

EPISODE 68

A STRONG WOMAN IS AN OXYMORON

Hi there. Welcome to the beginning of the world. My name is Michael Folz. And this is Episode number 68 of my podcast Dial It Back Or Die. And once again I'm going to drill down a little on another of those four basic parameters which I've said that the entire world has to adopt if it wants any sort of chance to escape this cultural mess that we've gotten ourselves into. And I have a little more trepidation than usual on this one since, no matter how much I might have prepared you for it, the plain fact is that most all of us have been so steeped in the opposite untruth for our entire lives that I am afraid that it is going to be just too jarring for many people to understand.

Nonetheless we must proceed. Because, of all the wrong ideas and wrong moves that the Western world has undertaken in the past several centuries, this one is not only the most negative and destructive, but also, as just stated, probably the hardest one to re-educate anyone about.

And we'll be getting to all of that soon enough. But first I'd like to discuss apples and oranges.

Now I would guess that most all of us have used the phrase 'comparing apples to oranges' as a way to express the futility of trying to judge one thing with the standards of another. But in many superficial ways, at least, apples and oranges are strikingly similar. They are both very popular 'mainstream' fruits. They are each prized for their sweetness. They are both round and about the same size. The image one has in one's mind's eye for both is usually of a bright primary color.

At the same time, though, you wouldn't think of judging what makes a great orange from the standards you would use in judging a great apple. For instance, you wouldn't look forward to biting into a crisp orange. Nor do you generally care how easy it is to peel a particular apple. And even the sweetness of the two fruits is of a totally different quality. Apples taste delicious when they have that slight hint of tartness. Oranges, not so much.

Keep in mind, though, that although we do hold the two fruits to completely different standards, most of us do enjoy both fruits, often to an equal extent. And I would guess that none of us holds an orange in low regard because it would make such a terrible apple.

But imagine if, for some reason, ideological or otherwise, that we did expect oranges to compete against apples, using only the standards of what made a great tasting apple. No variety of orange would remotely hold up. And if growers went to all of the trouble to try to breed an orange which kind of tasted like an apple, not only would it never be able to really compare to a half decent variety of apple, but everything that had made it distinctively ‘orange’ would no doubt also be destroyed.

And all of this is so obvious that it almost seems silly to go the trouble to explain it. I mean, that’s why when you use the expression ‘comparing apples to oranges’ it is always immediately understood.

Now one of the first things I pointed out when I started this podcast was how so many of the leading minds of that period known as The Enlightenment, including but not limited to Thomas Hobbes, John Locke, David Hume, Adam Smith, and, of course, Jeremy Bentham, were all not only lifelong bachelors, but also men who largely if not totally had no relations of any kind with any women, be they mothers, sisters, or even good friends, their entire lives. Which means that when they were thinking through their moral philosophies and all, they were doing it entirely from the male perspective.

But it wasn’t just that their first hand experience of the distaff half of life was missing. It was also that the collective wisdom of mankind up until this point, which was based not only upon the testimony of those countless millions of individual men who did share their intimate live with women, but also upon the experience of every society and culture which had ever existed, was that, simply put, men and women were qualitatively different creatures. Men craved adventure and excitement, status and power. Women were much more interested in stability and security. And to a large degree this was because they were almost always consumed with concern for the physical, mental, and emotional well being of their offspring and wider family. And if they did have leisure time they were usually content to fill it with social gatherings and events. Masked balls and parties, if they were wealthy enough.

What’s more, they seemed quite content to be left alone to their lives of domesticity and social intercourse with other women. Most important, they appeared more than grateful that they didn’t have to deal with all of the life and death matters that questions of war and justice entailed, not to mention the stress of commerce, or the endless arguments and jockeying for position which took place in the world of politics. Indeed, it was widely understood that to ask women to take part in the grubby affairs

of the world, it would make it that much harder for them to be the soft, loving mothers which they were absolutely required to be.

In fact, as I mentioned in a previous episode, even at the turn of the 20th Century, surveys showed that a majority of American women did not even want the vote.

Now before I go any further, it's probably a good idea to once again state the obvious: Clearly, humans being humans, in practice traits will overlap to a certain extent between the sexes. Not only that, but the fact that we've all known really tall women and really short men doesn't lead any of us to argue against the reality that in general men are somewhat larger than women.

Further, we should remember that, throughout history and across cultures, the civilized goal, especially among world religions, has almost always been for men and women to combine their different qualities in a loving partnership of equals. And we can certainly argue as to how much this has ever been achieved in practice, both by individuals and by cultures. But we shouldn't argue about the reality of that ideal.

Nor was the 18th Century entirely without positive change. After all, what with the first stirrings of a substantial middle class, there were increasing calls for greater partnership, for women to become more educated, and for them to be encouraged both to think and to be creative. There were also increasing efforts to show charity towards unwed mothers, widows, and other unfortunate women who were on their own. And by the end of the 18th Century most of the influential intellectual salons of Paris were manned by women. The most famous portrait painter in Pre-Revolutionary France was a woman. And twenty years before Jane Austen fully half of the published novelists in England were women.

And it's even more important to keep in mind that, even though up until the end of the 19th Century feminism of any kind was an extremely fringe movement, virtually all of the early feminists, from Mary Wollstonecraft up through Susan B. Anthony and the like, never thought for a moment that women were not qualitatively different from men. Rather their point was that women should be 'equal' because that qualitatively different female viewpoint should be considered to be just as important and relevant as that of the male.

On the other hand, there were two other strands which were slowly working their way up through the zeitgeist.

The first was that sexual revolution of the 18th Century which I talked about back in Episode 23. As you'll remember, and contrary to the pop 'history' which you might have picked up through novels and movies, up until then, and to a remarkable extent, sex had been successfully channeled solely into the realm of matrimonial relations. But as the 18th Century progressed a certain subset of upper class men bought into the self justifying and self serving idea that promiscuity was the natural state of humanity. Of course, upper class women certainly weren't invited into this new world view. But courtesans and harlots and other perceived low lifes soon became the pre-modern world's first celebrities. Public discourse and the popular press coursed. There was a plague of illegitimate births. And when 'liberty' led to 'licentiousness', and then that led to the horrors of the French Revolution, most of the Western world shrank back in horror. So that 19th Century culture was comparatively moralistic and moral.

But the cat of promiscuity was out of the bag. And from then on it would always be in the self interest of men to convince women that being a godly wife and a good mother was so much culturally induced brainwashing. And that to be a truly liberated woman she needed to become just as promiscuous as a man.

So that strand would continue. But even more important was the one created by our good friend Jeremy Bentham.

Because remember that, although obviously such a diagnosis did not exist back then, all of the evidence suggests that at the least Bentham was pretty far out there 'on the spectrum'. After all, as for Hobbes, Locke, Hume, and Adam Smith, it was somewhat common at the time for men in their positions as scholars and teachers to be lifelong bachelors. But Bentham's obsessively legalistic and quantitative mind, his almost complete inability to engage socially, and his fixation on absolute control over others, shown by both his Panopticon prison idea and his cultlike upbringing of John Stuart Mill, are all consistent with not only autism, but also sociopathology. And I will let you pause for a second to once again reflect upon how disturbingly not sane is the foundation upon which the worldview which you grew up surrounded by was built.

Okay, back to the subject at hand. Because it should also be clear, once again, that Bentham, growing up basically motherless, and as someone who not only hated the idea of any natural moral law but who also believed that human personalities were basically irrelevant, wouldn't have a clue as to how anyone in his ideal society, females included, would or could be anything different than he himself.

So that his Utilitarianism was totally about self centered individuals maximizing their pleasures. And the theory didn't for a minute recognize any inherent difference in the sexes or genders. And if there seemed to be differences in the way that men and women behaved in the world around him? Why, that must be totally due to custom and tradition.

And although when he came of age John Stuart Mill greatly regretted the stilted and anti-social upbringing which he endured at the hands of Jeremy Bentham, he was nonetheless a true disciple until the day he died. So that, although he valiantly tried to gussy up Utilitarianism for polite society, the Liberal Democracy which he theorized still in the end assumed that 'gender' was a social construct, and that, outside perhaps of having babies, there was no other inherent qualitative difference between a woman and a man.

And now I'd like you to pause for another second. And consider once again how, up until this point in human history, whether consciously stated as such or as just taken for granted, there had always been an understanding that there was some sort of 'feminine principle' in the cosmos and/or at least in human affairs. But that Utilitarianism and the Liberal Democracy which it spawned effectively denied the existence of any feminine principle. And that the unisex principle which was supposed to replace it was actually just a copy of what previous cultures and societies had thought of as the 'masculine principle'. In other words, the 'feminism' of Liberal Democracy is in effect a total denial of the 'feminine' as previously understood by virtually all of humanity.

Got it?

Anyway, so that was a really brief review of the history behind this topic.

Now a primary message of this podcast has been that this postmodern world which surrounds us all didn't just kind of happen due to history or technology or science or anything like that. And I've gone on and on time and again how in reality we are living in a nightmare world which was concocted by that strange little man from some 240 years ago.

And if you've been following along all this time I would of course like to thank you once again for so doing. But I strongly suspect that, still, deep down you don't really, really believe me. After all, a reality such as that would be way too dark, too weird, too unbelievable, too much like really bad science fiction. Besides, as I noted right at the beginning, there are lots of other smart people in this

world. So how come, if what I am saying is so simple and obvious, none of them has ever hit upon this realization?

But I would ask yet again that you look around you. Last episode I noted how, even though it is plain common sense that someone who indulges in violent entertainment—whether movies or video games—is going to tend to think more violent thoughts, and probably engage in more violent behavior, and even though experimental science has convincingly shown that this is indeed the case, and even though the American Psychological Association—the industry’s major group—agrees that this is the case, still the common message from those who lead our culture is that there is no science which supports this idea. So still ever more violent games and movies are produced for the masses. And still anyone who raises an objection is ridiculed as some uptight and confused Church Lady.

Now how could this be? Especially in a culture which is constantly praising itself for having such a strong belief in science? Can you seriously argue that this is due to anything other than true believers willfully disbelieving anything—including science—that contradicts their ideology?

So let’s again return now to sex and gender. Because as Episode 46 went to great lengths to explain, already over thirty years ago the entire brain science community had agreed that there were significant qualitative differences between the brains of human males and human females. And it wasn’t just observational experiments which showed that from the moment of birth baby girls and baby boys acted differently. It was also fMRI scans, which showed that men and women used completely different areas of their brains in order to solve the same kind of problem. And it was also an understanding how the sex hormones—estrogen, and to a much greater extent testosterone—literally rewired male and female brains while in the womb. I mean, the evidence isn’t even close.

And yet this culture continues to be consumed with trying to prove that gender is some sort of social construct. Really?? That’s just totally insane. In terms of science, you might as well be believing in a flat Earth. And it is hard to come up with any explanation other than, once again, true believers are refusing to accept anything which contradicts their ideological ‘religion’.

Anyway, this is so important, and it has screwed up our postmodern world to such an extent, that I feel as if I should now also quickly summarize Episodes 47 to 49. Because the evolutionary argument which explains our human reality has been rarely presented, if at all. And understanding that argument will help you to understand what I meant by choosing the semi-provocative title for this episode which I did.

So let's quickly go through it.

First, walking upright is one of the many simultaneously occurring game changing changes which are coincident with the sudden appearance of humans. And walking upright, especially without a counterbalancing tail, is an extremely tricky and difficult thing to pull off for creatures which have basically been on four legs ever since they first appeared on land hundreds of millions of years ago.

It is so tricky, in fact, that if a woman's hips got too wide, she would fall over.

But another game changing change was that, in a geologic snap of the fingers, our brains, and specifically our cerebral cortexes, became immensely larger than those of other apes. Which meant that a baby gestating to natural full term would never have been able to fit its head through a birth canal unless a woman's hips did get too wide.

This meant that as we humans evolved it turns out that we now are all born around a year prematurely. Which is why we all just lay around, bawling and completely uncoordinated, for at least that first year.

Worse, what is most uncoordinated at birth is our brain. So that for the first year something like 90% of the energy which we expend is used in trying to connect all of those wires in the head.

Even worse, still another game changing change is that we are way, way more conscious than any animal which ever preceded us. Which means that we are lying there squalling because all of that sensory input is coming into our brains. But said brains are nowhere near wired up. Which means that our comparatively huge consciousnesses are totally confused and freaked out by this world which we have suddenly found ourselves in.

Which would in short order drive any being totally around the bend.

Which is where mommy comes in.

Because the only way that these hypersensitive babies can stay sane, the only way that they can make it to be a toddler, let alone an adult, is if their mother is there to constantly, and gently, soothe them. Which means that, as an evolutionary necessity, the only way that today we could exist as a species is if evolution had selected for only those women who had personalities which were gentle, soothing, sweet, forgiving, and warm. Soft and squooshy if you will.

Because the children of women who didn't have those characteristics were unlikely to survive.

So perhaps the biologists are right when they say that, in general, all life is selfish. And when they point out the uncomfortable truth that Nature is indeed red in tooth and claw. *But that doesn't apply to the human female.*

No. And this is perhaps the biggest game changing change about humanity. Because also the only way that we could evolve to be hypersocial is because of those soft, modest ladies. This new, improved human female psyche. And, further, such an innately cooperative and unselfish being is a completely unexpected change in the whole pageant of evolution. And it might well be as dramatic as the sudden appearance of the complex cell. Or of multicellular creatures.

I mean, think about it. It's a really, really, really big deal.

So now let's consider the word 'strong'. Because like many other words it can mean different things depending upon in what context it is used. And it clearly takes a certain strength to be able to handle a range of responsibilities for a whole bunch of other dependent humans, day in and day out. It requires emotional strength, in the midst of all that, to handle the death of a young child, which most women have had to do throughout evolutionary history. It requires mental strength, in the midst of all *that*, to keep on keeping on when one's protection is no longer there, whether because one's mate is not available because of death or other separation, or because one's society has degenerated, and one's natural need for protection is no longer respected.

But usually when we talk about 'strength' we are talking about physical power. Force. Intensity. Potency. And not only is a strong person supposed to have these qualities, but we also tend to think of such people as independent. Assertive. Dominant. In other words, exactly the worst sort of person to act as the emotionally warm, caring, yielding, supportive mother that our freaked out infant absolutely requires if it is not to go insane while lying there with its completely unorganized brain constantly bombarded by all of those chaotic stimuli.

So why in the world would anyone expect a human female, who is the end product of up to millions of years of an evolutionary weeding out of harsh personality traits, and who literally no longer has such traits in her DNA, why would anyone expect or hope for such a being to be *strong*? Even weirder, why would any human female *want* to be strong? Especially when assertiveness, dominance, and independence are almost entirely a function of the male hormone testosterone, of which on average human males have twenty times as much as human females?

And yet. In today's postmodern world virtually every woman is introduced as a 'strong' woman, and then the audience wildly applauds. Every woman aspires to be a 'strong' woman. Young girls are actively and constantly encouraged to grow up to be 'strong'. Now if every man were introduced as a 'soft, motherly' man, if young boys were encouraged to grow up to be soft and motherly, we would think it somewhere between strange and somewhat creepy. Yet somehow we have arrived at a place where it is considered entirely normative that women should be 'strong'.

So normative in fact that you might well have felt disturbed by my just having made this point.

But, again, this isn't my opinion. This is science. This is evolution. This is DNA. And—especially understanding the role of testosterone in all of this—it's just an impossible vision to have 'strong' women.

But Liberal Democracy can't allow for this reality to be recognized. Because for its belief system to be correct, for it to be true that we each are completely independent and self-sufficient consumption units, with a truly equal opportunity to pursue our self interest in accumulating those goods and services in our metaphorical shopping mall of life, then women, by definition, would damn well have to be just as strong as men. Otherwise those metaphorical male shopping carts would always be able to push aside the female ones. And then it wouldn't be 'fair'. And Liberal Democracy's most central belief is that it is 'fair'.

But do you see the other side of this? What's really going on? Because in such a theoretical framework, if there is no weaker sex, then men no longer have any moral obligation to protect, or even show respect to, the weaker sex. So that men, who, remember, came up with this formulation, and then spent a couple of centuries trying to convince women of it, now get off scot free, and can now go and pursue *their* self interest, and to fill up those metaphorical shopping carts to their heart's content.

Meanwhile women, who, as you'll remember from Episodes 46 to 49, what with their utterly dependent babies, in primitive times literally could not physically survive outside of the context of the group. And so they also had to evolve personalities which more or less did as they were told. And now they are told by society to be 'independent' and 'strong'. So they do as they are told, and really, really try.

But they still lack the testosterone. And they still have the same DNA and the same evolved soft personalities.

Think of it this way. What if a bunch of NBA players convinced a bunch of short people that all you needed to succeed in basketball were ball handling skills and accurate shooting? And of course

those abilities are extremely important. But if short players who were great ball handlers and shooters then played against the NBA players it wouldn't even be close.

In like manner, many, if not the majority of, positions in a society or economy, especially a post industrial one, require diligence, intelligence, competence, day to day responsibility, sobriety, avoidance of excessive risk, what could be called processing skills, and, most important, the ability to collaborate. And in all of these attributes science has shown that women in general are the equal of, or are superior to, men.

But those positions and jobs, especially in a Capitalist society, which require assertiveness or competitiveness? Which require excessive self confidence? The will to achieve, to be seen as better than the rest? In other words, which require the successful harnessing of testosterone? Again, not even close. And most women who do try to succeed in such arenas will then have to use compensatory behaviors. And thus they then will all too often do come across as 'shrill' and 'bossy'.

But the craziest part of all this is that... We're a hypersocial species. And women, by being soft, emotionally warm, and collaborative, not competitive, are easily the more evolved half of it. And asking, let alone expecting, them to be 'strong' and 'independent' is really asking them to devolve. To become lesser beings.

Anyway, so how to describe the unisex workaday postmodern world of the present? How about the term 'utterly perverse'? For men as well as for women. Although on the whole it's really the women who suffer.

But let's start with the men. Because you'll remember from the Science section that human males also started out as utterly confused and frightened human babies who absolutely required feminine warmth in order to psychically survive. What's more, their boyhoods are comparatively innocent, and relatively free of the uncontrolled raging of the hormone testosterone. So that even though their adult lives would become consumed with achievement and competition, in many cultures domestic life evolved to offer at least a temporary refuge from such stress. And the high point in this valuing of domesticity in the West was in the 19th Century, when wife and children were placed on figurative pedestals, and the purpose of one's job or career to a large extent was considered secondary to keeping the home fires burning.

Not any more.

And as for women, we can start with that problem that now they are expected to be self confident and assertive, strong and independent. After all, everyone keeps telling them that. And if they don't especially desire to be 'strong', then theirs must be a personal failure. But all girls know at the core of their being from Day One that boys are and/or will be bigger and stronger, and more importantly, tougher and meaner than girls are any day of the week. So that girls can make all of the positive affirmations that they are instructed to make. But they will never even care to contemplate performing any of the casual brutalities that many, if not most, boys can and will do as a matter of course.

Then, even if they've fully bought into the gender equality myth, even if they fully believe that they should be assertive, independent, and strong, they run up against a horrible case of cognitive dissonance. Because guess what? They still have female hormones. They still have personalities which are a result of those countless years of evolutionary selection. The large majority of them still have a strong inner *need* to have babies and be moms. And why shouldn't they? As I pointed out in the Science section, being a human mother is ridiculously all consuming. So that if women hadn't evolved to actually really, really like having babies and children, then right now we wouldn't be here as a species. Period.

Which helps explain why, when a survey was done of female Harvard students, certainly among the most high achieving of young women anywhere, over half of them responded that their ideal future was not to be doctors or lawyers, but to be wives and mothers.

But, again, it gets worse. Much worse. Because remember that for male mammals pair bonding is highly unusual. Parenting for male mammals is rarer still. And the only plausible reason why we humans are even partially that way is because, as with baby birds, raising our young just cannot be done with only one parent.

And also remember how I pointed out that, just as with the instability of walking erect, male humans have hardly fully evolved into automatically pair bonding and parenting. Some, undoubtedly yes. Others, only with the force of social control. And for both types the evolutionary trigger that causes men to commit to taking care of a woman and her child seems to be the perceived weakness and defenselessness of said woman and child. Because just as a woman who sees a weak, defenseless baby will automatically seek to 'mother' it, so, too, will many men who see weak, defenseless women and children seek to protect them.

But the mothering instinct goes back many millions of years. Even crocodile mothers look after their children. As just noted, however, fathering is comparatively a far weaker instinct.

So that if society now tells everyone, including men, that women are not weak and defenseless, and if women are loudly echoing that, then this trigger is no longer there. Men will now perceive that, just like other men, women can take care of themselves. And so many will now feel no responsibility at all to protect or father. And men will regress, will revert back to the position of all of the other great apes, none of which pair bond or parent. And like virtually every other male mammal on the face of this Earth, they will now only see women as sex objects.

And although this isn't the only reason for the almost logarithmic rise in single mothers, it's certainly a large contributing factor. So that, in practice in the postmodern world, for every instance of a successful female attorney or business executive, there are any number of working class single mothers, barely earning above the minimum wage, barely keeping the lights on, with more life and death responsibilities than anyone should be forced to have, and with next to no time to actually be mothers.

So all of this has to end. If we want any chance for humanity to stabilize, let alone advance, then the feminine principle must be restored. Both in theory and in practice.

And next time I will be discussing how this might be achieved. And I'll especially be talking about the critical need for, of all things, love and affection. After all, of all the evolutionary changes which have occurred in this half of a geological heart beat that humanity is going through, this is the revolutionary aspect, both of hypersocial living and of the 'feminine principle', which might well have been the most dramatic and far reaching.

But that is for next time. For this time, though, since I've already thanked you once again earlier in the episode, I would now like to thank you twice again for so far having listened.