

**Research Article****Reading Nature as a Woman based on Logical Analogy****Dr. Biju Koonathan P**

Assistant Professor, Postgraduate and Research Department of Philosophy, Govt. Maharaja's College, Ernakulam, Mahatma Gandhi University, Kottayam, Kerala

Corresponding Author: **Dr. Biju Koonathan P****Abstract**

In reading Nature as a Woman, this study focuses on the use of logical analogy. Traditional Aristotelian logic considered analogy as a non-scientific method. Strictly speaking, it is fallacious in nature. However, analogy may aid to knowledge seeking process. Even though analogy cannot conclusively show causation, it is the most productive source of hypotheses. Scientific induction based on cause effect or causality is patriarchal in nature. It is founded on laws of excluded middle. Either by avoiding middle path or alternatives, the truth functional logic based on laws of thought arrogantly goes for extremes by using dichotomous thinking. Instead of knowledge based on abstract formal scientific logic, this paper relay on showing non formal analogical method for experiencing Nature in a better way. This study demonstrates how eco-feminists can successfully demonstrate the reciprocal nature of women and nature by analysing logical analogies within the context of an eco-feminist worldview. Analogies, if freed from their formal inductive structure, could play essential roles in expert problem-solving, interdisciplinary and transdisciplinary research and creativity in a variety of contexts. Unlike justice based on reason, Ethics of Care based on phenomenological perspective helps in experiencing the integrity, stability and beauty of nature in a more excellent manner.

**Keywords:** Analogy, Aristotelian Logic, Scientific Induction, Dichotomous thinking, Ecofeminism, Feminist Ethics, Ethics of Care.

**1. Introduction**

Thinking from the first principles that Descartes rationalism based on method of doubt brings dichotomous thought at the centre of modern western philosophy. Though he claims objectivity and impartiality in thought, his dualistic gendered thought places mind in superior place in relation to body. Thinking by analogy may help us to go beyond the oppressive hierarchal nature of abstract formal logic. Eco-feministic model based on care, a women experience, helps to reread analogy that will helps to uncover the limitations of formal reasoning and male bias over interpretations.

**2. A Critical Look at Dichotomous Thinking:**

"False dichotomies are often at the heart of discord".

Deborah Tannen

The discussion below focuses on the definition of dichotomy and attempts to analyse its divisions and flaws in general.

Dichotomy means "cut into two." Division by dichotomy refers to the process of dividing a genus into two species, one of which is positive, and the other is directly contradictory (Felice,

1977, p.61). For example, divide Indians into Hindus and non-Hindus. Dichotomic Division is based on the laws of excluded middle. This law states that 'A' is either 'B' or 'Non-B'. There are two alternatives, either of which must be predicated of the subject. It must also be noted that the two alternatives are contradictories. They must be mutually exclusive and completely exhaustive. For example, divide 'man' into 'good' and 'non-good'

Dichotomic division is formally accurate since in it all the rules of division are observed. However, in practice, this is not correct. Formally, it is possible to divide on this rule. But unless such a principle is guided by practical knowledge, the result will be absurd. To split by dichotomy, we must first understand the material facts. Dichotomic division is useful when we do not know all the sub-classes of a genus.

Rules of Division Observed (Splitting of a Genus into Species): A logical division is always of a class and not an individual. Every division must be based on one principle or a ground of division or Fundamentum Division (Felice, 1977, p.58). The principle of nationalism men can be divided into Africans, Europeans, Americans etc- If the principle is based on more than one principle, we commit the fallacy of 'Cross Division'. It is called because the sub-classes clash and cross with one another. For instance, Man into Christians, Tallman, African, White men, Englishmen. Here there are many fundamentum division is like religion, height, nationality, color and language.

Constituent species (sub-classes) must not overlap but must be exclusive of each other. For instance, man can be divided into Whiteman, Americans and Negroes. Violation of this rule give rise to the fallacy of Overlapping Division. Division must be exhaustive. Division must be complete, and no sub-classes should be excluded nor should anything new be included. For instance, if man is divided into Rich and Poor, the middle class is excluded from there.

Cross division should be distinguished from co-division and sub-division. Co-division is the process of splitting the same genus using different principles in separate acts of division. Subdivision is the process of separating a Genus into multiple stages, each with the same or distinct Fundamentum Divisionis.

Advantages of Dichotomy: Division by Dichotomy satisfies all the rules of Logical Division. That is, it splits a genus into two species, based on a single fundamentum division is. It is exhaustive and exclusive. Hence, it is formally a perfect Logical Division (Felice, 1977, p. 63). Dichotomic Division is useful when we do not know all the sub-classes of a genus. It is highly useful for many practical purposes like election census, taxation etc-

Defects of Dichotomic Division: In the first place it is not a satisfactory method to get a complete knowledge of any genus. The purpose of Logical Division is to give us a comprehensive knowledge of all the species. But dichotomy is not useful for achieving this purpose because it is not representative of all the species. Since Dichotomic Division is only formal, we are not sure whether the sub-classes exist or not. Without this knowledge, the division may be absurd. At each step, the negative sub-class is left indefinite. Dichotomy is misleading regarding mutual relation of the species. One sub-class is given the prominent place and all the other co-ordinate species are represented as inferior ones. So, the co-ordinate species look like sub-ordinate classes (Felice, 1977, p. 63)

This process is unnatural and is absurd. To divide a genus into two subclasses only, when it naturally falls into more than two. Subclasses are absurd. It is unnatural to divide 'man' into Americans and 'non-Americans', when it naturally falls into five subclasses. Lastly this is a long and tedious process of dividing a genus into all its species. Instead of enumerating all the sub-classes in one act of division, in Dichotomic Division, we have to go through a long series of steps before we complete the division.

The Relation between Division and Definition: Definition states the connotation of a term and division deals with its denotation and thus a complete meaning of a term is made clear by

these two processes. They are, therefore, fundamentally related since they have the same aim of making the meaning of things clear. Both are mutually complementary to each other. Definition is not possible unless we know the genus to which the term belongs. Division in its turn, depends on definition for the knowledge of differentia or the essential nature of a thing by which it is distinguished from other similar objects. On the basis of their differentia, the genus is divided into its species. Thus, division and definition are interdependent on each other.

A false dichotomy fallacy assumes that there are only two alternatives in a given scenario. A false dichotomy is a type of fallacy in which just two options are presented when there are actually more options accessible. On the other hand, a middle-ground fallacy is the false assumption that the middle point between two conflicting options is truer or better. The misconception that the truth is always somewhere in the midst of two opposing viewpoints. (argumentum ad temperantiam) Also known as a fake compromise. In actuality, there are a lot more facts, opinions, and choices in the middle, which might be visualized as a range of gray tones between black and white. People who are unaware of false dichotomies are distracted from the truth that there are numerous choices, even though reasoning in binary terms may feel more convenient and comforting.

The main flaw of dichotomous thought is that it is unnatural and deceptive about the mutual relationship of species. One sub-class is given prominence, while all other coordinate species are depicted as inferior. As a result, the coordinate species appear to be subordinate classes, which raises feminist concerns about their purpose.

### **3. A Feminist Approach to Analogy: Moving Beyond Dichotomous Reasoning**

*“Men think logically whereas women experience analogically”*

Feminism is grounded on the belief that women are oppressed and disadvantaged in comparison with men. This comparison of woman with man is due to the dichotomous thinking, which is a fundamental category of human thought. Tennyson, for example, wrote, 'woman is the lesser man'. Freud regarded women as castrated men who are 'sexually inferior'. Aristotle believed that all dichotomous concepts followed this structure: one was positive, the other was merely negative (Nancy, 1991, p. 97). The excluded middle separates one from the other, but not both. There is no third possibility.

In dichotomous distinction phrased A/Not-A is entirely different from phrasing A/B. A/B phrasing are mere contraries, not logical contradictories. Continuity between terms is a logical impossibility for distinctions phrased as contradictories as A/Not-A. In A/B distinctions both terms have positive reality. Why is it that women have a set status as the absolute other, while men have the position of absolute subject? Why is there is no reciprocity in the relation between the sexes? In A/Not-A dichotomies only one term has positive reality; Not-A is only the privation or absence of A. in this case the term occupying the position A has a primacy and a privilege in relation to defining its companion. A/B distinction considering C a third possibility, but in A/Not-A dichotomy the third term is impossible (Nancy, 1991, Pp. 92-93).

Descartes' philosophy assigns a positive value (A) to the mind and a negative value (Not-A) to the body. In Descartes's ontology, Not-A, the field of bodies, encompasses not just human bodies but also celestial bodies, animal bodies, plants, and rocks. In short, Not-A has no internal bounds. i.e. "the infinitum of the negative." Not-A is inherently impure. Not-A represents formlessness. Not-A is completely undefined and undefinable. From ancient Greece to the present, women have been defined not so much by their excellent characteristics as by the male qualities they lack. What needs to be explained is man's assumption of the role of the absolute subject and woman's established position as the absolute other. Why does the relationship between the sexes lack reciprocity?

This analysis helps to expose the dangerous of dichotomous thinking, and how it castrated or oppressed women from patriarchy or from philosophical thinking. Reading philosophy as a woman is the call of the day. The woman reading the text recognizes right once that she is the object of the discourse; she is portrayed as the 'other', alienated from the text. A woman reading philosophy must decide where to place herself (Tuana, 1992). This study focuses on rereading analogies as a female model for multidisciplinary research and issue resolution.

Analogy is a method of Inductive Reasoning in which a more complete resemblance between things is inferred from their partial resemblance in certain points. As Creighton puts it: "Analogy is a form of reasoning in which from the resemblances of two or more things in certain respects, their likeness in other respects is inferred". Mill expresses the analogical 'reasoning in the following formula. "Two things resemble each other, in one or more respects certain proposition is true of the one: therefore, is true of the other" (Felice, 1977, p.236). For example, the planets Mars and Earth share similar characteristics. Both have day and night, land, water, and atmospheres; both orbit the sun; both revolve on their own axis; and both obey the rule of gravity. Humans and other creatures now populate the earth. So, Mars, too, must be inhabited.

In analogy, the ground or principle of inference is similarity. Analogical arguments share the same general structure or pattern. Every analogical argument proceeds from the similarity of two or more things in one or more respects to the similarity of these things in some further respects (Irving, 2014, p.490). Basanquet suggests that "we must weigh the points of resemblances rather than count them". Welton clarifies that "the force of an argument from analogy depends on the character of identity and not on the amount of similarity" (Felice, 1977 pp. 237-238). Superficial similarities are sued to yield misleading conclusions. There should be no essential or fundamental difference between the things compared. While the resemblances must be essential, the difference may be only superficial. Analogy must be based on fairly extensive, i.e., it must be founded on rather broad knowledge of the things being compared.

We may now define a sound analogy as an argument in which the conclusion is based on the presence of essential resemblances, the absence of vital differences and fairly wide knowledge of the things compared. An unsound or false analogy is one in which the resemblances are a very small and external, the differences are very great and vital, our knowledge is very meagre.

The value or uses of analogy: Analogy is a fertile source of hypothesis. Similarities between phenomena suggest probable laws of connection. By suggesting possible explanations or hypothesis analogy has led to a great number of scientific discoveries. Many of the important scientific laws were first suggested by analogy. Where direct proof is not possible argument from analogy is of great value. Analogy makes difficult and abstract ideas clear, concrete, vivid and picturesque. Analogy is also useful in the initial stage of inductive reasoning as a guide to eliminate the irrelevant circumstances connected with a phenomenon. Analogy is superior to enumerative induction.

The distinctive feature of an analogical argument is that it leads only to probable conclusions, as it infers from one particular case to another through observed similarities. The universal principle behind the analogical reasoning is not completely analysed or defined. The inference suggested by analogy is not further verified and proved. The limitations or defects of analogy propagated by the logicians really a strength to the feminist reading. They argue that analogy yield only probable conclusions. Analogy is an incomplete process of induction. Analogy goes through only the first two stages of induction: viz observation and hypothesis it lacks verification and proof. Analogy has no proof. It is a method of discovery and not a method of proof (Felice, 1977, p. 243). As Mill says, it belongs to the Logic of Discovery. "It is a mere guide-post pointing to the direction in which more rigorous investigation should be prosecuted".

Nothing fundamentally new has been introduced to Analogy since Aristotle's Prior Analytic. If we examine it properly, we can explain the stagnation and visible crisis of classical syllogistic reasoning by pointing out that analogy is hidden within the syllogistic reasoning. Since a syllogism requires a general judgment as one of its premises, and no such general judgment exists in nature except as a pure tautology, every syllogism is therefore a deduction from the particular to the particular. This is a form of deduction by analogy. Any attempt to clarify the nature of this deduction immediately caused logic to fall into a paroxysm of interpretation (Zilberman, 2006, p.45).

#### **4. Exploring Ecofeminism: A Model for Analogy**

"Women and Nature share a powerful moral connection"  
Chris Cuomo, University of Georgia

According to ecofeminism, women's subordination in a patriarchal society is directly related to environmental injustice. Ecofeminism encompasses all aspects of the relationship, coexistence, and interdependence between women and the environment.

Karren's *The Essentials of Ecofeminism* (2002): By describing the relationship between ecological and gender dominance, ecofeminism seeks to achieve emancipation through its theories, tenets, and movements. The dominance of the environment is linked to the dominance of women. To understand their dominance, it is necessary to have a comprehensive understanding of this relationship. Feminism's ideas and practices should always be viewed from an ecological standpoint. Feminism should be considered when addressing environmental issues.

In addition to recognizing the interaction between individuals, this gender viewpoint allows for the examination of the internal correlation between the dominance of women and the dominance of nature. In both preventing and repairing environmental harm, women are essential. They are thought to be more in tune with nature than males. They are very close because of their nurturing behavior. The "domination-liberation" question has a theoretical response from ecofeminism. It critiques the social gender ecological viewpoint and illustrates how nature and gender dominance are linked, all the while rejecting the patriarchal social and cultural structure.

The ecofeminist discusses the logic of domination. Hierarchies need the existence of at least two groups, one of which has power over the others. This power allows the "superior" organizations to demand compliance from the "inferior" groupings. Hierarchies encourage a social system of control in which the superior group can influence the inferior group to support the superiors' purposes while preventing the inferiors from pursuing their own true goals (Desjarding, 2013, p.243). Ecofeminism encompasses a range of perspectives that recognize a link between social and environmental dominance. Ecofeminism challenges conventional thinking and behaviour in order to push for radical societal change to meet current environmental issues (Desjarding, 2013, p. 221).

According to ecofeminism, capitalism and patriarchy are to blame for both the exploitation of women and the destruction of the environment. This viewpoint contends that altering our value systems is the only way to improve social and environmental situations. In contrast to aggression, might, and dominance, ecofeminism emphasizes ideals like cooperation, nonviolence, caring, and sustainability. Ecofeminism begins with 'an awareness of the beauty of the natural world'. Chris Cuomo Professor of Georgia says, Moral knowledge, ethical sensibility and sense of connection can often precede a rational understanding. In Her book 'Feminism and Ecological Communities' (Cuomo, 1998, p.71). Chris expands on the concept of "dynamic charm," which holds that there are qualities in the living environment that we might value. From a magnificent view to simply focusing on a tree, an animal, or our own bodies, the beauty of the

natural world is all-encompassing. Since an ethic is not about a single choice or set of rules, it must be rooted in this sense of connection to nature. The very forms of life that we nurture and grow are the subject of an ethic. Where would the creativity, the caring, and the enthusiasm be without that connection? All we need to do is cultivate that appreciation.

## **5. Conclusion**

The theoretical underpinnings of ecology and feminism are united in ecofeminism, which is the result of the ecological movement and the women's liberation movement. Since ecofeminism is a result of both environmental and women's movements, it emphasizes ecological issues from a feminine perspective. Additionally, it encourages the development of women's freedom from ecological principles and applies female principles to the ecological movement. The idea of ecofeminism asserts a direct analogical link between oppression of environment and subordination of women in a patriarchal society. This nonformal analogy successfully works as a reciprocal novel method for experiencing Nature in a better way. This paper suggests to reread and reinterpret analogy as a feminist model and approach that will help to uncover the limitations of formal reasoning and male bias over interpretations. It could play essential roles in expert problem-solving, interdisciplinary and transdisciplinary research and creativity in a diverse situation.

## **References:**

1. Christian D. Schunn, 'Analogy' (Chapt.6), Elgar Encyclopaedia of Interdisciplinarity and Trans disciplinarity., Edited by Frederic Darbellay, Edward Elgar Publishing, Inc. USA, 2024 pages 24-27.
2. Copy, Irving M and Cohen Carl, Introduction to Logic, Peason New International Edition, USA, 2014.
3. Cuomo, Chris J., Feminism and Ecological Communities: An Ethics of flourishing, Routledge, London, 1998.
4. Desjarding, Joseph R., Environmental Ethics: An Introduction to Environmental Philosophy, Wadsworth, USA, 2013.
5. Felice Anne, Logic and Theory of Knowledge, Ladies Service Centre Press, Cochin, 1977.
6. Jay, Nancy., 'Gender and Dichotomy', A Reader in Feminist Knowledge, Routledge, London, 1991.
7. Karren J.W. Ecological Feminism Philosophy, Indiana University Press, 1996
8. Naess Arne, 'The Shallow and the Deep, Long-Range Ecology Movement', Inquiry, 16: 95-100
9. Nancy Tuana "Reading Philosophy as a Women" (chapter1) Women and the History of Philosophy: Paul: Paragon Press.
10. Nath Roy, Bhola, Text Book of Deductive Logic, Calcutta, S C Sarkar and Sons, Private Ltd, 1984
11. Zilberman, David B. Analogy in Indian and Western Philosophical Thought, Springer, Netherlands, 2006

**Citation:** Dr. Biju Koonathan P 2025. "Reading Nature as a Woman based on Logical Analogy". International Journal of Academic Research, 12(4): 13-18.

**Copyright:** ©2025 Dr. Biju Koonathan P. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.