

"SUPERIORITY," THE DENOTATUM/CONOTATA OF ----- ELLIOTT #1753

*This fact does not exhaust male superiority--nor do all the facts together weight against female superiority, which my thinksheets support as much as they do male superiority. For decades I've preached the mutual superiority of the sexes.

This thinksheet is on a subject many feel is too filthy to talk about, viz., white male (+Anglo-Saxon, +Protestant) superiority. To the filth is added the outrage that the talker, viz., me, is WM(A-SP): I call down upon myself the negative sanctions of "Christianity," "humanism," and whatever other value-systems the condemner holds dear. But I cannot forbear to speak out: through the years, and now more than ever before, my ears have taken in, are taking in, dangerous nonsense through abuse of the word "superiority"--nonsense because in violation of fact and therefore of sense, dangerous because nurturing mere contra-arrogance rather than open and reconciliation-expectant humility before truth and God.... This thinksheet is temporally after, but logically prior to, #1752....The multiple issue is honest to truth/God/humanity/reality/language. My matured conviction is that the human alternatives on this planet are (1) this honesty and (2) violence. As I see, at the moment and in history, little chance of the dominion of this honesty, I support violence-potential (including, of all things, the Pentagon!) for the maintenance of my freedom to preach-promote this honesty (which most of America opposes with speech but not violence, and which most of the world opposes with violence). (Implicate: "Arming" is insane but not quite as nonsensical as "the peace movement.")....After this intro, I expect almost no readers for the rest of this thinksheet: too many taboos have been violated. (A parallel: Dermott Robertson expected, and got, no mainline publisher for his THE DISPOSSESSED.)

1. The denotatum of "superiority" is physical: top dog over underdog (in Fritz Perls' colorful patois). Simple: Latin "super" = "over." For good and ill, the white male has been, and decreasingly is, over the rest of mankind (inclusively, "humankind"). Only we are thought by anybody (not by me) to have the negative Promethean potential, i. e., (Jon. Shell) "to destroy all life on this planet": Moscow and Washington are centers of White Male Power (all power positions in U.S.A. and U.S.S.R. being in the hands of white males, who in both states are a small minority).

2. Even where a small minority, the white male is top dog: clear proof of "superiority" in the denotative sense. Unreal and doomed is any dialog that does not grant this. Says a fanatic feminist, "You (white males) have controled history for 5,000 years; now it's our (women's) turn." To which the white male may reply, "You should have seen history before we took it over." (The myth of the matriarchal Golden Age Past is a pathetic contrivance; it won't work even if one drops "white" from "white male"--e.g., in the case of Sinic civilization.) The male is, historically everwhere, superior to the female; i.e., in charge, in power (matriarchy being always and everywhere within the sphere of superior male musculature). The superior male musculature*is as much the will of God ("lex naturae") in our species as is, in some other species, the superior female musculature. Bio-fact: the human male is more powerful (quick-release ergs) and less strong (slow-release ergs) than the human female. I've seen in print no theological accounting for these realities, and I don't expect to: it would be too subversive and therefore too dangerous to the theologian. E.g., an implicate of male power-superiority is (1) control of the sexual and parental relationships and (2) protection of these relationships from external threats (so the male is divinely assigned to war responsibility till the biblical male god relieves him by intrusive power-control, "the Kingdom of God"). NB: The above "control" and "protection" is only physical, but is physical (and the body is not to be despised).

3. Conotata of the word are (as can be seen in any synonymy) mainly offensive to ego, subverting efforts to face nonsubjective facts.