

"THE ROLES, THEY ARE ACHANGIN'":

THE DIDYADIC REVOLUTION ----- ELLIOTT #1825

Bob Dylan was/is right: "The times, they are a changin'." And at the heart of the changing, say I, is a double dyadic role-shifting: man (male), necessarily (?) dominating woman for the first million years, is painfully (for both parties) becoming woman's partner; and humanity, necessarily (?) having dominated earth, is painfully (for both) becoming earth's partner. To represent these two interconnected shifts, I coined the Greek word didyadic, which means "two pairs relating." This thinksheet's thesis is that we can widen and deepen our perception/action vis-a-vis each and both pairs by contexting each in the other--theologically-philosophically-scientifically-politically overcoming the double splits (woman/man and earth/humanity) overcome, in the past, only by mystics and poets. At present, both pairs are failing--but for each pair, and for both pairs together, there are brightening signs of hope, hope for double reconciliation and ultimately "the divine event/Toward which the whole creation moves." ...Obviously, only a book could begin to do justice to this thesis. This thinksheet is only twitterings.

1. In the bad sense, "privileged" means being in position/action at the expense of another's rights. The human female--as is now clear, in the light of ecological consciousness-raising--is "privileged" over against, at the expense of, the rest of nature: the human male has been, and in many respects still is, "privileged" over against, at the expense of, *the human female* as well as the rest of nature. Further, "privileged" groups use powers against the rights of other human groupings (economic, educational, social, political). What I call "creational liberation" is the total human struggle to free "rights" from "privilege." (Etymological note: "Privilege" is from two Latin words that combine to mean "laws" functioning to advantage some "private" interest or person or persons against the public. I've been dealing with the illegitimate, in the moral sense, functioning of this concept; the legitimate should be noted--e.g., the judge's privilege, over against police, military, and the rest of the public, to sit on the bench.)

2. The nub of the above paragraph is this: In "the West" (Christianity, Judaism, the Enlightenment, the American Way of Life), the only adequate context for viewing both rights and privileges is the doctrine of creation. Conceiving reality, as we do, as moral because derivative (as "creation") from the character and will of a Creator-God who is moral, we are pressed by inherent logic to conclude that every creature has (1) duties which it-s/he has (2) rights for the free and full exercise thereof. We human beings are obliged not only not to interfere (individually or collectively) with other creatures' rights, but also to fight for and enhance those rights. This moral construction is correct, and all who disagree with it (internal dissidents, other religions, other political ideologies) are wrong: this right/wrong, though opposed to sentimental "pluralism," is included in what it means to say/live, "We believe in God, Maker of Heaven and Earth..." This is the heart of the American religiomoral soul,* and it should be imposed on children in the public-school system (instead of the alternatives, viz., either having public-school worship or teaching religion as optional both for the individual and across the species--"Choose your own religion, or none," and "All religions are good, and right for those who live them"). These three postures can be simply called (1) teaching our (Western and American) religion,** (2) worshipping, and (3) teaching (objectively) about religion. Position #1 need not be ugly, but it must be narrow: "This is what we Americans believe, and it is inherently exclusive. It excludes us from agreeing with those (agnostics and cynics) who say not enough can be known of reality to declare it moral in character: we cannot, logically or livingly, believe in Creator/creation and leave open the question of life's moral/amoral nature (and so also the demand/option of rights/privileges). Note who is being excluded: we are; if others are excluded, it is because they choose not to agree with our Creator/creation way of seeing and living in the world. What then saves us from arrogance, and violence against infidels (i.e., those whose "faith" is "not" ours)? (1) The fact that (unlike, e.g., Marxist metaphysical determinism) we hold our position as faith, not fact-in-the-public-domain; and (2) The fact that

*See S.Mead's A NATION WITH THE SOUL OF A CHURCH. **Within, but not exhaustive of, Judaism and Christianity.

OVER

our faith is the conviction that evangelism to our faith must be by persuasion only, not by force. The normal American public-school teacher, thus, will be committed to our American way of faith, which s/he will teach modestly-humbly (because it is a faith among the world's faiths) and gently (because our "civil religion"'s internal logic excludes both propaganda, i.e., efforts to bypass reason in the interest of capturing souls, and also force, i.e., the application of threat-sanctions to secure submission). These three criteria should be used in the training, hiring, and disciplining of public-school teachers. (Why won't the "prayer in the public schools" issue go away? Because the expression is unconscious code for the conviction that the present situation in public schools misrepresents the American heritage and hope and is, accordingly, subversive of "the American Way of Life." Globalistic educationists argue that a public-school system should function to produce world-citizens, not citizens of a particular heritage. As I see it, that's as idealistic (bad sense) and impractical as expecting people to practice religion-in-general; and while I think these educationists should be free to experiment according to their lights, I'm against their use of tax money to do it.)

3. Slowly, painfully, the humanity/nature roles are shifting from master/slave to partner/partner. The Edenic garden-keeping is being put in the wider-deeper context of garden-living, i.e., being one creature/species in the biosphere, with special duties (according to our powers) but without privileged rights over against the other creatures, flora and fauna. In a just-published book (early '84, Paulist Press), an RC thinker (Jn. Carmody, ECOLOGY AND RELIGION: TOWARD A NEW CHRISTIAN THEOLOGY OF NATURE) states the new-roles proposition from the side of nature (p.185): "Nature has an independent right to exist, live, flourish." "Man" (i.e., both male and humanity) must be confronted, stood not only over against but also against, as usurper-oppressor of nature. EXAMPLE, the disposal of human feces; ITEMS: (1) Like desert-Africans, today (Mar/84) Pennsylvanians (in a number of areas) must carry drinking/cooking water in bottles, the general watersupply being too feces-polluted; (2) Prince Philip, in a recent ecology-speech, said "What unconscionable waste and pollution, to use gallons of water to flush a little human excrement!"; (3) When we wanted to build a modern, i.e., non-water, toilet on Cape Cod, the MA plumbers said OK and the State Board of Health (!) nixed it; (4) Ecologically, the best sewage-disposal is the dry toilet; next best, the old-fashioned outhouse; next, private septic systems; worst, public sewers (which empty into, and pollute, both waterways and reservoirs--the present PA problem). (When Chappaqua NY voted to go public-sewer, I published in favor of improving excretion-disposal by moving from septic systems to the outhouse. Instead of following my advice, the town decided to pollute the Hudson River...By millenium's end, towns that haven't gone dry-toilet will be refused state-and-Federal financial help.)

4. Demography must follow ecology: where people live must be allowed to determine (1) how many live there and (2) how they live. I approve what Congress did yesterday: it approved \$200mill. to feed/water otherwise-doomed Africans who live in an area (1) able to bear only a small fraction of their present number, and (2) that, only if their life-style shifts to prolife in the eco-balance sense. I approve for the short-range benefit to some humans, but I know it's against the longrange interest of "creation" (i.e., humanity-in-nature). Why? Because it encourages the nature-rape of both Africa and America--our "breadbasket" already in second-stage desertification and first-stage watertable pollution). Triage, in a wider than the war sense, is on us. We might call it the Caiaphas Principle (Jn.11.50)--but because of Christianity's radical individualism (centering in rejection of Caiaphas' suggestion that better Jesus die than "the whole nation," and in the Man-God focus of Torah/Israel on one person, and in the Hellenistic-Enlightenment philosophizing of this christocentric individualism), my guess is that Christians (and Christian theology) will be more hindrance than help to this humanity/nature adjustment toward bio-homeostasis. (Whenever I introduce my concern, I'm considered callous and "unChristian.")

5. What, now, does the female/male roles-revolution look like in context of this humanity/nature roles-revolution? ITEM: China's current one-child-per-family mass effort to reduce the tonnage of human flesh and so the burden on China's ecology. Obviously, the one-child woman has more freedom vis-a-vis male-world than the many-child woman.