ECOSEXISM, FORWARD & REVERSE

ELLIOTT THINKSHEETS 2238
309 L.Eliz.Dr., Craigville, MA 02636
Phone 508.775.8008 14 July 88
Noncommercial reproduction permitted

(Straight) **forward** ecosexism has its classic expression in Schopenhauer's comment that the biosphere is endangered only by the human womb, which only women have, so it's all their fault. **Reverse** ecosexism finds less than classic but more than ordinary expression in this 3 July letter, CAPE COD TIMES: "Male domination threatens life."....Don't look up the word: I just made it up. It means blaming the increasing rape & ruination of the environment on only one of the sexes; using the rising consiousness & conscience on this issue as a welcome new weapon in the battle of the sexes.

Male domination threatens life

Any society that strays too far from the basic biological and unconscious needs of its citizens is doomed to self-destruct. Attempts at "welfare reform" that fail to comprehend the real needs of real people will only make life more difficult for all of us.

From Governor Dukakis to the male savants at the Kennedy Center for Public Affairs to Daniel Patrick Moynihan, none of the current suggestions regarding so-called welfare make any sense at all in terms of the lives of women and children.

In nature, male mammals are good for one thing only as far as female mammals are concerned — the act of procreation. As soon as an infant is conceived, females chase off the males and further contact with them is usually limited to protecting the young from them.

Every depredation on the lives of women committed and perpetuated by male-dominant substitutions for nature (i.e., patriarchal culture) shows the wisdom of our mammal foremothers.

I regard all these male-created rules for women, featuring male-created scarcity of resources in place of nature's abundance for female and juvenile mammals, abominations invented only to enslave and destroy the creative capacities of all women and most of our children.

It is men who have created the juggernaut of destruction which threatens all life on this planet. Forcing all the creative capabilities of mothers into the service of this death-and-pollution machine is species suicide.

DEBORAH HOWES
Mashpee

1. The author is both friend & enemy of mine. **Friend:** Her first sentence is both biologically & politically sound. And her second sentence is sociologically sound. But after the first ¶ it's all downhill. **Enemy:** She presents us with a mishmash of manhate & negativity toward "current suggestions regarding so-called welfare."

2. The other printed response to her letter made a single point: if the male had disappeared immediately after procreation, so would women & children soon after: they could not have survived without the adult male's "aggressive, inquisitive, inventive" contribution. In short, though the bio-reference is mine, the dominant-testosterone factor. It's an irony of radical feminism that while damning men for dominance without distinguishing between **good & bad dominance**, this hard wing of a good movement exhibits bad dominance.

3. Her attack on Pat Moynihan stings me, for she proposes no suggestion on the welfare mess superior to his --indeed, she proposes none at all unless it's chasing off the male after procreation--which would be a self-contradiction, **the absentee male** being the social phenomenon counting most heavily in the problem of welfare.

4. The myth of **primordial matriarchy** is implicit both in her ethological projection (other mammalian mothers chasing off the fathers after procreation) & in her flat statement that "patriarchal culture" is a "substitution for nature": it's scientifically open whether patriarchy in our species is "natural," but radical feminist mythology considers it shut.

5. If patriarchy is natural, & here I'm not arging it is, then men have been doing a bad job of a good thing, and she & the rest of us need to ask why. Sin, say I, sin, male & female. But she offers no account for male evil that would give hope: any such account or story would have to separate the male ontologically from evil--for how can there be hope if the male is essnetially, inherently evil? She has a **free-floating** mythology with no visible means of support in science & no invisible means of support in religion or philosophy. Free-floating misandry. There for me is the pathos & the reason I momentarily hestated to name her in my response to her letter.

6. Her simple-minded **moralism** of bad guys & good gals perniciously distorts her perspective & her thinking. "The wisdom of our mammal foremothers" is set over against the stupidity of our mammal forefathers, who committed "depredation on the lives of women" with "male-created rules for women, featuring male-created scarcity of resources,...abominations invented only to enslave and destroy the

creative capacities of all women and most of our children....forcing all the creative capabilities of mothers into the service of" the "death-and-pollution machine," a "juggernaut of destruction" "men have created & which "threatens all life on this planet." Note the correlations: male/destruction, female/creation. Two observations qualifying this black/white split:

[1] The transposition is true also: females destructive, males creative.

[2] Since with significant but few exceptions it's the males who have been & are (to quote the other respondent) "aggressive, inquisitive, inventive," we would expect them to be both more destructive & more creative than females--which is the case. Today in our culture, high-testosterone females are more free than were their mothers to be creative & destructive. I thank God for their greater freedom & pray for internal & external restraints on their destructivity.

7. My response (CCT the 11th instant) as printed cooled the passion of my ecological concern & dropped both my humor & my concern for the welfare mess--a butchering the editor seldom inflicts on me. Here's what got into print, and I'll follow with material from the original:

Advice to sexist: 'Just say no'

Deborah Howes seems not to have noticed, implicit in her reverse sexist letter (July 3), a neat solution to the problem she addresses, namely, male dominance of everything in sight and range — women, children, and even the biosphere. It's Nancy Reagan's solution to the drug problem: "Just say no."

Ms. Howe says men are good for one thing only — procreation. Since there is widespread overpopulation, especially in the Third World, Ms. Howes should propose that women chase off the men (as she, with dubious zoology, says other mammalian females do after procreation) before procreation. "Just say no."

Last week, the U.S. Supreme Court approved the use of tax money in religious schools to teach children to say no to sex. Chastity education is now legal. Against teen pregnancy. Against AIDS. And I add, against too many humans.

I should think that my extension of her solution would please Ms. Howes, as it even further distances females from males, for whom she appears to have a general distaste. Fitting philosopher Schopenhauer's view into her wording, she should attack the "death and pollution machine" at its source.

WILLIS ELLIOTT
Craigville

§ My title was "Just Say No to Men." The editor confused by the wrong use of "sexist": DH is a *reverse* sexist, prejudiced against men, not women--indeed, prejudiced in favor of women. Further, the editor's "just say no" implies something narrower than my "just say no to men."

§ My "Since mother nature is groaning mainly from an excessive mass of human flesh, especially in the Third World, Ms. Howes should logically propose an earlier intervention of her solution: human females should 'chase off males'...*before* procreation. 'Just say no' to the procreation-causative activity." My "excessive mass of human flesh" was dulled down to "widespread overpopulation"!

§ Where the editor has "against too many humans," I had "against burdening the biosphere with too many humans." A writer's essence may be an editor's fluff & I'm sympathetic with the editor's space-constriction guideline. Too, letters to the editor are not literature. But readership declines as text moves from primary to secondary to tertiary colors (browns & grays).

§ Following the printed last word, I had "females chasing after males rather than chasing them away," a reality for which DH makes no allowance.

§ The editor elided my last two ¶s, which are:

Mutual blaming results only in the battle of the sexes. Every culture is a joint project of both sexes, and Ms. Howes' Manichean (good guys, bad guys) analysis is both simplistic and counterproductive. But in a backdoor sort of way, it may move humankind to become unwittingly kinder to God's other creatures. If enough females go as sour on males as one would judge from this letter the writer is, females won't have to chase off males: males won't come near enough to be chased off, or will leave right after procreation. A good deal of that is happening already.

As for males leaving right after procreation, that is the primary cause of the welfare problem, which was the occasion of Ms. Howe's letter. While she condemns present proposals for welfare reform, her solution to the present nature/culture impasse--"chasing off the males"--would only worsen the welfare situation.

I end where I began, affirming Ms. Howe's caring for the world that sustains human life & her concern for sociopolitical action to protect it.