

1. I've noticed how sophisticated young mothers are arguing for their motherhood instead of being happy, mindless mothers, i.e. mothers with a simple, unclouded conscience. As though they must justify their offspring's adding to the earth's groaning from exhaustion of irreplaceable resources and from potentially irreversible pollution; and as though they must defend themselves against the charge that they are being mothers instead of something more arduous and imaginative, something creative and useful rather than ambiguous. On top of all this, technology has freed men from being as responsible as they used to be for women becoming mothers: a woman now has more technological ways of avoiding motherhood, and is therefore more responsible for becoming a mother. Conclusion: The more women are "free," the harder it is to be a woman. Does this mean I'm against women becoming "free"? The opposite! Rather, it used to be too easy to be a woman.

2. The sanction of maturity [apparent in nonbiological uses of "adult," "adolescent," etc.] clouds and clarifies liberationist talk. Conjoint with human-potential talk of "fulfilment," it tends to rhetoric that's "good for the troops" but "bad for home consumption." Take, e.g., this discourse: *Society has developed to the point where some women are ready to take on adult responsibilities. As is the case with all adolescents, these women are meeting some resistance from time-lag adults, for whom adolescent language drawn from slavery--"oppression," "liberation"--seems excessive, odd, mildly amusing, and irritating....though, if we adults remember our feelings as we were going through adolescence, emotively accurate....yet with vicious effects when the analog (the slavery image) is literalized (on which cp. the use of the pre-sermon hymn "Break Thou the Bread of Life" as a pre-eucharist hymn)....And why didn't women become adult at some earlier stage in the complexification of society? One's response will reveal one's biases and hopes.* My main point here is that since the maturity-fulfilment model is, currently, the #1 salvation model for the literate culture, it's a sharp, powerful, dangerous tool--surgical, and can be used viciously with ill will or helpfully-critically with good will.

3. More on liberationist language: As rape-protectionists teach women to use anything weaponable in their purses, and as cornered nations use their full arsenal, so pressured liberationists use language weaponably, i.e. with high respect for its power but low respect for its native contexts, its denotata, and its prosaic/poetic discriminations. In his RELIGIOUS BODY, Gabe Moran rues this. You pay for what you get, including the unwanted reflexes and spinoffs of language pollution.

4. "Body language" I use to bespeak not only what we consciously and unconsciously say to others through our bodies, but also what our bodies say to ourselves...each one one's own skin-bag. The eighth way of being religious ["sensuous experience"] objects to the bodiless, abstract, deductive liberationist-talk: there is no such thing as a "person" or an "individual," and all arguing for the rights of such is deductive reasoning in defense of abstractions (usually compounded and rammed home with other abstractions, some--like "equality"--drawn from humankind's most abstract mode of thinking, viz. mathematics). What gave such power to Henry Miller's TROPICS and Lawrence Durrell's ALEXANDRIA QUARTET and Ingmar Bergman's SCENES FROM A MARRIAGE--all of them on the liberation theme--was their concreteness, their inductivity, their particularity of skin-bag. PROBLEM: Revolution must rest on a particular abstraction, viz. the situation/destiny of a particular collectivity of skin-bags: liberationist activity is essentially impersonal, abstract, deductive, and usually ends in that most impersonal human activity, war (as a recent book demonstrates). SOLUTION: Press for options expansion more with (Eze.11) "a heart of flesh" [sensitive skin] than with "a heart of stone" [adversary antivulnerability]. So, here are body-factors affecting one's view of reality: size, structure, processes, potentials, problematics, forms of contact with other bodies, assonance/dissonance vis-a-vis one's culture's ideals of strength and of beauty. So, we need women theologians, as well as men--and one theologian per skin-bag....The women's movement is fired by both acceptances/celebrations of the female body and rejections/denigrations thereof--both, by women..and by men.