist Issues* (volume 3, number 1), which includes essays by the sociologist Arlie Hochschild and the linguist Robin Lakoff.

(5) Stacy Alaimo's comment as a commentator on my presentation "A Genealogy of Ecofeminism in Japan" (Morita, 2023).

(6) Judith Butler (1990) articulates that even sex is gendered.

(7) Hagiwara Natsuko (a trailblazing ecofeminist in Japan), Saito Kohei (an internationally renowned eco-Marxist scholar), and the author formed a panel open to the public at Rikkyo University in Tokyo on June 6, 2024, to celebrate the 50th anniversary of ecofeminism and reevaluate its possibilities and future:

<https://www.rikkyo.ac.jp/research/institute/gender/news/2024/mknpps000002h5vz.html>

(8) In recent years, a school of feminism called *Anthropocene feminism* has emerged. Richard Grusin (2017), who edited the eponymous book *Anthropocene Feminism*, writes in his introduction that Anthropocene feminism is to express "a survivalist ethos in regard to the masculinist and patriarchal urge to proclaim mankind an agent of major change" and claim "responsibility for all human and nonhuman actants toward a goal of mutual thriving" (pp. xi). A school of ecofeminism called *Anthropocene ecofeminism* (Gaard, 2017) has also been born.

### References

- Adachi, M. (1986). Ekorojikaru-feminizumu no chihei wo saguru [Exploring the horizon of ecological feminism]. In Shakaishugi-iron-foramu (Ed.), *Chôsen-suru feminizumu* [Feminism that challenges] (pp. 113–125). Shinhyoron.
- Alaimo, S. (2016). Nature. In L. Dish & M. Hawkesworth (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of feminist theory* (pp. 530–550). Oxford University Press.
- Aoki, Y. (1978). Sengo-sekaishi no danmen (15): Bôbowâru to *Daini no Sei* [Cross-section of postwar world history (15): Beauvoir and *The Second Sex*]. *Asahi Jânaru* [Asahi Journal], 20(16), 84–89.
- Aoki, Y. (1982). Sei to bunmei: Gendai-shakai no gizen to mujun [Sexuality and civilization: Hypocrisy and contradictions in modern society]. *Josei: Sono sei no shinwa* [Women: Their sexual mythologies] (pp. 103–122). Orijin Shuppan Center. (Original work published 1982)
- Aoki, Y. (1983). Joseisei toshintai no ekorojî [Femininity and the ecology of the body]. In Y. Aoki & Y. Fujiwara (Eds.), *Feminizumu no uchû* [The feminist universe] (pp. 241–295). Shinhyoron.
- Aoki, Y. (1984). Feminizumu no mirai [The future of feminism]. In Iwanami-shoten-henshu-bu (Ed.), *WOMEN351: Onna-tachi wa 21-seiki wo* [WOMEN351: Women shaping the 21st century] (pp. 3–4), Iwanami Shoten.
- Aoki, Y. (1985). Feminizumu no mirai [The future of feminism]. In Nihon-joseigaku-kenkyukai-1985-nen-5-gatsu-shimpojiiumu-kikaku-shudan (Ed.), *Feminizumu wa dokoe yuku: Josei-genri to ekorojî* [Where is feminism heading?: The female principle and ecology] (pp. 7–44).

Women's Books Store Shokado.

- Aoki, Y. (1986). *Feminizumu to ekorojî* [Feminism and ecology]. Shinhyoron.
- Aoki, Y. (1987). *Seisa no bunka: Hikaku-ron no kokoromi* [The culture of sex/gender differences: An attempt at a comparative theory]. Kanekoshobo. (Originally work published 1982)
- Aoki, Y. (1990). Bosei-shugi no genzai: Agunesu-ronsô kara seishoku-kakumei made [Maternalism today: From the Agnes controversy to the reproductive revolution]. In Y. Kanai & M. Kano (Eds.), *Onna-tachi no shisen: Ikiru-ba no feminizumu* [Women's gaze: Feminism in living spaces] (pp. 22–29). Shakai Hyoron Sha.
- Aoki, Y. (1994a). Feminizumu no mirai: Ueno Chizuko shi ni kotaeru [The future of feminism: An answer to Ueno Chizuko]. *Feminizumu to ekorojî* [Feminism and ecology] (Expanded ed., pp. 207–236). Shinhyoron. (Original work published 1985)
- Aoki, Y. (1994b). Feminizumu to bunmeikan [Feminism and the view of civilization]. *Feminizumu to ekorojî* [Feminism and ecology] (Expanded ed., pp. 46–67). Shinhyoron. (Original work published 1985)
- Aoki, Y. (1994c). Josei-genri to ekorojî [The female principle and ecology]. *Feminizumu to ekorojî* [Feminism and ecology] (Expanded ed., pp. 189–206). Shinhyoron. (Original work published 1985)
- Aoki, Y. (2003a). Ekorojikaru-feminizumu towa nanika [What is ecological feminism?]. *Kan*, 12 (Winter), 326–331.
- Aoki, Y. (2003b). Tsuitô: Iban Iriichi—Fushigi-na deai [In memoriam: Ivan Illich—A mysterious encounter]. *Kan*, 12 (Winter), 54.
- Buckley, S. (1997). *Broken silence: Voices of Japanese feminism*. University California Press.
- Butler, J. (1990). *Gender trouble: Feminism and the subversion of identity*. Routledge.
- Clifford, J. (2003). Interviewer: Manuela Ribeiro Sanches, Santa Cruz, Winter 2000. *On the edges of anthropology* (Interviews) (pp. 43–78). Prickly Paradigm Press. (Original work published 2000)
- D'Eaubonne, F. (1983). Ekorojî to feminizumu [Ecology and feminism]. In Y. Aoki & Y. Fujiwara (Eds.), *Feminizumu no uchû* [The feminist universe] (Y. Tsuji, Trans., pp. 182–189). Shinhyoron.
- Ehara, Y. (1985). Josei-kaihô-ron no genzai [The status quo of feminist theories]. *Josei-kaihô toiu shisô* [The thought called feminism] (pp. 2–60). Keisoshobo.
- Fraser, N. (1997). Structuralism or pragmatics? On discourse theory and feminist politics. *Justice interruptus: Critical reflections on the "postsocialist" condition* (pp. 238–267). Routledge. (Original work published 1990)
- Gaard, G. (2011). Ecofeminism revisited: Rejecting essentialism and re-placing species in a material feminist environmentalism. *Feminist Formations*, 23(2) (Summer), 26–53.

- Gaard, G. (2017). *Critical ecofeminism*. Lexington Books.
- Grusin, R. (2017). Introduction: Anthropocene feminism: An experiment in collaborative theorizing. In R. Grusin (Ed.), *Anthropocene feminism* (pp. vii–xix). University of Minnesota Press.
- Hagiwara, H. (1988). Jendâ: Kosumorojî to jiritsu no rôgoku [Gender: Cosmology and the prison of autonomy]. *Kaihô eno meiro: Ivan Iricchi towa nanimono ka* [The maze to liberation: Who is Ivan Illich?] (pp. 70–100). Impact Shuppankai. (Original work published 1985)
- Hagiwara, N. (2001). Jendâ-no-shiten de toraeru kankyô-mondai: Ekofeminizumu no tachiba kara [Seeing environmental issues from the perspective of gender: From the standpoint of ecofeminism]. In K. Hasegawa (Ed.), *Kankyô-undô to seisaku no dainamizumu* [The dynamism of environmental movement and policy] (pp. 35–64). Yuhikaku.
- Hobsbawm, E., & Ranger, T. (Eds.) (1983). *The invention of tradition*. Cambridge University Press.
- Illich, I. (1982). *Gender*. Heyday Books.
- Kawai, H., & Aoki, Y. (1986). “Bosei-shakai” no bosei to fusei [Motherhood and fatherhood in a “maternal society”]. In Y. Aoki (Ed.), *Bosei towa nanika: Atarashii chi to kagaku no shiten kara* [What is motherhood?: From the perspectives of new knowledge and science] (pp. 1–34). Kanekoshobo.
- Kitazawa, M. (n.d.). Aoki Yayoi to wa? [Who is Aoki Yayoi?]. *Chi to Bunmei no Fôramu II* [Forum of Knowledge and Civilization II]. Retrieved August 19, 2024, from <https://chitobunmei.com/aokiyayoi/>
- Mann, B. (2006). *Women’s liberation and the sublime: Feminism, postmodernism, environment*. Oxford University Press.
- McFadden, M. (1983, June 26–30). *Anatomy of difference: Toward a classification of European feminist theory* [Paper presentation]. NWSA ’83 Conference, Columbus, OH, United States.
- Mellor, M. (1997). *Feminism & ecology*. New York University Press.
- Merchant, C. (1985). *Shizen no shi: Kagaku-kakumei to onna & ekorojî* [The death of nature: The scientific revolution and women & ecology] (M. Dan, Trans.). Kousakusha. (Original work published 1980)
- Miyasako, C. (1985). Feminizumu no chihei 3: Toshi-gata-shakai no feminizumu, aruiwa “gôman-ribu” yo sayônara [Feminism’s horizon 3: Feminism in urban societies, or good-bye to arrogant women’s lib]. *Kikan Herumesu* [Quarterly Hermes], 3, 118–127.
- Morita, K. (2022). Nihon no ekofeminizumu no 40-nen: Dai-ippa kara dai-yonpa made [The 40 years of ecofeminism in Japan: From the first wave to the fourth wave]. In N. Hagiwara (Supervisor), Hagiwara-zemi-hakase-no-kai (Author), and K. Morita (Editor & Author), *Jendâ-kenkyû to shakai-dezain no genzai* [Contemporary studies on gender and social design]

- (pp. 53–78). Sankeisha.
- Morita, K. (2023.7.27). *A genealogy of ecofeminism in Japan*. In Y. Yamamoto (Moderator), Ecofeminist Session funded by the Kitakyushu Forum on Asian Women (KFAW), online.
- Morita, K. (2024). 80-nendai-nihon no ekofeminizumu-ronsô wo sôkatsu-suru: <Aoki-Ueno-ronsô> no itsutsu no sôten wo megutte [Summarizing the ecofeminist debate in Japan in the 1980s: Five points of contention emerged in the *Aoki-Ueno debate*]. *Kitakyushu Forum on Asian Women*. Retrieved August 19, 2024, from <https://www.kfaw.or.jp/wp-content/uploads/2024/04/2231f7bcbd6a4fceeal2934023fc58b7.pdf>
- Nishikawa, Y., Ueno, C., & Ogino, M. (2011). *Feminizumu no jidai wo ikite* [Living through the age of feminism]. Iwanami Shoten.
- Ogoshi, A. (1991). Nihon ni okeru feminizumu to ekorojî [Feminism and ecology in Japan]. In K. Kondo & Y. Suzuki (Eds.), *Onna, kaku, ekorojî* [Women, nuclear, ecology] (pp. 87–114). Orijin Shuppan Center.
- Ogoshi, A. (1996). Feminizumu ni okeru “sabetsu,” “kankyô,” “ajia” [“Discrimination,” “environment,” and “Asia” in feminism]. *Tôsô-suru feminizumu e* [Toward a feminism that fights] (pp. 244–266). Miraisha. (Original work published 1994)
- Riley, D. (1988). *‘Am I that name?’: Feminism and the category of ‘women.’* University of Minnesota Press.
- Sakamoto, K. (2005). Feminizumu wa donoyôni “kindai” wo tou-bekika: “Kindai”-shugi-ronsô no yukue [How should feminism question “modernity”? The direction of the “modernist” debate]. *Aidentiti no kenryoku: Sabetsu-wo-kataru-shutai wa seiritsu-suru ka* [The power of identity: Is the subject who speaks about discrimination possible?] (pp. 244–273). Shin-yo-sha. (Original work published 1992)
- Sakurai, Y. (1990). Ekorojkaru-feminizumu-ronsô wa owattaka [Has the ecological feminism debate ended?]. In Y. Ehara (Ed.), *Feminizumu-ronsô: 70-nendai kara 90-nendai e* [Feminist debates: From the 70s to the 90s] (pp. 121–146). Keisoshobo.
- Senda, Y. (2009). *Hyûmanitîzu: Joseigaku/danseigaku* [The humanities: Women’s studies/men’s studies]. Iwanami Shoten.
- Shimizu, K. (1986). Feminizumu ni okeru kindai-hihan: Ekorojkaru-feminizumu no zentaisei e mukete [A critique of modernity in feminism: Toward a totality of ecological feminism]. In Shakaishugi-riron-foramu (Ed.), *Chôsen-suru feminizumu* [Feminism that challenges] (pp. 101–112). Shinhyoron.
- Shinhyoron-henshubu (Ed.) (1986). *Jendâ, moji,shintai* [Gender, text, the body]. Shinhyoron.
- Tamanoi, Y., Aoki, Y., Nagahata, M., Nakamura, H., Yamamoto, T., Kataoka, Y., Ito, R., & Kabayama, K. (1984). <Paneru-disukasshon> Sei to rôdô wo tou [Panel discussion: Questioning sexuality and labor]. In Foramu: Jinrui no Kibou (Ed.), *Shirîzu puragu wo nuku:*

- Minshû-ni-yoru heiwa: Heiwa-teki jenosaido to jendâ* [Unplugging-the-plug series: Peace by the people: Peaceful genocide and gender] (pp. 223–243). Shinhyoron.
- Thompson, C. (2006). Back to nature?: Resurrecting ecofeminism after poststructuralist and third-wave feminisms. *Isis*, 97(3) (September), 505–512.
- Toho, S. (2018). Nihon ni okeru ekorojî eno kea no fuzai: Ekofemi-ronsô ni okeru shizen toiu go no kentô kara [The absence of care for ecology in Japan: Through the examination of the word nature in the ecofeminist debate]. *Henkaku no Asoshie* [Associe for Change], 32, 32–39.
- Tokuyama, K., & Tokuyama, Y. (2013). Ekofeminizumu saikô: Kaihatsu-shihonshugi-kafuchôsei ni taisuru orutanatibu-na-riron toshite [Reevaluating ecofeminism as an alternative social theory: Transcending patriarchal capitalist system]. *Ningen-kagaku* [Human Science], 29, 153–187. Department of Human Sciences, Faculty of Law and Letters, University of the Ryukyus.
- Tooyama, H. (2023). Shin-jiyûshugi to ekorojî eno feminizumu to sono-shûhen no taiô nitsuite: Kôshi no ryou-ryôiki no takai-dankai deno saitôitsu toiu kanten karano kentô [Feminist and its surrounding responses to neoliberalism and ecology: An examination from the perspective of the reunification of both public and private spheres at a higher level]. *Joseigaku-nenpô* [The Annual Report of Women’s Studies] 44, 40–60. Women’s Studies Society of Japan.
- Ueno, C. (1985). Onna wa sekai wo sukueru ka?: Iriichi *Jendâ*-ron tettei-hihan [Can women save the world?: A thorough critique of Illich’s *Gender* theory]. *Gendai-shisô* [Contemporary Thought], 13(1) (January), 80–104.
- Ueno, C. (1986a). Kindai-sangyô-shakai wo koeru-mono toshite-no feminizumu [Feminism as something that overcomes the modern industrial society]. In The Asahi Shimbun (Ed.), *Kokusai-shimpojiumu: Onna wa sekai wo dou kaeru ka* [International symposium: How will women change the world?] (pp. 98–107). The Asahi Shimbun.
- Ueno, C. (1986b). *Onna wa sekai wo sukueru ka* [Can women save the world?]. Keisoshobo.
- Ueno, C. (1986c). *Onna wa sekai wo sukueru ka: Iriichi Jendâ*-ron tettei-hihan [Can women save the world?: A thorough critique of Illich’s *Gender* theory]. *Onna wa sekai wo sukueru ka* [Can women save the world?] (pp. 117–161). Keisoshobo. (Original work published 1985)
- Ueno, C. (Ed.) (2001). *Kôchiku-shugi towa nanika* [What is constructionism?]. Keisoshobo.
- Ueno, C. (2013). <Onna> no shisô: *Watashi-tachi wa, anata wo wasurenai* [<Women>’s thoughts: We will not forget you]. Shueisha International.
- Ueno, C., Senda, Y. (interviewer), Shirakawa, M. (interviewer), & Tamba, H. (interviewer) (2012). Kantô-intabyû: “Fuan-na jidai” wo dou ikiruka [Opening interview: How to live in the “anxious times”]. *Kikan: Pîpuruzu puran* [The People’s Plan Quarterly], 59, 27–48.
- Yamashita, E. (1986). Rensai 1: Feminizumu wo koete [Serial 1: Beyond feminism]. *Feminite*



[Féminité], 4, 3–9.

Yanabu, A. (1982). *Honyaku-go-seiritsu-jijô* [How translated words have been established].

Iwanami Shoten. (Original work published 1977)