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In order to perpetuate itself, every oppression must corrupt or distort those various sources of power within the culture of the oppressed that can provide energy for change. (Audre Lorde 1984, 53)

The purpose of my paper is to discuss the efforts of eco-spiritual feminisms and more specifically, of the Gift Economy network to contribute to ways of transforming the inhumane aspects of current world politics, more specifically, the increasing alienation of elite men and women from care work. The long-term goals of many ecological and spiritually oriented feminist movements are to help bring about a paradigm shift or a new social imaginary. The short-term strategies include attempts to expose and discredit the misleading rhetoric and lies behind the dominant neo-liberal policies and a variety of collective actions to help transform them. Revisiting globalization presupposes understanding the origins of the new world order as the result of historical legacies: the elite ideology of private ownership and colonialism. It also requires making more visible the dualistic, hierarchical master identity (Plumwood 2003) which has led to the current radical downsizing and restructuring of ethics, solidarity, democracy and collective responsibilities.

Under globalization, all kinds of borders and boundaries have become more permeable and fluid. The global and the local overlap in new ways, both negative and positive. In 1994 the richest 20 percent of humanity garnered 83 percent of global income, while the poorest 20 percent of the world’s people struggled to survive on just 1 percent of the global income (World Bank 1994). The situation has got much worse as the world-wide-web is being transformed into the world-wide-wedge and digital divide. The widening gap between rich and poor, men and women, “developed” and overexploited continents calls for global solidarity-based action.¹ According to Genevieve Vaughan, the initiator of an international women’s network, two basic economic paradigms coexist in the world today: the exchange paradigm based on power over, competition, short-sighted and divisive self-interest and the unconditional Gift Economy. The latter seeks to satisfy needs, consolidate or create communal bonds and give value to the other (Vaughan 1997; 2002) and in my view is rooted in strivings towards the Self of interspecies interconnectedness. The former is ego-oriented and based on a rationality of profit-making although neither mode of distribution and living should be seen in black-and-white, reductive terms. In Euro-American research, this relational and connected way of living in the world has been found to be more characteristic of women and girls due to socialization and education. According to Vaughan, the exchange economy, which has reached its peak as neo-liberal archicapitalism, is more visible and more valued than the gift-based and often more holistic worldview. The providers of gift labor, mostly women, have been conditioned themselves to give more value and credit to the male-defined public economy despite its encroachment on the free or forced gifts of care work, and its alienation from the body and emotional/bodily care. Although the communal aspects of the Gift Paradigm might echo aspects of communism and the unconditional love of the world religions, there is a significant gender-based difference: the patriarchal social movements
and philosophies rarely address women's subjugation and devalorization of women's contribution to social life. It also manifests as the outrageous exploitation, trafficking of women and children, sex trade and abuse of immigrant women forced to tend other peoples' offspring far from their own children.

In contrast, our network strives to make visible and valorize women's social, spiritual and communal contributions to collective wellness (Vaughan 2004; 2007). A key contribution to an analysis of dehumanized globalization lies also in the emphasis of this and other feminist social movements: acting on the impact of multilevel asymmetrical power relations which concentrate spiritual, material and political power in the hands of ever fewer groups. We need to confront the multiple gendered, ethnic, geopolitical and related dimensions of power monopolies in all of their manifestations. This applies to men and women across the whole spectrum and continuum of privilege, hegemony and control of resources.

**Feminists for a Gift Economy: an Alliance for Diversity and Solidarity Politics**

Our network is an apt example of a social movement based on spiritual and political gift-based practices as one antidote against the unholy trinity of WTO, IMF, OECD and World Bank--the masterminds behind the current politics of utilitarian monoacculturation. Our loose grouping of women activists with multiple other allegiances has been meeting around the world in different feminist events, women's conferences and at the World Social Forum since 2001.  

We are a non-hierarchical movement that in its very structure and mode of action shares many of the defining features of ancient and modern eco-spiritual cosmologies and modes of living, although this is implicit rather than explicit. Because the network has no dogma or organized leadership, it has also not defined itself as either secular or spiritual. The very opposition reflects a Western dualism and its hierarchies of a split dissociative consciousness and worldview. As a cross-cultural network, we do not embrace the Western dualistic epistemologies as an ideal norm, but seek rather, to reown, valorize and familiarize ourselves with less known imaginaries and ways of ordering the social and psycho-spiritual cosmos. The network has produced a common declaration of shared visions and a shared analysis of what we see as the root problems in the neo-liberal capitalist world order (e.g., Vaughan 2004; 2007; Kailo 2008). It can be summed up as the abusive and parasitical relationship between the exchange economy and the more hidden and undervalued Gift Economy whose gifts the dominant economic model (and "homo economicus") naturalizes and then appropriates. The gifts of nature and care work are made impossible through accumulation and artificially created scarcity. This relationship is a *mise-en-abyme* of power strategies that capitalism as well as patriarchal regimes in their various forms tend to adopt as a way of appropriating the surplus labor of women, and any vulnerable groups as well as nature (seen as a mere resource for the taking). The exchange economy can be looked upon as the projection onto the world of a hypermasculated worldview where the emotional, nurturing and domestic labors of love, ecosocial sustainability and other female-specific values or ways are not even considered "rational" (Weber 1920; Ve 2004). In fact, in Finland as elsewhere the traditionally female-dominated fields of education, health care and services are now being dismissed and labelled as "non-productive"--a reason evoked to justify the attempts to withdraw their public funding, lower their salaries and dismantle employee protections. To foreground the Gift labor as the material-spiritual pillar on which the male-dominant fields of technology, industry and economics are built means making visible the taken-for-granted background of public life. This does not mean that we idealize women, who can likewise identify with the worldview of hierarchical and dualistic power relations, the Master/slave relations, the idea that might is right. However, it does mean recognizing that around the world girls and women do get socialized more than boys and men towards an ethic of care or a responsible rationality, a rationality of care (Ve 2004). Since gender
colours all human activities, it also impacts on women's ways of expressing the spiritual, assumed to be a realm beyond gender and other ethno-cultural determinants.

It is important also to recognize that many cultures, particular Indigenous ones from the European Sami to North American Indians\(^v\) have traditions of gift or give back economies--holistic worldviews where spirituality and politics, history and story, the erotic and the material, humans and animals are not perceived as strict opposites but are seen to be aspects of each other in the web of interconnectedness and interdependency (Kuokkanen 2007). Even good and evil are not seen in black and white terms but as shifting, elusive, contextual and contingent aspects of each human being. Whereas Western cultures assume a universal opposition between the sacred and the profane, for the Sami, for example, in Northern Finland, all beings and sites are sacred, some only particularly so. The profane has no place in their traditional round rather than linear universe where all beings are embodiments of an immanent spiritual universe without beginning or end (Helander & Kailo, 1998). This is considered an aspect of the immanent spirituality of the culture's attitude towards life and living. The Samis have also traditionally circulated rather than horded goods and common resources, to consolidate group balance and to safeguard peace and collective wellness (Kuokkanen 2007).

However, their values are changing under the pressures of the global push towards individualism, privatization rights and the liberal capitalistic view that we are all alone responsible for our successes or losses.

Having co-founded the Finnish Ecopsychology Association (Metsänpeitto, Forest Shelter), I work on several fronts to help bring back the eco-social sustainable ways and values providing alternatives to the privatization of the Commons and the Darwinistic views on the survival of the fittest (or most greedy). The association expands the Finnish professional and individual identity to the greater Finno-Ugric family of relations and a socio-cosmic imaginary, where collective emotional, psycho-spiritual and economic survival weighed more than individual entitlements to private treasures robbed from the vulnerable. Space does not allow me to elaborate on our eco-camps and activisms; however, the values and practices I try to bring out into public debate are reflected in what I am writing here about the Gift Economy network. By focusing on the latter, I am at the same time describing the former. In this way the local and the global overlap and intersect in my eco-activism.

The theoretical views embraced by the Gift Economy network have been outlined by Genevieve Vaughan (1997) in her academic, spiritual and activist writings. In fact, as guiding principles, diversity and difference are as important to us as our joint resistance of the religious and economic fundamentalisms threatening women’s self-determination. Many of the network women share an interest in the ancient ethic and practice of solidarity, a we-economy and a communally oriented worldview and mode of living. There are culture-specific gift practices and values which we are trying to reintroduce and through which we can question globalization with its greedy, individualistic and addictive values (assumed to express the "human" natural impulses and self-interests). For all our cultural, ethnic, religious, sexual, geographic, class, age and other differences, we share the basic values to do with balanced and respectful relations between humans and nature, the value of ecological, cultural, biological, economic sustainability rooted in the rights also of future generations regarding our dwindling planetary resources. Also, the very term "spiritual" needs to be approached through an interrogation of power relations: who in the global village has seized the authority and power to define it, and with a mandate given by whom, in whose interest? A gendered male god or the elite that uses scriptures to justify human (male) control and authority over spiritual matters? What is the relationship between power, politics and spirituality, particularly in its gendered manifestations? Movements to humanize globalization cannot avoid confronting these issues.
The “Other” Spirituality

Vaughan has herself clearly outlined the Gift Economy's spiritual ramifications and processes (Vaughan 1998; 1997; 2002; 2004; 2007). However, although our events and feminars have begun with a spiritual invocation or a cross-cultural sharing of spiritual rituals, nobody has reserved herself the right to define it for the others. I believe that for many of us the spiritual manifests itself above all in practical ways, as well as through the ideals of enhanced wisdom, inner processes of alignment for the deepening of peace and balance. Instead of power over -hierarchies, rules and chosen scriptures, our spirituality manifests itself ideally as the attempt to facilitate everyone's empowerment and multidimensional existential and economic agency. It manifests also in our striving towards mutually respectful cultural relations, the attempt to be open to each other's human sameness and difference, and the sheer joy, uplift and therapy of working for positive change. I suspect we all also embrace the view that all created beings have intrinsic value and inalienable rights. All creatures and nature itself are by definition animate, they are alive, they grow, die. By aligning ourselves with the sanctity of all forms of life, we are more likely to align ourselves with attitudes that see value in giving back, or of passing on the gifts they have received for the benefit of the entire ecosystem, and all of its members. Oil, gas, water, land and animals are also free gifts from the Creator that nobody should have the right to privatize and rob from the majority of the world’s living beings.

The spirit manifests itself in the small, apparently insignificant care work of everyday life although it also exceeds any and all definitions. For many women, throughout the ages, it has manifested itself in the emotional labor attendant upon childcare and the nurturing of the sick and the elderly. Unlike the exchange economy, based on getting back more or the equivalent of what one has given, circulating gifts has as its aim the creation of wellness as its own excuse for being. However, one must not reduce the spiritual to down-to-earth chores, even though it is important to see their spiritual dimension when they are performed in the spirit of the gift. Spirituality expresses itself in many ways escaping the dualisms of everyday/Sunday, holy day/holiday. For men, freer of reproductive responsibilities or the day-to-day implications of parenthood and family, spirituality expresses itself in more individualistic, transcendental rather than immanent forms. This may well be a reflection of men's different socialization, freedoms and autonomies, and their great independence as guardians of the public sphere (although there is no homogenous masculine socialization, cf. Kailo 2008). My way of circumscribing the elusive non-essental "essence" of female spirituality no doubt overflows the mainstream containers for defining the spiritual. A key aspect of the Gift based spirituality is precisely the avoidance of One truth, one definition, one essence. A global village where only one form and expression of spirituality were legitimated would not be different from the repressive totalitarian order of globalization. Isn’t such a fundamentalism precisely what we want to change? Why, however, would women need their own form of spirituality? Why should they not let male ritual and spiritual experts define it for them?

Why women of all cultures need a spirituality of their own

Hallie Iglehart points out that when a dominant culture insists that power lies only outside the individual, in hierarchical organizations, people eventually cease to believe in their own inner power (1982, 294). This is what has happened to many women around the world, conditioned to rely only on external, mostly male experts, ritual guides and authorities. Women around the world, particularly the West, now attend endless therapies to try to marshal the self-confidence that is needed to make it in the increasingly competitive and demanding public and private life: “This inner wisdom, soul, has many names—the merging of the conscious and unconscious mind, the whole brain, holistic thought,
the life energy of the universe, the larger Self, the One Mind. All of these labels are expressions of simultaneous union between one's physical and mental selves and between one's self and the life forces around us. This sense of union with the larger powers of life is tremendously empowering. Hence, the connection between inner wisdom/strength/power and outer power is one that the patriarchy does not want women to make” (Iglehart 1982, 294). Feminists, too, are of course well-advised to avoid new stereotypes and to refrain from labelling all men in a cynical and critical light. However, it is equally necessary for patriarchal leaders to admit the multiple ways in which women have been controlled and colonized; it is undeniable that throughout history, women have not been allowed to experience, express or articulate the Divine except in male-controlled ways and contexts. For the authors of The Politics of Women's Spirituality (1982), what distinguishes cross-cultural feminist views on spirituality and patriarchal ones are the diverging attitudes towards power, rituals, transcendence/immanence, heaven vs. the here-and-now, non-hierarchical modes of relating to the spiritual experience and ways of defining the spirit and the gender of the spiritual expert.

Women do not want to, or cannot avoid spiritualizing the concrete, physical here-and-now as their creativity/“cosmic self” has been anchored to care labor which it simultaneously overflows.

However, why should we impose categories of gender difference on spiritual experiences, which are beyond gender? Also, patriarchal guides often claim that the spiritual ecstasy or feeling of oneness is beyond sex; which is why the gender of God is not supposed to be an issue. Such a view ignores power relations and the impact of representations, of an imaginary order, as tools for reinforcing and transmitting a sex/gender system that thereby is made to seem “natural” and “immutable.” If gender neutrality in the realm of Gods and Goddesses, and of the representations of spirituality were true, patriarchy would not have gone into as much trouble to destroy female goddesses, feminine images of the godhead, women's ancient spiritual practices and symbols (Spretnak 1982; Condren 2003). Also, patriarchal scriptures and practices have included elements legitimating and even condoning violence against women, in the name of male honor and the most untenable and arbitrary gender hierarchies (Kailo 2004). For Eller (1990), the creation of a feminist spirituality is a logical extension of other feminist premises. The interest in reclaiming the female body as a positive image and as an intrinsic and celebrated part of women's existence, moves simultaneously with the desire of uniting spirit, body, and mind into a more holistic, resisting or empowering lifestyle. In this context, healing becomes a metaphor for any form of self-transformation, whether physical, emotional, or mental: it is the name given to the overall effort to gain self-knowledge and marshal personal power (Eller 1990, 110). However, it is important to stress that feminist approaches to power emphasize power within and empowerment for all rather than power over.

The significance of gender for women's spirituality has been analyzed by Iglehart (1982, cf. Ruth 1994) in relation also to meditative practices. She points out that what helps men expand their spiritual selfhood has very different implications from the point of view of women’s psycho-spiritual needs (see also Sjoo 1999). Many meditation practices were developed by men to increase their sensitivity and receptivity, qualities already encouraged (or overdeveloped) in women. Such meditations are in Iglehart’s view usually rigidly proscribed, hierarchically transmitted, mystified, other-worldly, and ascetic. They tend to fragment the mental, physical, and emotional being. She believes that they often focus on withdrawing from the world while also emphasizing quiet and control. Iglehart notes that women, in contrast to men, are too used to being quiet and controlled, and they have been withdrawn from the world outside their homes for too long. They therefore need meditations that help them discover, trust, and express their inner wisdom, love their bodies, and use the full power of their inner strength and emotions to guide and inspire them in their personal/social/political lives (Iglehart 1982, 296). (I do not see this excluding women’s simultaneous needs for receptive sensitivity, as well). Other feminists also feel women do not need to learn how to
overcome or transcend their bodies, but rather, to learn to get better grounded in those parts of
themselves which patriarchy has labelled as “impure” and what the beauty industry has also
subliminally named as chronically deficient and unhygienic (Iglehart 1982, 296). Many women, like
Indigenous peoples, do not see the physical body as the “other” of spirit, but rather, feel it is the sacred
site and embodiment of immanent spirituality. The spirit, in this light, is what allows us to feel
connected in and through our bodysouls. The body is the vessel for periodic self-renewal, a fulfilment
coming from loving and nurturing also oneSelf beyond the consumerist obsession with lack,
deficiencies, perfectionism. A woman with low self-esteem, a Self as a vacuum--is the easiest of
targets for consumerist as well as religious manipulation and projections. It appears that big business
and fundamentalist religions have wanted it that way. Spiritual as well as economic capitalism thrives
on the freefloating needs, soul desires and longings of those who are lost to their own Self, and Self-
determination. Iglehart feels that there is a fine line between “quieting” women and suppressing those
women, who already are vulnerable to external pressures. Some spiritual leaders have managed to
abuse women precisely by first weakening their ego boundaries (Sjoo 1999). Many eco-spiritual
feminists note that the patriarchal interpretations of world religions have compromised the spiritual
core of the moral teachings by using divine law as excuse for massacres, holy wars, racial stigma,
social and spiritual imperialism. As a summary, then, women's eco-spiritual groups seek to formulate
a new imaginary a) as a way of healing from the widespread and multidimensional gendered violence,
having resulted in women's weakened self-image, agency and subjectivity b) in order to help women
redevelop trust in their own bodily processes and insights and to revalorize them beyond the myths of
female spiritual "uncleanliness", "impurity" and “inferiority” c) to extend women's logic of care and
everyday spirituality also more consciously to boys and men, as a means of ensuring that more people
will embrace the rationality of care and cross-cultural responsibility, not the mere rationality of
control, production, efficiency, self-interest, nationalistic chauvinism and profit. Of course, men, too
(by no means a homogenous group!) need to be healed from many officially sanctioned dysfunctions,
armored militaristic masculinity among them. It needs to be recognized that the spiritual needs,
experiences and power of women is not identical across the globe, despite similar effects by
patriarchal systems of control and religion. Even today, there are many cultures where women’s
sexual-spiritual power is still celebrated as part of a maternal symbolic genealogy, gift logic or mode
d of distribution despite the encroachments of patriarchal capitalistic neoliberalism (e.g. Makilam
1999).

The Gifts of women’s social movements: a union of spirituality and politics

The time has come to reclaim the stolen harvest and celebrate the growing and giving of good
food as the highest gift and the most revolutionary act. Vandana Shiva (2000, 127)

There are many ways of accessing the spiritual and no doubt the members of our networks
also include advocates of the main religions, who have found ways to negotiate their spiritual life and
feminist strivings. It is, I believe, precisely one of the contributions of women's social movements to
help both religious and economic systems own up to their gender-specific power-oriented abuses.
Women of color have also sought to “purify” the white women’s movements of their colonizing
leanings, particularly the impulse of some women to appropriate Native people’s traditions as spiritual
fast food in place of seeking continuity of being in their own cultural roots and ecological wisdom
(Gardner 1991). As Shiva underlines in Stolen Harvests. The Hijacking of the Global Food Supply
(2000), she would rather be “a sacred than a mad cow”; for without an ecological dimension and a
revisiting of the boundaries between species, how sustainable can globalization become? Do not
animals providing us with the gifts of our food also have inalienable rights? Is “humanizing”
globalization thus the best expression with its anthropocentric associations?

As my paper has sought to suggest, it is not enough to strengthen and share our spiritual resources; we need to act on what we preach to role-model social transformation. Women's spiritual and social quests are two dimensions of a single struggle and it is important for women and men to become aware of the ways in which spirituality can support and undergird women's quest for social equality (Christ 1982, 328). The lack of attention to the political dimension in spiritual activities can result in an individualistic emphasis without any built-in accountability (Riddle 1982, 378). This creates spiritual markets, not responsible communities. The lack of political analysis can result in a sense of passivity that ignores political reality and is non-critical of the violent nature of our present society. The Gift Economy network does not seek to provide all the answers, or to create a new feminist fundamentalism to replace “competing” ones. We are not out on an eco-spiritual pilgrimage passionately seeking converts—are we? I believe we emphasize spirituality as process and ongoing revolution beyond static dogmas and the creation of new enclaves of power. The spiritual must escape the proper—of propriety, and of property relations—or else it quickly solidifies into yet another tool of missionary politics oppressing the other.

I suspect, as do many participants at the World Social Forum (Mumbai, 2004) that the women's movement has provided the most inclusive ethical analysis of neo-liberalism and its destructive patriarchal fundamentalisms. For me, the validity of a theory and practice is the extent to which it enhances human rights and ecological sustainability, and how strongly it advocates the rights of all to spiritual and other basic forms of self-determination and expression. The feminist self-reflection has ensured a constant process of realignment and assessment of one’s own collusion with abusive politics and ways. For all the internal strife, conflict, contradictions and failings of individual members of the movements, they have much to give and teach those who have not yet faced their issues with power. As the Black Lesbian American Audre Lorde (1984) notes, the erotic is manifest in everything that binds us, as the eros and magic of everyday life. I call it the Gift Imaginary where we can also give expression to utopias of equality and justice, the rawmaterials for change (Kailo 2007, 2008). We need a Gift Imaginary to relearn circulating rather than monopolizing knowledge and wisdom, and the material goods that are the precondition for us to even talk about the spiritual. As Vaughan states: “By restoring gift giving to the many areas of life in which it has been unrecognised or concealed, we can begin to bring the gift paradigm to consciousness. (Vaughan 2002, 2). For me, Vaughan’s life-long work in producing gift-validating theories of justice, walking her talk, funding and creating tangible social change, and creating the Gift Paradigm network is the most significant current example of spiritual and political, transformative feminism (see www.gift-economy.org). Influential across the world, she is already bringing about a radical spiritual paradigm shift towards the kind of ecospiritual global solidarity that we need more urgently than ever before. She has brought together a number of other influential international peace activists—too numerous to list here—creating a new agora for global debates on where the true revolutions start—the earth, the bodyspirit, the politics of everyday life.
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As for my own ecoactivism in Finland, my politics overflow my national boundaries and identity, with close spiritual and political allies residing far from my home base. Nationalistic interests do not typically form the core of women’s social movements as the need for global justice and an eco-social future for all has become a shared key concern. Still, I refer to the new networking as the politics of *af-finn-ity*, emphasizing through this play of words with my motherland the importance of one’s own ethno-cultural roots despite the cosmopolitan outreach. I cherish both my Finnish background, and my world citizenship beyond the patriarchal and nationalistic politics of self-interest.

The Feminists for a Gift Economy group was initiated by the American philanthropist Genevieve Vaughan at the Norwegian Feminist University, Kvinneuniversitet Løten, in July 2001. Women from 17 countries had been invited by Berit Ås, Linda Christiansen-Ruffman and Paola Melchiori and formed a broader groups called WWW-women (World wise women). This group of activists from around the world split into new subgroups some of which still overlap while others have gone into other directions. We have been meeting at the World Social Fori in Brazil, India and Africa. See more details on [www.gift-economy.org](http://www.gift-economy.org).

For a description of pre-Christian nature religions echoing some of our principles and ways of living, see Sjo 1999, 14; Spretnak 1982; Kailo 2008.

However, see the many Gift economy practices in Africa, the Caribbean, the US, Asia, Middle East and India, as reported by members of the Gift network (Vaughan 2004; 2007).

Our association has produced an introduction to ecopsychology, the gift economy and related issues (Irma Heiskanen & Kaarina Kailo, *Ekopsykologia ja perinnetieto. Polku ja eheyteen* (Ecopsychology and Traditional Knowledge—Paths to Wholeness), Greenspot, 2006.

These values have obvious affinities with those one can see reflected in most ecological feminist theories and practices. Among the shared values are recognizing the interconnectedness of all instead of the cult of autonomy, independence and individual entitlements characterizing neo-liberalism (Mies & Shiva 1993; Shiva 1997, 2000; Plaskow & Christ 1989; Spretnak 1982; Eller 1993). Although some of my references are dated, I still find them worth quoting as pioneering, classic texts on women and spirituality particularly in the Western Anglo-American context. On the other hand, I also recommend the writings on the gift and now implicit, now explicit manifestations of the spiritual by members of the Gift Network from Indigenous, Caribbean African and many other contexts (e.g., Armstrong 2007; Trask 2007; Benally 2007; Antrobus 2007). I have focussed on familiarizing myself with the Sami and Canadian First Nations women’s spiritual traditions and now seek to expand my knowledge of the spiritual ways of other “women of color” (Helander & Kailo, 1998, Kailo 2008).

I suspect that for many main religions, the idea of women being spiritual subjects in their own right is also threatening. It is seen as creating chaos, even anarchy, it evokes the loss of control. After all, men tend to be socialized to measure their worth and status in opposition to and in relation to, even inferior femininity.

See Spretnak for an analysis of those aspects of patriarchal religions that are against the spirit of justice, human rights and peaceful relations with one’s neighbors (Spretnak 1982, xvi).

Numerous studies show that the upbringing of girls in the Western context leads to a different moral reasoning and values than that of boys; in Finland, many studies show that girls, for example, are more tolerant of difference, less racist, more collaborative and more concerned about environmental sustainability.

Walter (1985) and Biehl (1990) provide examples of zones of contestation and disagreement within the ecospiritual movement which are by no means unified.