

# Why Are We Doing So Badly ?

Robert Mann and Andrew Macfarlane

*NZ Envir. 68* 12 - 14 (Dec 1991)

based on a talk presented at the 'Ecopolitics V' conference, Univ. of NSW, April 1991

## Introduction

What has gone wrong, that we humans can be managing ecosystems so very destructively, especially over the past two centuries (since the industrial revolution), and most horrifically in the uncontrolled technomania (best criticised by Mumford, Illich, and Goldsmith) of the past few decades? The quasi-global culture of industrial growthmania bids fair to bring about in mere decades what took the Romans centuries - decline and fall - but on a far more monstrous scale and with vastly more toxic aftermaths.

What are the influences which have led us astray into this crazy excessive industrial activity? What distractions are diverting us from the correct direction which has been pointed out by *The Ecologist* for two decades and is brought up to date by Ted Trainer<sup>1</sup> ?

At Ecopolitics IV, two years ago, it was argued<sup>2</sup> that economism, with its accompanying language-sabotaging econobabble, has been one of the most harmful pseudo-solutions, popular but furphicious, which has been not merely diverting effort from genuine solutions but, worse, feeding back to exacerbate the problem. The furphies sketched in that paper were: economism, scientism, anti-science, "anti-"sexism, anti-racism, and Noo Eege. Here we develop that analysis, with more detail on "anti-"sexism. We will argue that the misrepresentation of human biology entailed in what has become *mainstream* feminism constitutes the most under-rated political furphy of the past two decades, and is by now a main reason why humans are managing the world so disastrously. A generation raised in denial of the main facts about men and women is unable to behave as conservationists.

In contrast with the typical one-author Ecopolitics conference paper, our team's perspectives include marriage, divorce, parenthood, childlessness, religion, mathematics, psychedelics, and even commerce. Our diversity is of course limited by the fact that we are veterans of tertiary study and - brace yourself - sharing the male sex with Newton and the largest minority of humans. For none of this make we apology. Our many attempts over the past decade to discuss feminism with its ideologues have been very largely evaded; the present paper, only the latest of a line of opportunities, was almost entirely avoided by feminists at Ecopolitics V.

## The Value of Humour in Political Argumentation

In 'Yes, Minister' (and 'Yes, Prime Minister') Antony Jay & Jonathan Lynn have used humour to convey a highly unpalatable message - that the modern democratic nation-state is affected precious little by elected governments. The career bureaucracy machinates obscurely to expand the military-industrial complex. Elections, and

politicians' utterances between them, are largely deceptive image-charades. Such a dismaying picture will tend to be strongly rejected by the human mind unless presented with humour, as brilliantly achieved by Jay & Lynn.

Similarly, we believe that examination of feminism will not occur unless discussants all maintain their sense of humour. We enlist therefore the late great Peter Sellers' technique of verbal vignettes. To illustrate the technique, here's a vignette to press home the wise saying "you can't take it with you".

It's not widely known that Charon, the ferryman on the Styx, carries out some pre-processing on each boatload of newly-arrived souls. A simple questionnaire will assist the further processing on the far shore.

The sturdy boatman interviews briefly a nervous ex-Kiwi passenger :

**Charon**<sup>3</sup> : Do you come from a small country where they lost control of the game 'the one that dies with the most toys wins'?

**Ex-Kiwi**(*nervous, but resigned*): Yes.

**Charon**: I see. And how many did you die owning?

**Ex-Kiwi**: Only a modest quarter-million's worth - and the cars were quite old - two old cameras - six radios - must I go on? I should add in fairness that the size of the toys mattered too . . . some of mine were quite small . . .

**Charon**: I see. And how many of these toys have you brought with you?

We apply this vignette technique to the recent bumper-sticker slogan "Women Can Do Anything" (and its accompanying insinuation that they should try to do everything).

**Young Woman, to Recruiting Sergeant**: I want to join the army - in particular, to insist on my obvious moral and legal right to become a front-line troop.

**Recruiting Sergeant**<sup>3</sup>: I see. You want to serve your country alongside our courageous men. Good to see women exercising their freedoms to the utmost. That's what democracy is about - defending freedom and maximising choice, especially for women, yes?

The first fact which I am duty-bound (but statutorily prohibited) to point out to you is that if you get captured you will, most likely, be persistently raped. You look an intelligent woman, sorry person, you would have thought that through. OK?

Secondly, we have to make sure you realise that, in the front line, your *own* men may, in certain desperate circumstances, repeatedly rape you. OK? - Sign here that you won't attempt to claim off the government if that happens.

The point of this vignette is not only to rubbish slogans of the ilk "Girls Can Do Anything", in effort to revive consideration of that crucial topic the division of labour, but also to point out that we men do have an understanding of our own capacity for evil.

Evil is of course a term which isn't much heard these days. A wide variety of utopian tendencies have discarded such concepts. Earlier, men have discussed at length their own capacity for doing people in. Gandhi, Martin Luther, St Francis of Assisi (to name but a few) dealt with it very well. The standard way of getting along with each, a striking feature of human males among all male mammals, entails stable social structures - those proved over at least a few generations. You may dislike aspects of these structures, such as hierarchy: that trigger-word is today unpopular, like the word evil. Nevertheless, it is a fact that certain aspects of social structures deter bad behaviour and often encourage exemplary behaviour. As Goldsmith argues, one might as well talk of an animal without cells, or a cell without organelles, as blather of a society free of hierarchy. The far older societies of the social insects, notably the three genders of our friend the honey-bee, are neglected inspirations for those working on gender in particular and the nature-nurture issue more generally. They achieve marvellous resonances with Nature, but only by a marvellous division of labour. The very recent notion that there should be almost no division of labour between the two genders of human is both novel, evidently implausible, and amply refuted by the empirical findings of the experiment with feminism. Less than one century has proven more than enough, if the results be honestly appraised.

Two decades ago, S Goldberg of NYU scored an early 'Guinness Book' record - the greatest total (69) of publishers to have rejected a book which did however finally get published. His scholarly survey of findings from 1400 human societies studied on his subject - *Male Dominance* - is subtitled in the definitive edition "The Inevitability of Patriarchy". It is routinely blacked out by feminist "scholar"s. So too, perhaps even more thoroughly, is the admittedly difficult but surely central 1982 book *Gender* by Ivan Illich. The "excuse" that those authors are men can hardly be claimed for Goldberg's successor, Anne Moir (who holds a doctorate in genetics). Her book *Brain Sex*<sup>4</sup> brings up to date the picture which Goldberg had so much trouble publishing in the late 1960s. This new text may score a new record - briefest time in print! By the time reviews reached us, the book could not be bought. Yet feminists continue to chant "women are powerless", when it appears that for two decades their ideology has had something approaching a stranglehold on publishing, at least of the key facts which their ideology cannot accomodate.

Nothing important has changed. The Amazons remain a forgery - but the *NZ Listener*, let alone *Broadsheet* and other magazines promoting hatred of the largest minority amongst the human species, will doubtless continue to print letters from angry young women relying on the Amazon myth as if it were factual evidence of human biological potential.

Today, especially in the overdeveloped world, social engineering of a most radical type has already made grave inroads. Overdeveloped nations are now pretending to maintain writing-based legal systems, highly complex & dangerous chemical engineering (let alone genetic!), and degraded public education systems, all staffed increasingly by quasi-literate "professionals" whose lack of technical competence is exceeded only by their lack of grasp of human biology. These operatives, some of whom hold MBA degrees, are commonly observed to be working on the assumption that humans will soon - certainly can - create non-hierarchical schools, companies, qangos, statutory agencies, even tribes, and of course families; in all of which structures, women will do similar work to that of men. The damage to thought by such assumptions is already around us, and the monstrously

destructive way of life callously, ruthlessly imposed by their proponents is, we will argue, *the* under-rated problem of today's world. Households in which the woman has usurped formal power produce not only confused, dangerous dogs but also oafish children who are often incapable of the education and manners needed for any high civilisation. Feminism appears incapable of acknowledging the need for drastically cutting consumption; indeed it evidently entails further growth to provide its separate houses, cars etc.

### The Sabotage of New Zealand

The past quarter-century has, for Kiwis, been mainly a period of sabotage and demolition of what we judge to have been the most decent "mixed economy" and the kindest, most secure nation that has ever existed, at least since the industrial revolution. The NZ blend of public and private enterprise had afforded, for some decades, an extremely effective (and matchlessly efficient) school system; among the safest & most efficient airlines; a safe rail system itself designing & making some outstanding locomotives; bridges etc. created, for local needs using local materials, by a competent public works department; a public hospital system of good efficiency promoting high standards; a level of serious crime below most in the overdeveloped world (*e.g.* an urban murder rate only a few percent of Dallas'); a minimally corrupt civil service of high competence; and good, cheap, service-oriented science of which Lord Rutherford was only the most famous son. We believe daughters also had, by any comparison as distinct from ideology-based absolute, good access to education and many professions. Finally for this brief list, the people who had colonised these islands a millennium earlier won from the British Empire the best deal that any aborigines on the planet proved able to get in that era of colonialism, and quickly embraced literacy & schooling, in the least damaging leap from the stone age into industrialism.

### The Evoked Secondary Furphy: Wimpism

The ascendancy of feminism two decades ago has evoked from men, on a large scale at least in New Zealand, that dismal wonder of the modern world, the wimp - the man who is pretending androgyny and is committed to suppressing his own initiatives and desires in favour of those promoted by women. According to a clinical psychologist, Paul Baakman of Christchurch, the *majority* of Kiwi men had by the mid-1980s turned themselves into wimps whose own opinions could not be ascertained.

The manipulative, devious paths to power which characterise those who cannot prevail in private by physical strength have by now advanced to remarkably high levels in the judicial, educational and medical systems. Competence and justice suffer greatly. In NZ today, affirmative action has, for instance, elevated to the position of Chief Executive Officer of the nation's Ministry of Education one Dr Maris O'Rort, who told a conference of high-school principals

" education must concentrate on the growth and development of people *rather than* content, subject matter or maintenance learning of current knowledge" (our emphasis).

Education has long been distorted for social engineering, but her words, especially those which we have emphasised, spell out the most destructive attack yet on education. In NZ today, if you want a university lectureship and have

never attempted a higher degree, that's OK - if you're a woman. (If you want a lectureship never having studied for even a first degree, that's OK too - if you're a Maori woman.) Is anyone examining how much of this affirmative action can be absorbed consistent with carrying on the literate tradition going back to the ancient Greeks?

One example of feminist/wimp "scholarship" is the peculiarly dishonest & furtive promotion, by fanatics bent on victimising retired Assoc. Prof. G H Green, of numbers - variously 23, 26, and 29 - suggested to be the total killed by Dr Green's "unfortunate experiment" at National Women's Hospital. None of these numbers has any published basis, and all were avoided by even the feminist judge Sylvia Cartwright's conclusions from her protracted public inquiry. The special private adviser during the Judge's investigations, Dr Charlotte Paul, declines to explain how any of the numbers was deduced. A very recent TV report, resulting from the reporter's extensive private discussions with Sandra Coney who has put about such numbers, now mentions **36** - and still no authority let alone published method of calculation. One might expect the local experts on medical statistics to illuminate this issue . . . instead, wimpism rules.

### What To Do ?

We contend that human biology includes sexual dimorphism and division of labour to a far larger extent than is admitted by feminism. The notion that women can and should occupy 50% of all social positions, especially professional and political careers, is utopian in the worst sense. It has not only failed to materialise but is doomed by facts of human biology. And the efforts based on it, since the end of the 1914-18 war but especially during the two decades since the 'The Female Eunuch', have already done great harm.

For those who have come this far with us, some useful actions have (we hope) been implied. Limits to affirmative action need defining. Gross incompetence, let alone dishonesty, must be firmly resisted, especially in institutions which exist to safeguard and refine knowledge. Wimpish humouring of feminism should be discouraged - or, to put it positively, we must stand up for justice.

Crucial in the recovery from our two decades of delusion will of course be those women who can see further than the temptation to political advancement through illegitimate feminist power-plays. Would any of them like to take up the baton?

{ this is a convenient place to mention Christina H Sommers *Who Stole Feminism ?* }

Acknowledgement: Discussions with Peter Cumming and Dr Grover Foley were very useful in the genesis of this article.

### Endnotes

1. F E Trainer 'The Nature of a Sustainable Society' *NZ Environment* 67 21-25 (1991); *Abandon Affluence* (London: Zed Books 1985).

2. L R B Mann 'Living as if Gaia Mattered' in K Dyer & J Young (eds) *Proc. Ecopol. IV* 471-477, University of Adelaide Centre for Environmental Studies (1990); reprinted in *NZ Envir.* 63 28-31 (1990)
- 3 {in the accent of the father in Sellers' 'Common Entrants' (by Muir & Norden), on the album "Songs for Swingin' Sellers" }
4. A Moir, D Jessel *Brain Sex* London: Michael Joseph (1989), now available in paperback.

---

---

<sup>1</sup> see his paper for this conference; and especially his *Abandon Affluence!* London: Zed Books 1987

<sup>2</sup> L R B Mann 'Living as if Gaia Mattered' in K Dyer & J Young (ed.) *Proc. Ecopol. IV* 471-477 (1990); see also B Medlin, same *Proc.*

<sup>3</sup> (*in the accent of the father in Sellers' "Common Entrants" (by Muir & Norden), on the album "Songs For Swingin' Sellers" )*

<sup>4</sup> A Moir, D Jessel 'Brain Sex' London: Michael Joseph (1989)