

EPISODE 69

LOVE IS GOOD

Hi there. Welcome to the beginning of the world. My name is Michael Folz. And this is Episode Number 69 of my podcast Dial It Back Or Die. Now right now we're in the middle of me trying to explain a little more fully each of the four parameters which I listed in Episode 65. And keep remembering that I'm not predicting that any of them will happen. I'm just saying that they are what will need to happen if we are to have any chance to get out of this alive. Anyway, last episode was mostly spent going over all of the history and, more importantly, all of the science as to why 'sex' is real, and 'gender' is a total crock.

In other words, most of the last episode was spent explaining how women do really poorly when attempting to be men. Which is a point which would have been laughingly banal at any other time or place in human history. But which is a point that in our present postmodern circumstances might well have come across as controversial. Am I saying, sputter, sputter, that women are inferior to men?

No. Actually, especially considering our present evolutionary circumstances, I am saying exactly and precisely the opposite. But we'll get to that in just a bit.

First, though, let's briefly consider Co-optation one more time. Because I think that even George Orwell would have been shocked at how easily and how thoroughly, outside of his fictional totalitarian system, people could become convinced that War was Peace, Lies were Truth, etc., etc.

And one of the crowning achievements of postmodern Co-optation has been to, for lack of a better word, completely *brainwash* the most educated among us into believing that the word 'feminism' in effect means the utter denial of what had been understood throughout every other time and place in human history to be that qualitative difference that I am referring to (for lack of a better term) as the feminine principle. I mean, think about it. Just over a hundred years ago one of the principle arguments for feminism was that by including the soft, womanly viewpoint we would greatly accelerate the movement towards world peace. Today we think of it as a great advance that women can now be front line soldiers, and kill just as efficiently and as dispassionately as the men.

Again, think about it. Geez.

Even worse, during the past ten or twenty years this brainwashed belief in a primordial unisex has resulted in a complete mash up of gender, identity, and sexual attraction. So much so that those of you who are intimately familiar with how far this has gone with gender fluid Gen Z will no doubt think me absolutely daft for what I am about to lay out. As if the youth of today would or could possibly be interested or able to make such a drastic change.

Well, stranger things have happened. Remember, I went through the Sixties. And there are those sayings to the effect that you can believe whatever you want to believe. But that in the end Reality will always win out. And already it's common knowledge among the youth of today—left, right, and center—that *This Is Not Working Out*. And sooner or later at least some of them might start to figure out the real reason *why* this is not working out. That other old saying about if you find yourself stuck in a hole, then maybe you should stop digging.

And then they can listen to this episode. And find out what to do about it.

So now let's talk about social harmony.

For instance, both Ancient Roman and pre-modern Japanese cultures are considered to have been pretty masculine and militaristic in outlook. But even they understood that, to be a little poetic here, you can't force your way into the kingdom of Heaven. In other words, even they understood that for society to have any redeeming value, then both grace and the other ennobling, receptive feminine traits had to be honored.

Nor were their cultures particularly religious. But, in theory at least, even in these relatively warlike societies, they each recognized the ultimate futility of grasping after fame and fortune and victory. And the wiser among them, either through Stoicism or Zen Buddhism, sought peace of mind by actively cultivating what had always been seen as traditional feminine virtues: Namely, modesty, humility, chastity, and forgiveness.

So that even in the most 'masculine' of world cultures, the feminine was not only acknowledged, but also, in many, if not most, aspects of social behavior, considered to be superior. After all, as I've kept repeating throughout, we are a hypersocial species. And there's no way that 'hypersocial' works in a completely male, individualistic, competitive framework.

Nor, before the modern era, did any literate civilization that I am aware of ever exist which did not formally recognize that social harmony was the only plausible justification for, well, civilization

itself. And as I pointed out in Episode 16, the story we are told about the Middle Ages in general, and of Feudalism in particular, was that it was all so much ignorance and dysfunction. But even Feudalism recognized that no element of society could exist independently of all of the other elements. And, further, that it was the absolute duty of the strong to protect the weak. For the wealthy to make sure that the poor never got too poor.

A thousand years ago, with GDP only a tiny, tiny fraction of today, they still had that much figured out.

As I've been telling you all along, though, under the individualistic Age of Enlightenment thinking social harmony was no longer all that relevant. Nor, under most understandings of Deism, would a belief in honoring a personal God provide any pervasive civilizational purpose.

Which, once again, is where the whole substitution of 'economic man', that self serving individual accumulating goods and services, came in as a source of meaning. And it would be stupid to pretend that we humans do not care about things and pleasures, nor that the study of the proper allocation of resources in the marketplace or otherwise is not an important topic.

But the be all and end all of human existence? You know and I know that this is beyond absurd. Yet, more or less, Capitalism is entirely based upon that assumption. Marxism was entirely based upon that assumption. And if you've been paying any attention for the past 68 episodes, so, too, is Liberal Democracy entirely based upon that assumption.

After all, if social harmony is no longer the most valued quality, if God is no longer the most valued quality, if, as Jeremy Bentham said, 'pushpin is the same as poetry', then what are we but naked economic men? And I'm emphasizing 'men' here, because as I keep pointing out, the Age of Enlightenment ideas were never a result of consultations with women.

On the other hand, if the mass of womankind had been consulted back then, then the purpose of life would have no doubt been instantly obvious to them. Although they probably wouldn't have used some high falutin term such as 'social harmony'. Instead they probably would have said something like: The purpose of life is to be loving and to serve others.

And they wouldn't have said that just because of formal philosophical or religious study. Rather it would have been because, as my little recap last episode of the evolutionary pressures created by our suddenly gigantic big heads tried to remind you, human women have necessarily had to evolve so as to be loving and to serve others. Once again: We wouldn't be here today as a species if they hadn't.

But if the post-Enlightenment meaning of life is synonymous with economic man, with individuals striving to accumulate, then women most definitely are inferior, second class citizens. Not that women never like comfort, even luxury. But as the last episode tried to make clear, a system which is centered on economics and individual self interest, as opposed to one which is based upon social harmony, is always going to be playing to natural masculine strengths. And it will pretty much totally disregard all the natural feminine virtues of collaboration and relative lack of hierarchy.

And if instead of economics we make power relationships the be all and end all of human existence, then pretty much the same thing happens. Again, I'm not denying that status, hierarchy, and power relationships exist in human society. But if we start pretending that those aspects of the human condition are the central elements, the really meaningful parts of existence, then once again women most definitely are going to be inferior, second class citizens.

And I don't care how many government mandates are mandated. Or how many sensitivity sessions you are forced to attend. In the end it's always going to be a basketball game with a bunch of short players, no matter how good they are at ball handling or shooting, trying to compete against a bunch of much taller players. In other words, if economics is really what life is all about, and/or if 'power' really is what life is all about, then there's no way that the 'problem' of female inferiority can ever be fixed. Period. Deal with it.

And if you try to finesse the situation by ensuring that men become emasculated and weak, and so that the sex/gender thing really does become semi-equivalent, then you're also going to be ensuring that when our new Chinese overlords show up, there's going to be no one to stop them.

Of course, all of that was assuming those 'ifs' about it all being about economics or power. And those are mighty big—and absurd—ifs. Because, as I tried to establish all the way back in Episode 3, everything does always depend on what your foundational assumptions are. And as I've been attempting to show throughout all of this, as a matter of fact we are not primarily economic man. We are not primarily power hungry man. Instead we are first and foremost hypersocial humans whose propensity is to cooperate with one another, and who—especially now that we are in a ridiculously specialized and interconnected socio-economy—necessarily *have to* cooperate with one another.

In other words, the Greeks were right. The Romans were right. Confucius was right. The Western World was right up until around the year 1700. Social harmony is the greatest good. And the

only way that we can hope to be happy here in this convoluted pile of seven-billion-and-counting humanity which we have become is through social harmony.

Duh.

Or maybe instead of 'social harmony' we can substitute the more modern sounding term 'Peace and Love'.

But however you want to say it, let's face it: This is our only alternatives to a world in which the best case scenario is lifelong addiction to an endless assortment of dopamine feedback loops. And I don't care how much you might love science fiction. But do you really look forward to that as your best case scenario? So that if we're going to have any sort of viable vision, it's going to have to involve social harmony. And therefore by far the most evolutionary sensible way forward towards Peace and Love is by letting the ladies lead the way.

And if you've been listening all along then you'll know that in saying that I am no way referring to that small subset of women who can at least somewhat successfully ape the male behavioral pattern. And I'm certainly not referring to the much, much larger group of young women in the West who are horribly and self-destructively failing at trying to ape the male behavioral pattern. No, I am referring, even at this late date, to the vast majority of women on the face of the rest of this Earth who would still almost instinctively say that the purpose of life involves being loving and serving others.

You know, one of the more famous put downs of womanhood was given by the 18th Century smart ass Samuel Johnson. Someone asked him what he thought about the then new phenomenon of women preaching. And he replied that it was like a dog walking on two legs. It wasn't that it could do it well. Instead it was a wonder that it could do it at all.

Well, if you know anything about male mammals in general, you'll also know that when it comes to love and affection the wonder is that human males can do it at all.

And with science telling us that women's brains and minds are more naturally cooperative and collaborative, that most definitely means that were postmodern women to learn to stop trying to force themselves into this sick self absorbed mold which we have been telling them that they should be in, which has all of the drawbacks of being male with none of the benefits, if women would learn to once again actively embrace the feminine principle, then quite clearly they would be seen to be in the superior position.

What's more, throughout space and time the vast majority of humans have prized love, joy, patience, kindness, goodness, etc. In other words, all of those cross cultural traditional feminine virtues. And if we can't, right here right now in our postmodern squalor, still hold those values as at a minimum the goal that we should be trying to head towards, then what the hell is the point of going forward with all of this?

So that if we're ever gonna get out of this place, then the real women, those who have been able to do a 180, who have connected once again with the real feminine principle, and who have rejected Liberal Democracy's fake monopolar vision of the human condition, they're the ones who are going to lead us out of it.

Through warmth and affection and through putting others first. Through Peace and Love.

Now at this point some of you might object with the following: I keep making the argument that women have evolved so as to bear five or six children, and to also feed and care for each of the surviving ones up until their teenage years, all the while feeding them the beautiful lie that the world of Nature is not always red in tooth and claw. And then to also feed and care for the husband who is necessary for all of their physical protection. Because in fact Nature always is red in tooth and claw.

And you may say, Fine, I get it. But this is the 21st Century. No one is afraid of lions and bears and scary barbarians any more. So why should we be trying to keep women locked up in that cage?

Well, my answer to that is that I'm not the one locking them up. It's their million year lineage of DNA which has selected for warm, soft, collaborative, non-independent personalities that's doing it. Because obviously a century or two isn't going to change anyone's basic DNA. Or one's basic brain engineering. No matter how much you want to pretend otherwise.

So... An ideology can certainly accentuate women's—and men's—self-absorption. But self-absorption is not synonymous with independence or strength. And never will be.

And here's another problem with women no longer honoring their evolutionarily derived feminine principle. Because now the men—who, remember, in evolutionary terms are those dogs barely tottering on two legs—now men immediately devolve back to a level where it literally no longer registers that paternal duties, a responsibility to protect, and—it almost goes without saying—any need for mutual love and affection, even exist. In other words, they devolve to being like most all of the other primates, where any interest in females now becomes only insofar as they are sex objects.

Sex objects. And I'll be getting to that a little more in the next episode. But for right now just think for a minute on the great majority of present day musical performances and the like here in this postmodern moment. And, gee whiz, I'd hate to be regarded as a fuddy duddy. But there's zero actual sensuality going on. Just crude and utter softcore, and nowadays not so softcore, porn. Young women beyond willing and eager to bump and grind in a desperate bid for success and attention.

And this is where fifty years of 'feminism' has brought us.

So if you're not particularly conversant with other cultures and other historical periods, then let me fill you in. Because if any woman from any other time or place throughout human existence were to see the state of womanhood today, they would most definitely not see liberation. No, they would absolutely recoil in horror and disgust at what they would perceive as totally empty, wasted, and degraded lives.

So: Women independent? Women emancipated? You know, in the Soviet Union they had these giant complexes of instantly dilapidated high rise apartments, which quickly became thirty story walk ups because the elevators never worked. And during the walk ups there was this overwhelming stench of cat urine. Because nobody took care of that. And, still, the vast majority of people living there totally bought into the idea that they were sincerely building a worker's paradise.

How could they be so dumb? How can we be so dumb?

Well, we don't have to be. And if you happen to be female yourself, or you happen to know someone who is, then just think of all the billions of units of psychological energy which have been wasted by women not just trying to be something they ain't, but trying to be something which is the precise opposite of what they are. And just think of all the legions of Gen Y and Gen Z women who dutifully did what society told them to do, turned their back on a million years of evolution, and became those self absorbed 'individuals', and are now so tremendously frustrated and lonely and unhappy.

And now just think of what might happen if the 180 did take place, and if all of that energy were now expended on consciously manifesting what I keep calling the feminine principle. And, further, on maybe taking it up to the next level, and seeing where that leads.

To my mind, at least, it's really a beautiful concept.

After all, as I've said before, a conscious, adult animal whose entire focus is not on herself, but on caring for and providing for others, in other words in being selfless, is something that Evolution and

Nature have never seen before. It's actually quite mind boggling. And perhaps, given the weird and seemingly random way that evolution works, it could just be that it's just some weird dead end that won't work out.

In which case, of course, neither will we humans.

But I prefer to see the emergence of the human female as a totally new and improved stop on the journey to wherever all of this is taking us. And you, at least as a minimum, should be able to see that this is at least a possibility. So why can't we recognize, even here at this late date, that we did make a wrong turn, that we are following a terrifyingly wrong, nonsensical 18th Century ideology. And figure out a way to back up. And then go forward?

Ah, were it so easy, eh? After all, for starters, if women are to honor their original nature, but if the world already has too many people, so that they can't have those five or six children, then what are they supposed to do? Just sit around the house all day and watch Lifetime movies?

Well, as I've said before, I wouldn't suggest that any more than I'd suggest that all the men in a suburban cul de sac form a war party and go raid the neighboring cul de sac. Although I would caution that we do have to keep in mind the obvious, and also well documented, reality that the vast majority of women still do have that strongly evolved innate desire to be mothers. (And, by the way, even in modern, decadent, aging, child poor Western Europe, recently the average wish by young women was still for 2.4 children.)

But I've also already stated that in most workplace traits—cooperation, sobriety, sense of responsibility, etc.—women generally are superior to men. What's more, much more than men, they seem to enjoy both the collaboration and the process which characterize most of the work performed today. I mean, as a kid I could never understand how girls could enjoy playing 'nurse' or 'teacher' or 'store'. How could you possibly win at that? And wasn't winning the whole point of doing anything? And if I and other boys did any role playing, it was always as completely unrealistic adventurers, such as astronauts or soldiers. So that, if girls naturally grow up fantasizing about doing useful work, then why the hell shouldn't they be the ones doing it?

And for instance: Since science has shown that mothers with children are more cautious and risk averse, if only such people were allowed to work on Wall Street, then Finance would quickly return to being the conservative, non-economy disrupting occupation that it used to be fifty years ago. And that would be pretty nice, wouldn't it? And imagine if the whole legal profession were replaced

by professional mediators, whose expressed purpose was conciliation and compromise, not confrontation, which women in general are much better suited for. We'd finally get rid of the lawyers. Now that would be really Utopian.

Anyway, I would hope that these two examples would assure you that the future that I am envisioning is in many ways the direct opposite of that old 'barefoot and pregnant' cliché.

Now the next point. Because remember that women, by properly manifesting their actual feminine nature, and by not trying to ape some mono-sexual vision from some weird autistic 18th Century dude, can now actually return to their true selves. But at the same time I have to continue to stress that this by no way means that their true self is independent. Because also remember from back in Episodes 46 to 49 that men and women necessarily co-evolved.

So that in my brave new world the equality of the sexes is intimately tied to this co-evolution of the sexes. Men doing the man thing and women doing the woman thing. Instead of living in separate, isolated worlds, though, they are back to doing the complementarianism thing. Each is complementing the other. Each is part of a whole. After all, as I keep saying, in terms of physical existence, women are undeniably the dependent ones. But in terms of emotional and psychological existence, it's the men who are the ones who are lacking.

And if 'complementarian' sounds too 'religious' for you, then how about: Conscious Co-Dependence?

So how does that work? Well, since I myself am particularly interested in music, let me replace 'man and woman' with the analogy of a guitarist playing with a bassist. Now both instruments are somewhat similar. But at the same time they are quite different, with different strengths and weaknesses. You can't play lead licks on a bass. And even if you were a tremendously agile bassist and could do that, you would be then defeating the basic purpose of the bass, which is to make sure that the 'pocket' is always stable.

Now that doesn't mean that bass players can't be highly creative. They certainly aren't just required to go thump, thump, thump on root notes. Still, no matter how creative they may be, every bassist is more than well aware that nobody goes to a concert to hear bass solos. Although that doesn't matter to them, because they know that their job is to support the music, which is way more important than the ego satisfaction of being a star.

Further, it's also more than true that, although few people ever pay attention to the bass lines in a piece of music, if a band doesn't have a bass player, and/or has a mediocre or crappy one, then the whole thing falls apart.

And you don't need to tell me about all the great male bass players out there, and how some women are really good guitar players. Because this analogy isn't about music per se. It's about basic psychic tendencies which result from the way that our brains are wired up before we are even born. And by now you should have also internalized that I'm presenting *ideals* here. Obviously, personalities do vary, and traits do overlap to a certain extent between the sexes. So that occasionally there are naturally born outliers amongst all the billions of us.

And if my last analogy still makes you think that I am casting women as somehow inferior or less important, then let's turn it around and make an art world analogy.

Because in this one the female is the painting. And the male is just the security guard standing there so that no one damages the painting. So that now, in the same way that no one goes to a concert to hear bass solos, no one goes to a museum to look at the security guard.

Complementary. Conscious Co-Dependence.

But let me get real Medieval on you and present you with a remarkably sophisticated ideation of the whole male/female thing. Namely: Chivalry.

Now back in Episode 16, where I discussed the Middle Ages, I pointed out how, even fifty years ago when I was in high school, the idea of Chivalry was presented with a snicker, as if it were all some elaborate game constructed so as to hide the reality that it was all going to end with some extramarital sex. As if two young, red blooded humans could do otherwise...

No. For at least a century it was dead real. Young women really did try their hardest to be those chaste fair maidens. And young men really did try their hardest to be those chaste, peaceful knights in shining armor. And those troubadours weren't just singing songs about romantic love. Instead their poetry was really thinly veiled allusions to what can only be described as mystical, otherworldly thought.

The result of which was that, as I noted, the 13th Century was one of the few times in Western, if not world, history that was remarkably free of war and conflict. And the reason why all those jousting tournaments were so popular wasn't just because now knights had nothing better to do. It was because,

following those ideals of chivalry, young men were seeking to show how vigorous, yet still ‘boy scout’ clean, they were.

All in all, especially when you throw in all the extensive, and spontaneous, veneration of the Virgin Mary, which can prettily readily be seen as Christianity affirming a feminine principle which had not even been part of the New Testament, one can conclude that, even if it is perhaps hard to accept that the womanly viewpoint was dominant in that era, it was certainly way more prominent than it has been in this past century or so.

Again, ponder for a moment: A thousand years ago, in many ways they were further along in all of this than we are now.

Anyway, if a positive change is going to happen, if this ship is ever going to be turned around, then let me suggest that the old ideal of chivalry needs to be taken out and looked at once again. And, if so, then it’s probably going to be up to the ladies to do it. Because I suspect that, even at this late Gen Z stage, there are a lot of young women out there who—and maybe right now they’re afraid of being canceled and so are keeping it a secret—but who deep down still would like to be that fair maiden.

Okay. Let’s say that you’re one of these. Then you still have this huge problem. Because the complementarian thing only works if the other side is willing and able to play along. And too many of the young men these days are emasculated overweight losers spending all of their free time playing video games and looking at internet porn. What’s more, those guys who still are alert and heterosexual can get all the commitment free sex they want out there in the marketplace. Go to all that trouble to be a knight in shining armor? Give me a break.

So that is indeed a problem.

But if you are one of these women, then you need to remember that Love has always included that problem. Love has always been one of those trust exercises where you fall backwards and trust that the other person will catch you. And throughout history just about anyone who has actually tried out Love has had the experience of, at some point, landing, crunch, on the floor.

After all, as I keep saying, we humans most probably are at that weird, halfway Cambrian moment. And the ideology that surrounds us certainly isn’t helping matters any.

But if you are in favor of resuscitating that feminine principle, then here's your chance to truly become a 'strong' woman. Because you can be the first. You can dare to be kind and gentle. You can say 'screw it' to the dead, surrounding culture.

Now how's that for liberation?

Well, oops, it looks like I've run out of time again. Darn. Especially because I was just getting to the good part. Which is how we're going to be able to, at this late date, extricate love from the tentacles of sexual performance.

Don't worry, though. That's for next episode.

For this episode, though, once again, I'd like to thank you once again. For what? Well, for once again so far having listened.