

This ebook was downloaded from Carstenjohnsen.org --a site for visionary books on Christian Philosophy.

The Part of the Story You Were Never Told ABOUT WOMEN

Carsten Johnsen

Page 1

AUTHOR'S PREFACE

A subtitle for this book might have been: "In Search of a Woman's Soul".

At a famous Church Council of the early middle ages the following question was the topic of a most serious discussion: Does a woman have a soul? Are you curious to know what conclusion those dignified priests and prelates of old arrived at? Well, it was solemnly voted--with one single voice deciding the majority, if we are to believe the details of the story--that full freedom should be henceforth opened in the Church for teaching this bold doctrine: Women--as well as men--are owners of that precious treasure called a human soul.

Now, I do not know, of course, what degree of authority you for your part would ascribe to the mentioned body of learned theologians as far back in the dark middle ages as this. But in case you do accept their verdict as normative, then the matter ought to present grounds for some further discussion. In our days the consensus seems pretty unanimous. The findings are what modern researchers delight in calling "significant". Isn't that generous indeed? There can hardly be room for any really serious doubt any longer: Even women must be accepted as "man-sized" human beings, creatures endowed with a soul!

But what KIND of soul are they endowed with? That is the great theme this present book essentially deals with. And I feel I am not laying it on too thick when I say: What has revealed itself to me, a poor male researcher, regarding the peculiarities of that "female soul", is sensational, --simply stunning.

Page 2

INTRODUCTION

PART I

WOMAN--ENIGMA OF THE AGES

Life has its whims and its vicissitudes. Mine has not proved to be an exception to that rule. For instance, all along it seems to have insisted on bombarding me with puzzling questions about the nature of women, as compared to that of men. Some of those questions have popped up at somewhat critical moments. I must confess I had permitted myself to get quite heavily involved with philosophical studies already by the time when, more or less unexpectedly, I was faced with an old intriguing question. It is a riddle which seems to leave most men in the field of philosophical research fairly undisturbed, strange enough. But not me-- certainly not at that moment: "What special part have WOMEN played in the development of philosophy in this world?" The answer to that question is bound to have a considerable lot to say regarding simply women's

very status as intellectual creatures. Have they succeeded gloriously, or failed miserably, in the prestigious field of the spirit called speculative reasoning?

With new-kindled curiosity I worked my way once more through one epoch of philosophical history after the other in our Western World, just scanning the horizons, anxious to count every single woman who might have left her traces in the sands of that history, in the form of some heavy document of speculative thinking.

What did I find? Not one notorious woman philosopher, --just men, men, men, all along the road. What an incontrovertible testimony! But testifying WHAT, if you please? How was I going to interpret this firm fact of human history, a fact more eloquent than a million boastful words, no doubt, but eloquent in what direction? WHY had women failed so completely to meet the stern criteria demanded in our culture to be accepted as great masters of discursive thought? The failure could not be disputed. But what did it actually mean? Was this a crushing blow against the essence of women, or a crushing blow against the essence of philosophy? If the verdict implied was not a clear condemnation of women as thinkers, it would have to be a condemnation of traditional patterns of thought as we happen to know them here and now.

Page 3

At this juncture please imagine for a moment the situation confronting me, at that time a poor student majoring in philosophy. Of course my personal vicissitudes mean very little where matters of an entire humanity are so decisively at stake. But the human interest story does have its place after all. From now on my dissertation seemed doomed to adopt the character of a veritable settling of accounts between two belligerent parties. On the one hand there seemed to be the Woman with a capital W. On the other hand there was Philosophy with a capital P. To a student the academic question involved is of course always bound to be far from negligible. Was my work going to be accepted or rejected? But of course teachers are not the only fellow creatures toward whom any student, like all other citizens of this world, has the responsibility to behave in an ethical and acceptable way. Even in a male of this present age there is still left some kind of an ideal, a certain rudiment of chivalry regarding the attitude he displays toward the female sex. So how could I now answer bluntly in the case at hand: "That poor contribution on the part of our women in the august field of philosophy must mean a definite intellectual fiasco attached to the name of universal womanhood."

On the other hand, how could I, an assumed lover of philosophy, resign myself to the opposite alternative, saying: Speculative thought as a human value must be bankrupt. If women refuse categorically to have anything to do with it, philosophy must be a most dubious thing.

Wonder of wonders: my dissertation was accepted; strange enough, one might certainly say; for it must have been something of a heartbreaking disappointment to my major professor to see the turn I, his dear student, was gradually taking in my attitude toward that man's mistress par excellence: PIA PHILOSOPHIA. To him, you see, philosophy was not just a menial trade, a certain job he had taken on in order to eke out a living. Oh no, to him it was the great heart affair of his life. To his "inward Man" there could hardly be anything more sacred than for instance platonic idealism on the highest level. And outwardly-- if the outward world had any chance of making itself felt at all-- this devotion to philosophy in its purest essence was probably bound to take the form of

a certain "point d'honneur" more sensitive than what we common mortals ever experience. This is where his reputation among his colleagues must have affected his life to some extent. Of course even a super-idealist of platonic "purity" must have his honor as a scholar to take care of. My professor happened to be reckoned among the foremost thinkers in contemporary France. He was the self-evident Dean of the philosophy department. The present reputation of that time-honored university dependent on him to a large extent. What you should know particularly in this connection about the institution as a whole, one of the oldest and most famous in Europe, is the following: In it my special professor certainly was not the only one who happened to be enthusiastically convinced of the incomparable virtues of philosophical speculation. In that milieu philosophy was sacro-sanct.

Page 4

How could my rather anti-philosophical work be accepted with honors in a super-academic environment of that ultra-conservative kind? Imagine the sudden appearance of a greenhorn like me, a barbarian from Ultima Thule (I am a Norwegian), in a company like that, putting all traditional values upside down, and doing that with a boldness which to them must seem like proud audacity.

Faced with their kindness and considerateness, I felt almost like a traitor. What was this disloyal treatment I was giving my noble superior? Are things bound to happen this sad way all the time in our world? Every new generation, without one word of apology, rushes into pathways the old ones have never known or accepted. Without hesitation we are abandoning ourselves to neologies that would cause our forefathers to despair.

Today, in rueful retrospect, I am feeling sincere sympathy with that fine old teacher of mine. What do I know about the agony he may have gone through, as he came to realize the "unfortunate" trend my special dissertation on the character of women--and on the character of human philosophy--tended to develop? What I was getting involved in was certainly something infinitely far from a condemnation of women. To him it must rather have appeared very definitely as a "condemnation of philosophy." My situation reminded me of something even Plato, the great master of the most frigid and pitiless philosophy of our world, once uttered with visible sadness about such "naughty pupils" as Aristotle. The old teacher compares them to "colts that spurn their mothers."

On the other hand I could not imagine that my own professor's ever so gentle heart would really break as a result of HIS "naughty pupil's" treacherous act of estrangement. If I had been very naive and very self-conceited, I might of course have jumped to the conclusion that I had, at least for a little while, shaken the unusual equanimity of that man's philosophical mind, causing him to surrender in from of the battering force of a sledge hammer I call Christian realism. But again and again my mind was driven relentlessly back to the real facts. My teacher's endless admiration for the most masculine of all philosophies (classic Greek idealism) had not suffered the least damage during all that fierce hammering of mine. Its toughness was absolutely unimpaired. In other words, my clumsy attack against the mighty platonic fortress of pagan humanism had been like a bucket-full of water sprinkled on a bunch of geese.

Page 5

And now his attitude toward women: Had the most aggressive feminists of his day managed to upset that man,--turn him into a woman hater? Far from it. True enough, he remained a bachelor, just like Schopenhauer. By the way, it is a remarkable fact that most of the really famous philosophers in our history have remained single. Good for them. And probably also for the women they would otherwise have married. Evidently those giants in speculative rumination did have sufficient common sense after all to realize that their life style and the style of their deepest thinking had very little to offer to a genuine woman. The contribution their philosophy could be assumed to make to human matrimony, would run the risk of being a rather poor one.

But please do not think that I am seriously associating my dear old philosophy teacher with such inveterate woman haters as Schopenhauer. For that famous German pessimist did not shy away from saying about women that they are "by nature instinctively deceitful and ineradicably prone to telling lies." My teacher would never have stooped down to the baseness of taking words as philosophically unworthy as that into his mouth. Nor would he ever have condescended to the level of excelling in dubious aphorisms à la Fenelon, such as the one accusing women of being "full of artifice, dissimulation and fine tricks."

Oh no, my professor accepted women on an equal level with men, as genuine TRUTHSEEKERS. It would have been a logical impossibility for him to harmonize such honest human truth-seeking with Schopenhauer's statement about a feminine nature of ineradicable deceitfulness. But the most incredible tolerance was the one he showed me through that award of a "tres bien", the highest grade of the French University, for my dissertation "Essai sur l'Unité de l'Homme" (English: "*Man the Indivisible*"); as far as I can see, a merciless book on the demerits of platonic dualism, describing it as nothing better than a fatally disrupting heritage to all lands in the West.

Again and again I am speechless with wonder, as I observe an incredible capacity, on the part of some eminent scholars, to find space enough in their roomy system for both A and non-A, both thesis and antithesis, all at the same time. It is often some of our most gifted humanists, adepts in discursive thinking, who manage to integrate, in their minds and hearts, mutually exclusive world views. They perform that "integration" with the elegance of fabulously performing acrobats.

I for my part must confess my total incompetence in that kind of acrobacy. Never have I succeeded in making diametrically opposite qualities join each other in the synthetic creation of a higher entity. Nor do I think that true realism in human thought can have anything to do with that Hegelian magic.

Page 6

That was probably also the reason why I seemed for some time to have considerable difficulty now in feeling perfectly happy in front of the female sex and philosophy, both at the same time, just the way my teacher seemed to. On the other hand, how could I choose between the two? How could I take an unequivocal stand, categorically in favor of the female sex--AGAINST philosophy? Here, you see, there appeared to be sundry things which could not be pushed under the rug like that. A question troubling me a good deal was this one: Could there be among typical women either a failing willingness or a failing ability to compete on an equal footing with men in certain types of intellectual activities? Were they, if not downright unwilling to seek truth and fully accept it, so at least somewhat unable to do so? There are so many

categories of truth-seeking and truth-absorption. Why should just one sex excel in them all? I constantly have to come back to a field of truths limiting themselves to the purely theoretical. Would it really be such a shameful thing for women to admit that they do not excel in all fields with perfect virtuosity?

One fact seems difficult to deny. And as a researcher of blameless integrity you ought not to have any intention of denying it. There is a clear limitation happening to women's intellectual abilities. Does that limitation as well manifest itself in a definitely significant way? Yes. Philosophy is by no means the only field of intellectual knowledge, you see, in which the female sex has made a visibly mediocre contribution, as compared to the male sex.

What is this now, you may say with a considerable degree of disappointment--or with gloating satisfaction, as the case may be. Is now this author as well going to preach his own peculiar message of feminine inferiority?

WHAT SENTENCE DO OUR MATHEMATICS TEACHERS PASS? HAVE THEY TOO HATCHED OUT A BAD PLOT AGAINST THE REPUTATION OF WOMEN'S SOUND WITS?

Here is something that has hardly ever been pushed under the rug of secrecy in our modern society. It has for a long time been common knowledge in school environments in every land. Mathematics teachers have never tried to hide the simple fact that the girls in their math classes have a terribly hard time competing with the boys. Pure mathematics is a most abstract science. To the math teacher this means it is definitely the most noble of them all. So don't be surprised if HE is tempted to find a certain inferiority in individuals--or groups of individuals--who have a hard battle to fight in order to grasp things that he himself grasps with playful ease. How come that those girls do not find their way just as naturally in the age old labyrinth of pure thinking? Boys seem to get along so much better in that maze. So there must be something so far more grandiose about boys than about girls, as soon as forceful thinking becomes the great issue. And now please tell me:

Page 7

SHOULD NOT THIS NATURALLY CAUSE US TO EXPECT A LOWER IQ IN BOYS THAN IN GIRLS?

Notice, however, what really happens when educators subject the same girls and the same boys to the common test of general intelligence measurement. Then the girls reach scores just as high as the boys, sometimes even somewhat higher. How do we explain that? Have those girls suddenly got rid of their entire inferiority? Have they, through some spell of miracle or magic, blotted out every trace of their traditional deficiency in abstract thinking?

Not at all. They are still exactly as "inferior" as they used to be. Just examine those parts of the IQ test that demand of them, inexorably, that they should think, not practically but theoretically, not in a concrete way but in an abstract way, not with their "hearts" but rather with their "brains". I am here distinguishing between a person's basic senses englobing his total being and, on the other hand, an abstracted intellectual grasp.

But, you may say, is there anything of that onesided abstract element in our current intelligence tests?

They are soaked with it! And that is where our women do as poorly as ever. The weird game of "pure"-brain exclusiveness is playing its merciless tricks on holistic human creatures everywhere.

What kind of "brain-wash" is this then? Well, deep down in the distant recesses of platonic philosophy--also called "idealism", here in the sense of pure-spirit-ism--there is something infinitely "precious" which is supposed to remain, after all material, bodily elements have been luckily shed, completely screened out. This is the only value the human being is assumed to get safely ashore at the steep embankments of "the other world." It is NOT *feelings* of any kind, NOT will in any direction, NOT the remembrance of any particular object enjoyed by your liberal senses in a personal world. It is exclusively something absolutely bodiless, so independent of time and space. It is *PURE INTELLECT*.

Could you think of anything more comfortless to the heart of a genuine woman? When women think, they do so with their entire body, as it were. They seem incapable of setting apart, as a separate entity, the "brain waves" phenomenon, or whatever you would like to call it. I am speaking about that "pure" thing which is supposed to get along all by itself, some bodiless specter, called the process of thinking. True philosophers is something they will evidently never be, those women folks. For inmost in their bosom there is something making rebellion against such cutting-to-pieces of totality. They just can't bear that anatomical dissection, that bloody--or should we say entirely bloodless--experiment of abstraction bloody--or should we say entirely bloodless--experiment of abstraction.

So how do our women folks manage the task of grasping that blessed "purity" right out of the air? They manage miserably. Let us express it conservatively. Women pose as mediocre thinkers, by and large.

And now comes the most surprising thing of all: What is the final score resulting from these intelligence tests? Women have the incredible thing happening to them that they end up obtaining IQ testimonials bearing something pretty equivalent to the following inscription: "JUST AS INTELLIGENT AS MEN." Or sometimes even: A TINY BIT *MORE* INTELLIGENT THAN MEN.

What a heavenly bliss! What unexpected factor could it be that has here eventually come to a poor female's rescue in the final analysis? What element in those intelligence tests has been strong enough to raise her scores sufficiently to place her on the lever of veritable men, or at times even a "tiny bit" *above*?

How could I, in the special approach of my research project, find plausible reasons to explain the apparently inexplicable?

WHAT IS THE FUNDAMENTAL NATURE OF FEELINGS?

Women's expertise is in the realm of feelings, people say, *not* in the realm of thought. So let us first try to get some basic insights regarding that prominent field of feminine competence. Is, generally speaking, an abundance of feelings a good or a bad sign?

How do people, by and large, appreciate the fact that feelings do exist in such and such a person's human breast? Who are the ones enjoying the glory of being declared "winners" in this domain of life? Is it men or women? Let me begin with one

fact I have been able to establish as fairly certain: Very few people would think it particularly great for a person to be without any feelings whatsoever.

This reminds me of the birth of certain abnormal children. They come into the problematic world without any sensitivity, physically speaking. If such a child falls down from his chair and even hurts himself considerably, he may not cry at all. His body being rather feelingless, he just does not have any sensation of pain. So he simply shows the "sympathetic behavior" of "not making any fuss about it."

Some thoughtless parent might say: "Oh dear, I wish I had children like that. Mine make a terrible commotion at the mere idea of being hurt."

Page 9

Be careful about the way you express your wishes. How fortunate, that most of our silly wishes never materialize. Did you ever hear about the couple who had the fabulous experience coming to them that they could have three wishes fulfilled, choosing freely, but no more than just three things. So they were supposed to reflect carefully before they expressed their choices. Unfortunately it so happened that the wife failed to have sufficient control over her thoughts--or feelings, call it whatever you like. All of a sudden she expressed aloud a wish that most people would consider as regrettably superficial in this case. The couple were extremely poor, and she may have been terribly hungry. The wish into which both her mind and her mouth suddenly exploded was this one: "How I wish I had a good fat sausage lying on this empty plate in front of me." The next thing happening was that the sausage was realistically lying there, as nice and as appetizing as could be. The husband did not feel convinced that the happening was all that nice. It irritated him immensely that his wife had so light-mindedly squandered one of the three wishes. That anger on his part appeared just as difficult to repress as had been the material concupiscence expressed a moment ago by his better half. Before he knew what he was actually doing, his anger exploded--in the form of a wish: "How I wish that sausage were securely fastened to your nose."

Dash!-- In less time than it had taken for the husband to express that not particularly pious wish regarding his wife and the sausage, the reddish-brown monster moved from the plate to the woman's nose, attaching itself solidly to it. What could they do now? There was just one more wish left. And that one was desperately needed in order to put things straight again. For of course the good lady could not spend the rest of her life in that awkward condition. Her hideously long nose had to come down to its normal size. And there all three wishes were used up to no avail.

What the story should teach us is the importance of having the right kind of wishes in our lives and of being careful to express them in a right way. A while ago we mentioned a very wrong wish expressed very carelessly. I am referring to the unwise parents saying that they would rather have children of an entirely different kind, namely the kind that never cry because they never feel hurt. Would you really like to have a child of that absolutely insensitive kind?

Once bitten, twice shy. Thus goes an English proverb. Does it express a sound reaction? To be sure. Some languages put it this way: "A burnt child shuns the fire." Now, what would happen to a child of that other kind? Would he draw back with equal swiftness the finger he some day happened to put into the fire of a candle? Not at all. He would keep it there for any length of time, without making "any fuss about it", without shedding one single tear? If that is your wish for him, then there is a desperate need of

a new wish neutralizing the first one. Without sensitiveness there is simply no hope of survival.

Page 10

FEELINGS ARE A GOOD THING, BUT . . .

"Well, well," may be the hesitant remark of some man at this point, "let us admit that much. Feelings ARE a blessed thing. But should there not be a definite limit to all good things?" This is where the seamy side of the matter comes in. "Women just do not know any limit in their feelings, and particularly in the way they give expression to them. In women's lives there are veritable Niagaras of feelings. This is indeed a bit too much of a good thing."

Some will even say, it is a definitely EVIL thing. To tell the truth, this seems to be the prevailing idea among men about women and their feelings. An entire world has evidently agreed to look more or less down upon the female sex as "those emotionally unbalanced ones." More exactly expressed, they are not only "the unbalanced sex." They are the "hysterical sex." You didn't fail to register that harsh verdict, did you?

Who would dare to deny certain notorious facts of that order? It is too well-known indeed that a woman will "start up in panic" and "squeal like a stuck pig", as soon as the tiniest mouse happens to run across her kitchen floor. It would serve no purpose to try and explain away those every-day occurrences that everybody knows and comments upon, would it?

But then once more something rather unbelievable happens. It almost stuns those who are attentive enough to notice it. And just WHEN does it happen? It usually happens at the moment when danger and pain--real danger and real pain this time--come into a woman's life. They announce themselves, not as casual and transitory guests. No, they come as members of the household, so to speak. They come to stay. This may be in the form of wars. It may be in the form of some serious illness. In all events it is something that cannot be brushed aside by means of crying out in a more or less melodramatic manner. It is not something that can be warded off by throwing up one's arms hysterically. It is simply too severe, too realistic, for that. It has to be borne.

At that moment a radical change seems to be taking place in the feminine pattern of behavior. The inexplicable has once more forced itself upon men's attention: That same little woman, who once screamed and fretted, and probably caused her male companion to look down upon her as a definitely inferior partner--inferior precisely in the ability to bear pain--, the very same woman is now prepared to bear a world of pain,--without a sob, without a word of complaint. SHE is the brave one,--braver than any man.

Page 11

A SHOCKING STATEMENT ABOUT PRONENESS TO SHOCK

Here the statistics from war fields and hospital wards are strangely unanimous in their testimony. Authoritative public reports tell us the story with a peremptoriness beyond dispute. Take for instance what our psychologists and psychiatrists have reported from the terrible Blitz over England at the early stages of the Second World War. How did women and men, respectively, react to the ordeal they had to go through during those hectic weeks of incessant bombardment from German airplanes which

were supposed to decide the war in the course of that brief summer season? The results of comparative investigations carried out by experts on that occasion will be quoted later, when we shall endeavor to explain it, to the best of our ability, giving reasons for the apparently unreasonable. May it suffice, so far, to state the immediate findings. One of the researchers, Frank D. Long, reports as follows in his survey, entitled "Women Less Prone to Bomb Shock than Men."

"IT MAY BE THAT WOMEN ARE MORE EMOTIONAL IN ROMANCE BUT THEY ARE LESS SO IN AIR RAIDS."

Women seemed to have some "mysterious shield against the nerve-shattering effects of war noises." They performed the jobs at hand "with calmer deliberation."

So we have again seen two opposite sides of the same coin. Its controversial nature was part of the apparent ambiguity I myself had to cope with for some time in my research regarding peculiarities of the feminine mind. Could there be unity in the midst of the contrasts, or just disruption? How could the very divergences make a harmonious pattern? Was the case of the women a still more dubious one than most researchers had ever suspected? Normally one of the least promising cases is when a test person reacts differently to the same stimuli from one day to the other. Was the result going to reveal that women do not have a minimum of decent consistency even in the "BAD qualities" ascribed to them? To be super-sensitive and proof against sensitivity almost simultaneously, could a combination of opposites like that spell normality?

Page 12

OPTIMISM IN THE WORK WITH DIFFERENTIAL PSYCHOLOGY ASKS SOME ENTIRELY DIFFERENT QUESTIONS

Why not this series of positive view-points for the purpose of explaining the inexplicable:

Could there still exist, right in the midst of this apparent inconsistency, some meaningful pattern asserting itself, some hidden order in the apparent disorder, some secret sense in the apparently non-sensical, some deeper purpose in the apparent purposelessness? Why should not a modern brand of imaginative thinking suggest some sort of "radar screen", installed by the loving solicitude of a Creator who has from the beginning made the design of creative motherliness?

In my on-going research I was soon assailed by all those crucial, but also wonderfully promising questions, a weird mixture of hope and despair.

Across an otherwise gloomy horizon there appeared flashes of lightning, at times somewhat scaring, but still tinted with the bright colors of incipient promise. They seemed to lend rays of intelligent insight to an old hunch: Was there, in the friendly skies of feminine aeronautics, some kind of majestically rising "control tower," assuring safe landings in the densest darkness of troubled nights? How could the uninitiated observer expect to read the message sent out? He just can't, if he lacks the code that causes it to make sense? The underlying principles would just have to escape his attention, simply because they form part and parcel of a security system entirely unknown to his sphere of intelligence. Why should not the explanation in your case and

mine be one as simple as that? We may just lack the indispensable receiver mechanism. So we fail to register even the remotest buzz of a voice. Nevertheless it is a voice as clear as crystal, to the perception of feminine intuition. And why not with a message approximately like this:

"Now, watch out, little maid of the intuitive sorority. See to it that you behave with dignity and calm deliberation in the special matter confronting you at this very moment. Its inherent nature is such that it demands a firm control of your entire being. That attitude on your part is now imperative for your coping with it in an adequate and victorious manner. Please don't be led astray by the equally good instruction you were given as late as yesterday night. Conditions then were essentially different. The matter confronting you on that occasion were simply such that you could still, without any risk of harm, give free course to even entire floodgates of feelings. This helped you to relax and be of good cheer. Not so today. On this serious occasion your very essence as a woman demands stern reserve, sobriety and self-control. Pluck up your courage, little maid. The full victory is in sight right behind those dark clouds of a troubled present. The future is still yours."

Page 13

Just imagine, so far, that an aeronautic control tower of that kind does exist in our women's world, flashing its message through the ether, securing their safe flight through the twilight regions of an ambiguous borderland. If so, then why should it be impossible to unravel the apparent mystery, decipher the code language of this peculiar type of human aeronautics? On the contrary, it ought to be entirely possible to get hold of some basic rules for what has here established itself as rock-bottom verity in a neglected field of intelligent research. The result of such tireless investigation might be insights shedding wonderful light on fields of inquiry of other related environments as well, -- an open door toward treasures of knowledge which might enrich the lives of both men and women immeasurably.

WHICH SEX IS THE MORE SENTIMENTAL IN MATTERS OF L O V E ?

My introduction could not reasonably skip this most important issue of all. I am referring to that GREATEST THING IN THE WORLD: Love, -- alias Agape, the fundamental motif above all fundamental motifs. For with this we have arrived at the aim par excellence of our present study, a new formulation of the *battle* par excellence between the *motifs* par excellence. That is, the all-out war of the ages between Agape and Eros. In my research, this coincides with the war between Alterocentricity (Other-centeredness) and Ego-centricity (Self-centeredness). The most dramatic thing that ever happened in the historic battlefield of planet Earth.

All the time during my research in the history of ideas of the Western World it was my hope to find some kind of common denominator for essential things happening, with widely varying labels of "good" or "bad" in different fields of human endeavor. That dawning hope was changed into glowing anticipation, as one day I reached a distinctive milepost on my pathway toward secure knowledge. This promised to make the non-understandable understandable, the enigma non-enigmatic. My characterological studies had come to a point where our women themselves seem to have no doubts or disagreements. They are unanimous in stating that this is the one thing of capital importance in their lives: love.

LOVE IS AN AFFAIR OF THE HEART: SO IT IS BOUND TO BE EMOTIONAL!

Nobody would dare to deny that love has something to do with affairs of the human heart. So how could it help having something to do with emotions? In this field women have become famous--or infamous--for a boundless degree of emotionality. They have gone on record as being hopelessly subjective in their evaluations of life's most basic realities. In all matters related to love the fair sex is said to be wildly unrealistic. Accordingly, they are unreliable, absolutely, in all matters pertaining to this central area of life! Their unpredictable emotional vibrations cause them to be living liabilities of potent danger to the society they form a part of.

And then again, what do I see all of sudden? Quite unexpectedly, right in the midst of that "crazy passion," called love, women abandon themselves to something remarkable. They keep referring to it as a realism they just cannot leave in the lurch.

Realism!--Did you ever hear anything more fantastic? What a sensational about-face movement (a U-turn 180 degrees) of the whole matter under discussion. The male population of the debating club are dumbfounded. We shall have a good look at that phenomenon, too, later on, in an honest attempt to have it integrated into a larger--and truly meaningful--totality. So far, we just pass on, immediately basing ourselves on that mentioned flabbergasting claim of realism, on the part of women. Why not make it, tentatively, our very postulate? We simply accept the daring contention of that little woman, as she faces the issue of love, in terms of a capital matter in her very life, biologically speaking. What that "realism" she boasts of implies, is nothing more and nothing less than the following: Before she can go to the serious "business" of really loving any "candidate" of the opposite sex, she makes a great condition, a sort of *sine qua non*. The absolutely necessary prerequisite she suggests, is that the "guy" should be truly lovable; that is, in himself, with all he objectively stands for, really worthy of her genuine admiration and sober-minded esteem. That worthiness is what she has firmly resolved to make the basis--or an integrating part--short and sweet, of her love affair.

Now what do you think about such a woman lover and the critical requirements she has made her own? If that rumor holds good, you can hardly deny, can you, that this must testify to something fundamentally realistic in her attitude.

Of course a further question may here have to rise up in all its critical severity: Is realism, necessarily and inherently, a good thing? Is rationality a real boon, something to be truly desired? Some philosophers and theologians, exerting a tremendous influence in our world today, do claim the very opposite. In my book *The Part of the Story You Were Never Told about Agape and Eros*, I give a thorough study to a case of libel as shocking as that. Here a researcher as outstanding and as world famous as Anders Nygren seems to have convinced ever one that Agape, the Love above all loves, is just IRRATIONAL! In that irrationality it is believed to find its greatest glory. I have permitted myself to challenge basically that idea. For I do have a firm belief in Realism. In Biblical philosophical terminology that Realism is rendered as THE LOVE OF THE TRUTH. And without that, how could there be anything good left in all our speculation?

BUT WHEN DID THE TYPICAL WOMAN'S LOVE BEGIN TO DISTINGUISH ITSELF AS RATIONAL?

Well, whether you believe me or not: a similar trend of sober REALISM is exactly what I claim to be characteristic of a true woman's attitude toward love. In due course, and with due accuracy, we are going to quote an outstanding researcher in this field of study, an internationally renowned woman anthropologist. Briefly summed up she actually says:

A typical woman cannot love a man whom she does not esteem and admire, a man whom she KNOWS to be unworthy. She just does not manage that kind of acrobacy in her love life. True, she may very well fall wildly in love with an unworthy man, a contemptible man. But then that is for this simple reason: She has not yet come to a point where she is able to see him that way. She still sees him as perfectly admirable, maybe also as just the poor victim of other people's cruel slander and misrepresentation. To protect the unfortunate guy from the cruel effects of that slander, and rehabilitate his record, that is precisely what she sees as the first great mission of her life as his bride elect. On the other hand, "as soon as she becomes convinced that he is really worthy of contempt, she ceases to love him."--"To a MAN," says our author, "the very opposite may easily happen. Many men love--even to the extreme of suicide and murder--women whom they despise or believe completely unworthy."

Now do differences between the sexes, as here expressed, have anything to substantiate them in the standard findings of modern differential psychology? If so, then of course the question must naturally arise: Is not this a double set of apparently contradictory facts once more observed in human life? How can that be reasonably accounted for in terms of reliable scientific research? How can it make sense, I mean in terms of simple common-sense logic? Can one and the same person be basically romantic, sentimental, subjective, in short a hopeless scatter-brain,--and then also basically realistic, logical, so what all sound science would call objective and matter-of-fact-minded?

Page 16

DOES A WOMAN SAYING "LOVE" MEAN SOMETHING WIDELY DIFFERENT FROM WHAT A MAN MEANS?--

There is something here we must get to know more about. It might make a tremendous difference if we really did know it, and were able to cope with it intelligently.

The same research suggests other facts of a remarkable nature. Among boys and girls in our environment those facts are certainly not common knowledge. The word "love", our anthropologist claims, has a widely different sense to a woman, as compared to a man. A woman believes she is loved according to a special criterion of her own. But the man loves her according to another and rather opposite criterion. "That is a fateful thing," she adds.

I would not be surprised. If this is true, then what here happens between men and women must be fraught with destiny. For this comprehension gap would mean a deadlock in elementary inter-human communication. Men fail to understand women, and women fail to understand men.

What particular man and what particular woman? The very man, the very woman, who claim solemnly that they love each other. As human beings we cannot

afford to live in ignorance about things affecting our simple every-day existence so tremendously.

One special aspect of this enigma-studded inquiry has aroused my curiosity and kept it captive in a more overwhelming way than any other, as the riddles are gradually being unraveled. I am referring to the spiritual aspect. What will these differences reveal regarding the deepest recesses of human characters? How can any theologian or any historian of ideas, once confronted with so intriguing a theme as that of human love, fail to ask himself: What does all this mean in terms of the historic battle in our world between Agape and Eros? For such a long time had I felt an urgent need of arriving at some tenable theory, some truly satisfying insight. This urge has been pushing me forward all the time. It is not merely an urge of the common human curiosity type, but an existential urge. "To be or not to be, that is here the question."

Page 17

PART 2

The Positive Term that Failed to Make its Way into the Dictionary, Simply Because the Corresponding Negative One was so Much More Fascinating

The famous British scholar Samuel Johnson was once asked, "Who do you think is the more intelligent, man or woman?"

"Well," said Mr. Johnson with a smile, "that all depends...WHAT man, WHAT woman?"

To some this may seem the only expedient way to wiggle out of a most controversial topic. The question we are here asking is not a less controversial one: "Who is the more egocentric, man or woman?"

"Are you looking for a quarrel?" may be your first response.

No, I am looking for something infinitely better, something about which our world has an incredibly poor knowledge, in spite of the fact that it must be assumed to be a fundamental motif in human life, actually an absolute prerequisite, indispensable for elementary soundness and success. The proper name for it is Alterocentricity. Is that known to you?

"I never so much as heard about it in all my life," you may answer.

I do not blame you. Even some of the largest standard dictionaries have evidently not felt that the time has yet come to register it. Strange enough, by the way. Most people seem to be fairly familiar with the notion of Egocentricity; that is, just the rather negative motif that causes so much trouble in most environments. But obviously one has not found it urgent at all to have in readiness even a name for the opposite force.

But let us just as well coin a new name then, and why not just one that is entirely English and immediately understandable: Other-centeredness. That is the opposite of Self-centeredness.

To begin with, we may consider this biopolarity from a mainly psychological point of view, without any onesided stress on moral and religious evaluations. Some people are born with a prevailingly alterocentric (other-centered) disposition as their natural trend. That is a sort of temperament,- just as the "sanguine", or the "extrovert" is a

notion of temperament. The other-centeredness of a human individual then means exactly what it says: That individual tends to place the center of his (or her) life OUTSIDE himself (herself) rather than IN himself (herself). What is central (most important) is the "other ones", other persons, other things. This seems to be where some people find their main values.

Now, this difference in temperaments or natural mental dispositions was something I had studied for a fairly long time, like psychologists usually do, in terms of a trend directed either more inward (the intro-vert) or more outward (the extrovert). That is the subject of differential psychology.

But here we cannot limit ourselves to speaking about other-centeredness versus self-centeredness as mere temperaments, without any moral implications whatsoever. The moment must come when we speak most seriously about the altero-centric CHARACTER versus the ego-centric CHARACTER. And that certainly is not the realm of a purely amoral (non-moral) science. There might be something basically evil about me if my character is fundamentally self-centered, ego-centric. To be other-centered in terms of a well-integrated wholeness in human life, this is bound to be the great ideal. So my determination has been to arrive at the full facts about altero-centricity as a fundamental motif in human life. That is the way the principle of the New Testament term of Agape has to be studied, as an ideal making you overwhelmed-almost speechless-with wonder

PART 3

Sex Difference in Alterocentricity

It so happened that I had seen differential psychology as a natural field in which to go hunting for promising clues leading, maybe, to a treasury of precious information of the truly holistic kind.

From times immemorial this world of ours has stood in front of a fascinating image-that of the mother and her child. What is the secret force binding those two together with such unconquerable bonds? What is the main element in the MOTHERLY? And what is the main element of the CHILDLIKE? Is there a common trait characterizing the mother and the child? I do think I have grasped one remarkable characteristic constantly pervading, and deliberately molding, the patterns of behavior in both motherliness and childlikeness. That is a certain movement OUTWARDS. Is there something in terms of an essential OTHER-CENTERED outreach that the WOMAN and the CHILD do have, and which the MAN and the ADULT do not have? How could anyone prevent me from asking that question, and from going to the field of study where some answer could be expected?

On the other hand, I honor as absolutely legitimate the question you may here raise: How could any researcher nourish any reasonable hope of arriving at any really worth-while insights regarding a matter as spiritually profound as that problematic one about altero-centricity versus ego-centricity, by simply comparing women and men? How could a spiritually well-balanced person hit upon an approach as "non-spiritual" as that?

I simply knew what all people know. First this: it is an unshakeable biological fact that men are different from women in essential respects. What is a woman's great biological assignment? It is to bear and rear children. Does a man have any biological mission of precisely that nature? Not at all. Hence certain structural features in the respective physiological constitutions of men and women are fundamentally different. So why should not their psychological dispositions be fundamentally different as well, in some respects? I have posed this biological datum as a basic one for my further thesis.

It would be natural to assume that just the mentioned fundamental sex difference in biological assignments would provide an evident basis for some corresponding and equally demonstrable differences between a fundamentally feminine PSYCHE and a fundamentally masculine PSYCHE.

And why should not such differences reveal themselves exactly as differences between the prevailingly altero-centric (other-centered) and the prevailingly ego-centric (self-centered)? The child is a great center any potential mother has had installed, from creation on, in her very life. If this is so, then we here have a most prolific and most promising field for deeper study of the true nature of OTHER-CENTEREDNESS as a fundamental motif.

Of course I was fully aware of difficulties that might arise, and the necessity of making cautious moves here. Works like those of the famous American anthropologist Margaret Mead, and many others, regarding certain strange variations in the patterns of masculine versus feminine behavior, from one culture to another, invite to caution. Such reports of culturally based sex differences will not only fill the reader with wonder. They also tend to make him very careful in his conclusions. Our attention is called to races and cultures presenting group characteristics sometimes almost diametrically opposite to those we have otherwise been accustomed to consider as the only natural and the only possible ones. Of course such discoveries should make the investigator circumspect in his endeavor to establish the existence of really original psychological differences between the sexes. But they should not cause him to despair of finding ANY such differences. No evidence has been given, thus far, to prove their non-existence. On the contrary, we have good reason to feel convinced still that some absolutely fundamental sex differences in psychological attitudes do exist.

ARE WOMEN INFERIOR? IF SO, HOW AND WHY?

Here I should perhaps insert just a remark on the hardships and serious suspicious to which a man in our environment exposes himself, if he has the temerity to state bluntly: "Men are more egocentric than women." First he should know what he can expect from his fellow males with an "anti-masculinist" doctrine of that kind. He immediately risks being branded as a treacherous type of heretic. Some zealous crowd of scandalized representatives of his own sex might see to it that he is duly taken to task for his heresy. Of course it may take some time before he is actually seized by the collar and burnt on the stake. But he would always be well advised to use those precious moments of respite wisely. He should quickly pull out the best arguments he can find in support of his audacious statement.

Page 20

Jokes aside- the social relations between the sexes have developed into a bitter fight of prestige and leadership. In our civilization man has, to a large extent,

established himself as the dominant sex. But the women have not accepted that domination without some serious protest.

It would be strange if this prolonged battle of the centuries--a more serious battle than many jestful commentators seem to think--had failed to produce a certain amount of muddled thinking. Slogans and cliches exert a fabulous power over mankind. Even the most sober-minded may sometimes yield to rash conclusions and ridiculous generalizations: Women are so stupid, so and so depraved. Or--MEN are; it all depends on the sex of the person who happens to be evaluating the situation at the moment, and indulges in flinging out that evaluation.

In this part of my work I shall frequently speak about "typically feminine" and "typically masculine" traits of character. As a rule I then think of femininity and masculinity as general concepts, not the special femininity and the special masculinity of our present culture.

But particularly ONE thing should be kept in mind: In all such cases: I do not for a moment imagine that I have, with this, established any infallible facts whatsoever about Mrs. Smith or Mr. Jones, or any other precious individual you, my good reader, may happen to be thinking of. For they are living persons, not abstract proto-types, adjusted to the needs of statistical research. In fact, that good Mr. Jones of your acquaintance may happen to be ten times more altero-centric, with regard to any feature we are discussing at the moment, than any woman you can think of to match him, and especially more altero-centric than some individual woman to whom you may be tempted to compare him, from the same angle. For they are living human beings, not representative types of this or that sex.

In such a study as this, I must have the right to expect to be understood by my readers without any constantly repeated apology when I state squarely: Some general tendency is more characteristic of men, some other tendency is more characteristic of women. That is all we can claim.

The great question is of course only: WHAT tendencies are more typically feminine. The prejudice of centuries has sometimes fooled a whole world into believing firmly: "This is typically masculine!" Or: "This is absolutely feminine!" And then, upon closer investigation, the very opposite might turn out to be the general fact. Sometimes stereotype evaluations of the superficial kind have proved most detrimental to women. We can understand the anger this must arouse among members of the "women's lib" movement.

Page 21

But here something else also has to be admitted: A radical and aggressive feminism has often done far more evil than good to the cause of womankind. A fomentation of angry feelings will naturally tend to perturb all diplomatic behavior and even all sensible thought. The case is understandable enough. Women have frequently felt as if they were actually left in the lurch even by the higher powers that govern the universe.

"How does it come to pass," some of them will shout excitedly, "that even the Church seems to bestow its blessing upon that atrocious injustice of the centuries? Can it be truly Christian to perpetuate this age-old prejudice of an imagined "female inferiority?"

We grasp the natural indictment implied: Should it be strictly necessary to have the discriminatory practices of this shameful myth consecrated even through the rites and dogmas of a world religion?

In fact, Christianity suggests a very simple explanation of the fact of women's sufferings and their position of inferiority and contempt in human society: The introduction of SIN into this world is the primitive cause of all discord among human beings. And wherever there is a lack of spontaneous agreement, or heart-felt respect and good-will among parties confronting each other, dominion on the one side, and submission on the other, seems to be the only solution. As things are today, the union between man and woman, also, apparently can be maintained on one condition only: One party is bound to submit to the other.

Whether the angry suffragettes of our day can be expected to have their anger calmed down by such an argument, that is of course quite another question. Perhaps they will rather insist with redoubled indignation: and ironical defiance:

"Aha, but why should it be precisely WOMAN who was destined to submit?"

There may be various answers to that question, religious ones and sociological ones,-theoretical ones and practical ones. And several of them may express the truth at the same time, perhaps each one from its own special angle.

In an unconventional discussion I once had about the prevailing inequality of the sexes I was asked just that same angry and ironical question. The answer I gave may have sounded rather paradoxical. I mention it here because I think it may give a summary, as it were, of the great apparent paradox going right through this book:

Page 22

"Why should it become just women's lot to play that part of the 'inferior'? Well, most likely for the simple reason that they are SUPERIOR."

I should take it for almost granted that most MEN, at least, in my audience on that occasion did not feel there was too much logic in my answer. But I shall try to make my logic clear. I hope the reasons I shall give will show a new way-and a better one-of evaluating things as superior versus inferior. It might turn out in the end, you see, that women's differentness from men spells superiority rather than inferiority in this particular case. Here are my reasonings:

First, in what does true superiority consist? Biologically speaking-especially in the total sense in which we shall here consistently try to look upon "bios" -the answer is clear enough: Superiority consists in adapting oneself as perfectly as possible to one's proper environment, and in meeting the requirements of life under the prevailing circumstances in a most perfect way. For certainly, the greatest challenge any individual has to face is that of life itself. His response to that challenge will decide the question of his superiority or inferiority at any given moment. Adapting oneself, however, is just the God-given specialty of the altero-centric being. Adaptability is a typically other-centered virtue. But what does that adaptation imply in the last analysis? In many cases it implies nothing less than Submission.

It requires real greatness to submit. Especially those who regard things from a spiritual angle-as well as from a material one-ought to be the first to admit this fundamental reality.

Would it be such a far-fetched and illogical assumption then to imagine that it might have something to do with a certain GREATNESS in women-a mostly unobserved

superiority-when we have to admit that they have succeeded in performing the master-stroke in human life: submission? For, after all, they have succeeded ten times better than men would probably ever have done. I shall show you a number of criteria indicating that.

Now some inveterate scientific doubters may of course consider even that undeniable feminine ability of a comparatively graceful submission from their special point of view:

"Is this an original feminine quality?" they may object. "Is it not rather a quality acquired through generations of social development toward a patriarchal system?"

That view, of course, may be adopted as a temporary hypothesis. But then there still remains one problematic question. And the doubter should not forget that he has voluntarily exposed himself to the momentous weight of that inexorably penetrating question: Why has a remarkable degree of patriarchalism been permitted to establish itself so naturally and so successfully in the great majority of known cultures?

Page 23

Modern feminist emancipation, it is true, does represent a certain reaction against the dominating position of the "strong sex" in our world. I am speaking of your present culture and mine in the Western World. Our women's lib movement has done its best to put a certain check on that trend toward patriarchalism (a male-dominated world). But, frankly, even that has surprisingly little of the inexorable extremism characterizing revolutionary reactions in general. To tell the truth, women's rebellion against the tyranny imposed upon them by men through millennia now in this culture is astonishingly modest, indeed! Why?

There must have been an intuitive comprehension in women of the fact that the maintenance of relative peace and harmony in the human family is only to be had at the price of their gracious subjection.

Havelock Ellis, too, appears to have been fairly well convinced that there must be something more original, more fundamental, than just cultural conventions at work here. Speaking about women's typical ability of submitting to society, to husbands, to duty, he says says:

"It is reasonable to suppose that women would not generally have fallen into this role unless there were some organic basis which made it natural and less arduous than it would have been in men."(3)

Now one important fact still has to be accepted regarding that valuable endowment in women of submission. We have stressed the fact that submission is part and parcel of a person's general adaptability. And adaptability is part and parcel of general alterocentricity. But that immediately raises the following question:

HOW CAN WOMEN BE ASSUMED TO POSSESS MORE OF THAT GENERAL ALTERO-CENTRICITY (OTHER-CENTEREDNESS) AS A BASIC TRAIT THAN MEN?

You have a right to be skeptical. You have a right to be surprised. I understand your serious objection: How on earth could any respectable investigator conceive even the very idea of considering fundamental sex differences in terms of altero-centricity versus ego-centricity? Is there any plausible reason whatsoever to expect fundamental

differences of that kind to exist at all? At least there ought to be some indication to start with, some minimum base of reasonability to justify such an anticipation.

Yes, you are perfectly right in demanding this.

Page 24

PART 4

A Fairly Dependable Point of Departure

Let us first admit one sound tendency in modern psychological research. It has been to reduce the role of heredity and of fundamental factors in general, as compared to environmental factors. We all realize how important and wholesome it was to react forcibly against false conceptions of the past. But in all reactions there is a danger of going to extremes. Here the danger would be that of ascribing almost everything to the transforming forces of environment and social convention. We are not here speaking about the comparatively cautious conclusions drawn by more well-balanced investigators in modern differential anthropology. But all investigations are not that cautious and well-balanced.

Would it be an unwarranted irony to say that some experts in the human sciences seem to be looking forward to one great day of final triumph for their system. That is the day when they shall be able to establish that no constitutional differences whatsoever can exist between male and female--either in body or soul.

Common sense, however, ought to warn us that we must be prepared to encounter at least some "slight" differences, after all, which just cannot be due to the omnipotent influences of society. Nobody, one may hope, would ever try to explain away the fact that the UTERUS, for instance, is a congenital feature which a woman HAS and a man does NOT have, nor will ever acquire.

And why then should one not make allowance for the theoretical possibility that some MENTAL characteristics, as well, may owe their existence--or part of their existence, anyway--to NATURE rather than to NURTURE?

What obvious natural differences, then, will impose themselves upon the attention of any reasoning observer? Considering woman from a biological point of view, what would you say is her unquestionable mission? It is to give birth to a new individual, and to bring that little one up in a satisfactory manner. This is, in the eyes of biology, the great contribution of womankind in the service of life. But how then could anybody be surprised if he should happen to find that this great reality has influenced also some general characteristics of the feminine mind, and now I am speaking about characteristics NOT NECESSARILY RELATED TO CHILDBIRTH IN A DIRECT WAY!

The direct connections are obvious enough. Bringing up a child in a really satisfactory way, that certainly does demand a great degree of self-abnegation and self-forgetfulness. If that motherly task is the natural biological assignment of women, how could one doubt that a reasonable amount of precisely altero-centricity, so indispensable to the task, has been granted to them?

Page 25

It actually becomes a woman's natural profession in life to sacrifice herself, that is, to place the center of her entire existence outside her own person. In other words, she is biologically predestined to be altero-centric.

You will notice where the emphasis of my thesis lies. Our attention should be concentrated, not so much around masculine ego-centricity, as rather around feminine other-centeredness. The former, however, naturally provides a sort of contrasting background for the latter.

Of course it cannot be denied that the immediate trend of any human being who gets aware of his existence as a unique individual, would be to look upon himself (or herself) as an obvious center. So if there is to be any deliverance from that natural self-centeredness, it is bound to come from outside. What could there be in the world a woman finds outside herself that is strong enough to impress here as being the center of her life? Her child is there. The child is a reality strong enough, and congenial enough, to her own being. The child, even before he arrives, so before he actually appears as an outside reality in her life at all, manages to assert himself as a modifying, nay a transforming, influence. Every aspect of the feminine mentality is naturally transformed by that inherent biological force of a potential maternity.

HOW FAR ARE OUR SOCIOLOGISTS RIGHT WHEN THEY SAY THAT SOCIAL PRESSURES ARE THE TRUE TRANSFORMERS OF OUR LIVES?

Who does not know today the preponderant importance the youngest schools of psychological research attach to the fabulous forces of social pressure? We perfectly understand and generally accept this point of view. We understand and accept the question these differential psychologists feel bound to ask--in our case, as well as in other cases: A person in such and such a society is seen to behave in such and such a way. But does he do that mainly because his fundamental nature is such and such?

In my special instance I should of course expect a similar question to be asked. In fact, I should ask it most eagerly myself. For a capital aim of mine should be to check the validity of my special theory. Both caution and criticism are wholesome, and indispensable to the success of my research task. So my conscience forces me to listen to the serious voice of a neutral critic evaluating the enterprise I am pursuing. "The author of the present thesis," he says, "pretends that a woman will behave in what he calls a more alterocentric way than a man. Well, if so, then why does she do it? Perhaps to a large extent simple because she feels that she is 'expected to do so'. That is a sort of 'alterocentric complaisance' we all seem to indulge in more or less. That woman is a social being. And SOCIAL beings are inevitably influenced--in many cases entirely molded--by their respective SOCIETIES."

Page 26

Thanks ever so much for every piece of criticism that tends to keep us on the right track. That urgent appeal to regard the phenomenon from a social environment angle has undoubtedly contributed toward correcting many errors and preventing many rash conclusions. Take the current example of a boy growing up in a certain culture. His social environment tells him day by day--and even in ways that are far stronger than any words: "We expect you to do this, and to feel like this. For you are a boy. You are not a girl (You are not a sissy)."

"Of course I am a boy (I am not a sissy!)." That is the boy's wholehearted response. And this too comes in ways which are stronger than words. One thing is certain: Before long he does all the things boys are supposed to do, and he even FEELS the way boys are supposed to feel. (For girls of course do tend to be sissies. To be like them--for him--would be a shame).

In other words, the accumulated expectations and the governing norms of long generations in a certain community contribute in an almost incredible degree toward forming certain stereotype codes of human behavior in that community.

These then become searching questions we cannot refuse to ask even in the case of a rather striking "alterocentric" behavior on the part of the female sex in our culture. I must accept the whole weight of this searching inquiry, launched against my special interpretation of the facts. What should prevent precisely that kind of conventional expectations and current social norms from being the most likely direct reason why women behave more alterocentrically? I fully accept this challenge on the part of the sociologist.

But notice: I am not compliant enough--or "sissy-like" enough--to stop at this stage. My questions go further, and they are questions directed toward the specialists in social psychology. Here is a capital one:

Page 27

BUT WHAT THEN, DO YOU THINK, HAS FORMED AND MOLDED WITH SUCH DILIGENCE THOSE CONVENTIONAL EXPECTATIONS AND SOCIAL NORMS IN THE FIRST PLACE?

What is it that may be logically assumed to have decided, in the course of those long generations, just HOW those expectations and norms should develop? Above all, tell me one thing: Why, for instance, do they happen to be just expectations and norms tending toward the creation of FEMININE ALTEROCENTRICITY? For just that has been the historic case, not only in our present culture, but in the majority of known cultures around the world and down through all known ages? This is the troublesome question I have to ask you very frankly. Please give me a relevant answer.

Of course the question in this case is a far deeper one. So it is also far more difficult to answer. Some will probably say it is a question for philosophers and not for men of sober scientific research, as the naturalist knows science.

I admit that the question of the origin of the norms themselves is a more difficult question. It is bound to be. At least so with the current methods of empirical research applied today in the field of social psychology. And I perfectly understand the psychologist's reluctance against going all the way back to that deeper question, demanding that it should be given a fair treatment, a thorough answer. I accept his hesitations.

On the other hand, I do not understand the attitude of such social psychologists who act as if the problem never existed. How can we have any hope of ever solving a problem, as long as its very existence is denied, or at least ignored?

If a particular tendency in a particular sex (for instance other-centeredness in women) is something rather fundamental (congenital), then we would not expect that to change considerably from one environment to the other, or from one age to the other. To me one question would seem particularly worthwhile asking: Do the great majority of

known cultures give evidence of developing rather DIFFERENT or fairly SIMILAR systems of sex roles? We do know that some cultures, available for modern sociological research, have surprised the investigators precisely because they appeared quite exceptionally divergent from what the investigators were used to "at home." The tasks and special activities women in the United States might seem to assume as "quite natural" in *their* society, would be considered as totally improper ("fundamentally unfeminine") by women in some island in the South Seas. Again and again we are speechless with wonder and agree wholeheartedly with the investigator that different environments produce thoroughly different views and attitudes in the people concerned.

But please remember one thing: Here, as in so many other instances, the special angle from which the observer (even a trained anthropologist such as Margaret Mead) happens to view the matter at issue (in this case the "striking divergences") may be quite decisive for the eventual interpretations individually arrived at to account-- "intelligently" --for the phenomena observed. You and I, children of the Western world, will start out from the idea, for instance, that a woman is "less at home" in a field of labor (HARD work) than a man is. Therefore, as tourists (or anthropological scholars) visiting a distant land in which women have the function as the main bread-winners, for instance taking care of the work of the fishermen, we are astonished indeed.

Page 28

Would it make any difference if, from the outset, you happened to consider women in general as equally "laborious", or even MORE laborious" than men? Certainly. You would in a way be duly prepared for what you were going to observe-- together with Margaret Mead the great anthropologist, or, on your own, as a simple tourist, visiting the land of the Tschambuli people. You would find nothing but what you had expected all the time, namely a pattern of tough female laboriousness. Do you see how it may happen that what one author might describe as extremely divergent, comparing two population groups, could easily be interpreted as NOT SO DIVERGENT AT ALL by another author. As for Margaret Mead and her "Tschambuli problem" I shall have to come back to details about this in a later chapter entitled: "Art versus Artlessness."

The impression that has overwhelmed me particularly after I got more deeply into a systematic study of the strange subject of Other-Centeredness, is rather this: In human cultures, by and large, the distribution of sex roles in one, has a visible and most remarkable relationship to that of the other. How can we intelligently explain that fairly close relationship? Must we not assume the probable existence of some common original factor having its due part in the molding of sex roles in all known societies?

THE REVOLUTIONIZING REALITY I PLAN TO DEMONSTRATE TO MY READER, AS WE PROCEED

The astonishing findings of differential psychology today will be just one tool used in order to make the drama of an ongoing battle between fundamental motifs in human lives stand out in its destiny-molding significance. The thing we must get to know, before it is too late, is what Alterocentricity really involves. This is where our special study of the two sexes and their respective reactions becomes invaluable. The conventional norms for a general female pattern of behavior, as I have come to envision

them, have one great feature in common. And that is, unfortunately, one that does not always seem to strike our eye so easily. At least popular opinion seems to have much difficulty in grasping it. It obviously demands a certain degree of deeper reflection-in OUR culture at any rate-to discover that those norms constantly converge toward this strange thing I have called Alterocentricity. But that convergence, once you have discovered it, is as clear as noonday.

Page 29

And here then comes the question I venture to send out in advance, even before I have started to give any substantial evidence of the tenability of my postulate: How does it come to happen that all those norms of female reactions find themselves knit together in that great knot of "feminine alterocentricity"? Whoever could it be that gave the word of command, as it were, to the fabulous forces molding norms and roles in human societies:

"Whatever you do to women, be sure that you do allow them to remain CONSISTENTLY ALTEROCENTRIC in all the varying forms of their multifarious developments!"

What in the world is it that makes women more sensitive, not only to the demands of pure biological survival, but also to the solemn voice of a definitely ethical admonition:

"Don't take that course of conduct there, dear little lass, but rather this morally safe one! And please stick to that moral rule throughout your life!"

Does nature as such have a mysterious faculty of intuition? I firmly believe that there is SOMETHING fixed and fundamental in feminine nature,-yes, SOMETHING which may always suffice to account for an astonishing constancy right in the midst of fluctuating elements on all hands.

I am by no means against what differential psychologists are doing today. They should with unabated vigor continue their important efforts to clarify the influences certain social pressures keep exerting on men and women respectively, causing their respective behaviors to become different. But all the time they must keep in mind that truly congenital biological factors also have their part to play in the process. Our theories and logical conclusions must be kept free from insidious falsifications. Even those very norms and roles that have eventually been consecrated as the "only adequate patterns of behavior" for a given group of individuals, may quite well, in the last analysis trace their origin back to some set of genuine biological factors.

Fortunately a doctrinaire rigidity and prejudice is not the rule in modern research. The absolute reign of the cultural factors has not managed to become an inexorable dogma. Complementary alternatives are free considered. A Norwegian researcher, Brun Gulbrandsen, may be cited as an example. In his work KJØNNSROLLE OG UNGDOMS-KRIMINALITET (1958)--Sex Role and Juvenile Delinquency--he sums up such an alternative in a way suggestive of a wise and realistic compromise:

Page 30

"Some authors try to explain the difference in behavior (between men and women) on the basis of biological differences. Others focus their attention mostly on differences in social conditions. The best way to attack this fundamental problem seems to be to find out how much could be explained by the latter, the rest being left to biology." (P. 169)

That impresses me as a fair deal. I would like to add, though, a suggestion to be considered without prejudice by the differential psychologist: Why should there not be cases in which priority might be granted to a more concentrated study for the purpose of registering just original causes residing in the purest biology. In other words, for some time the researcher might do his best to find out precisely how much could reasonably be explained by that blessed biology,--and leaving the rest to society (loaning our formulation directly, *mutatis mutandis*, of course, from Gulbrandsen's proposal).

You may be interested to know that Gulbrandsen draws an interesting conclusion from just demonstrable sex differences in one particular field, that of CRIMINALITY. His statements in that connection should have a considerable degree of general validity; his question might be summed up in this way:

SINCE AN EQUALIZATION OF THE TWO SETS OF SEX ROLES IS WHAT HAS GRADUALLY BEEN TAKEN PLACE FOR A LONG TIME, WHY HAVE NOT WOMEN TENDED TO BECOME EQUAL TO MEN IN THE FIELD OF CRIMINALITY AS WELL?

"During the last hundred years there have been great changes in the social roles of the two sexes. The changes have in general been described as an equalization of the two sets of roles. If this is true, and if social conditions do influence the crime rate, one would expect a more equal participation in crime by members of the two sexes. But such has not been the case, according to official data." (Op. cit. p. 170)

The author adds, it is true, that this does not UNEQUIVOCALLY support the biological theories. I shall have more to say, of course, about this. How is criminality versus non-criminality related to ego-centricity versus altero-centricity? You do have a hunch, I am sure, that there must be some definite relationship.

Page 31

By the way, I must say I do share the author's belief that the concrete results of that "Equalization Process" has been exaggerated. In fact, no environmental influence whatever would, in itself, be sufficient to make a woman do or feel exactly as a man does or feels. In order to manage a metamorphosis of that kind she would first have to cease being a woman. In other words, her very essence would have to be changed. And one of the essential features of her being is just alterocentricity.

I do not plan to involve myself in any subtle theoretical demonstration of this. The practical facts must speak for themselves. My main objective all the time will be to accumulate cogent facts about the nature of alterocentricity as a positive trait of human character. To that end we shall study a number of personality features, one by one. How is alterocentricity related to introversion versus extroversion, to certain forms of human intelligence, such as abstract reasoning versus intuition? How is it related to

activity versus passivity, to artistic abilities, to humor, to verbosity, to such serious phases of social life as morals and religion, to more material ones, such as economics and politics, to attitudes as important--and as popularly fascinating--as those toward marital relations, and so on, and so forth.

What I have already intimated regarding the real nature and final aim of my planned presentation may have sufficed to give the reader a fair idea of the kind of approach he is entitled to expect. It will not mainly be the approach of experimental psychology. It will, to a much larger extent, be that of the history of ideas. Differential psychology is here bound to play a rather accidental role. A comparison between the sexes is merely an expedient instrument, in a preparatory phase of the presentation, enabling me to convey a more graphical image of the tremendous reality my special concept of altero-centricity stands for in the history of mankind, as well as in the life and destiny of every single human individual.

**IT IS JUST IN THE ACT OF TURNING OUTWARD (TOWARD THE OTHER ONES--
THE *OTHER ONE*) THAT A MAN HAS HIS ONLY CHANCE OF BECOMING WHOLE
AGAIN (FINDING SALVATION)**

It will soon be realized that the wider topic of this work is *human character as an integrated totality*. I shall demonstrate how the very act of turning wholeheartedly outward causes the wonder of simple integration to happen instantaneously.

Very early did I realize that a work like this would be sadly deficient if the relevant findings of thorough research in modern psychology were not taken into consideration. So I found it worthwhile to spend some time--for a professional historian of ideas a good number of years-- obtaining an over-all view of the field, as well as gathering facts having a special bearing on the topic at hand.

Page 32

Now material sciences generally content themselves, in all matters of differential research, with pointing out the objective differences, and the direct causes of those differences,--perhaps also their immediately visible and plainly measurable consequences, but without any deeper evaluation of "good" or "evil".

This would not make perfect sense in the case of programs of investigation dealing particularly with the human mind,--especially not those including the realms of the SPIRIT in the widest meaning of the word. Here one cannot so easily abstain from moral evaluation. But one requirement must be absolute: Such evaluations should never be permitted to distort fundamental facts of either history or nature. Any authentic data of even purely material sciences are sacred, just as well as spiritual truths. They must not, in any way, be strained or perverted just to adapt themselves to the "verification" of certain theories regarding a "more spiritual" world.

If we are to attach any meaning or dependability to serious research, then it will have to remain an unshakeable principle of our psychological and our philosophical anthropology that all verifiable truths about man must be respected as inviolable and holy. Accordingly, the truths about man, described as "material", and the truths about that same man described as "spiritual", just cannot be supposed to be mutually incongruous, in the sense that there is necessarily a bottomless gulf between them. The nature of their encounter is not a mood of irreconcilable antagonism. In the reliable

findings of serious human investigation so far, there is no basis for any assumptions of that sort. On the contrary, there must be every logical reason to assume something definitely consistent about those two "heterogeneous" fields of anthropological investigation (the "physical" one and the "spiritual" one): Being, both of them, authentic phases of one and the same reality, MAN, there is bound to be the most harmonious relation between them. Accordingly it should also be of the greatest advantage to consider them side by side in order to elucidate the full truth. We are not satisfied with a lacerated truth. That would be contrary to all genuine humanity, and to life itself.

Page 33

PART 5

Abstract versus Concrete Modes of Thinking

ARE WOMEN MORE INTELLIGENT IN WAYS WHICH THE INTELLIGENCE TESTS JUST FAIL TO REGISTER?

First, how would it be reasonable to assume that Alterocentricity is related to the two forms of intellectual activity here placed opposite each other? It goes almost without saying that a person having the center of his existence in the external world will tend toward a concrete mode of thinking rather than an abstract one. Abstractions do have their reality in the depths of man's interior world. The more you close your eyes, for a contemplative inward look, the better you seem able to cope with pure abstractions. We call this introspection, which simply means turning one's gaze inward. Philosophers usually show an outstanding capacity for that kind of intellectual activity. The point of gravity will here tend to be the inside rather than the outside.

You should know what kind of world we happen live in here today. It is a cultural environment in which just abstract intelligence enjoys a tremendous prestige. Whether that prestige is fully justified, considered from the point of view of life as a totality, is another question. The mental equipment needed by an all-around human being, comprises a wide range of different faculties. We may theoretically break this down into various forms of intelligence. There is scholarly intelligence, social intelligence, religious intelligence, and so on, and so forth. To cut them apart is our usual disruptive habit. Here I must at once express my deep regret at the rather stepmotherly treatment that has been given to most practical types of intelligence. This realm of human thought impresses many people of great influence in our society as something so "pitiably" concrete--just like cabbages and potatoes--that they hesitate to give them a status on the level of true thinking at all. Our world today simply fails to realize what admirable feats are being accomplished, day by day, thanks to those inconspicuous forms of human intelligence. Their strokes of genius pass on fairly unnoticed.

THE PRESENT CRAZE OF IQ TESTING

We live in an age of an almost frantic intelligence testing. Schools and business concerns are anxious to get your IQ. Your aptitudes and abilities are measured and registered on all occasions. With mathematical accuracy one great fact must be established: Just where is your intellectual endowment to be located on that fateful scale between imbecility and genius?

Page 34

Is modern psychology able to give an approximately reliable picture of a human soul in this important respect? In fact, would it be fair to expect such ability? Probably it would be far too much, indeed. True enough our culture has reached a skill which is admirable. But at the same time it is still, in some fields, characterized by a superficiality that is horrific. In our most highly developed sciences there are deficiencies which our scientists seem to overlook completely sometimes. We often reach a degree of specialization that threatens to take away everything that is truly human. We certainly get to know more and more about less and less, until we finish by "knowing everything about nothing." This kind of specialization is bound to mean simply disintegration. How can we go on entertaining the vain hope that one limited area of research--call it psychology or anything you like--could ever be sufficient, all by itself, to really map down in a satisfactory way that vast and composite totality which is a human mind.

There is no denying: Our one-sided civilization has now for centuries regarded the faculty of abstract thinking--and the mental activities dependent on that--as the culmination of human intelligence. So where are employers looking to find their employees? Where are the promising ones of intellectual talent to be spotted? The personnel director, searching the type of man power that would help him to make his business a booming success, now invariably has his gaze turned toward the abstractly reasoning type of individual. Who is that? It is the egocentric type. No wonder that the attention proves to be one-sidedly centered around the MALE sex. Some of us still remember quite well what happened at the historic moment when the first Russian sputniks made their sensational appearance. Suddenly this caused America and other nations to rush into a scramble for super-abstraction. That automatically becomes synonymous with a super-masculinity which the world had hardly dreamt of before. Those excelling in abstract categories of thought were pushed forward into realms of study whose abstract formulas have already, on several occasions, brought our world to the brink of a precipice from which there is no salvation.

Opinions may tend to vary when we try to find the rationale for that new and rather one-sided concentration on MALES as THE INTELLIGENT ones. I may suggest one rather simple explanation: The male sex has invariably excelled in the special form of intelligence upon which our world has now put such a great premium. Perhaps I should not say "now." For that furious one-sidedness with which one here favors abstract intelligence is not to be traced back only as far as the time when Soviet space vessels entered spectacularly upon the scene. No, this has been going on for centuries and millennia.

Page 35

The judgment of critical evaluation I am here passing is not limited to a small part of our world, by the way. What we have to do with, is a case of world-wide prejudice. How could a generation, so heavily laden with deep-rooted pre-occupations regarding human intellect, be expected to discover that there is exactly the same amount of genius in women--only with a different emphasis. Women had the bad luck (or maybe not so bad after all) to excel intellectually in domains in which their genius will tend to be less conspicuous, and less subject to technical measurements.

THE IMPORTANT DISTINCTION BETWEEN BEING INTELLECTUAL AND BEING INTELLECTUALISTIC

Some may feel that this book speaks about human intellect--and particularly about its abstracting forms--in a somewhat disparaging tone. But please notice one thing: Alterocentricity, as I understand it, does not automatically imply a bluntly non-intellectual tendency. Still less does it imply an anti-intellectual tendency. In fact, if alterocentricity had been AGAINST the intellectual, then it would at the same time have been against totality in human life, and against realism. And that would have been quite contrary to my essential views of the alterocentric. No, indeed, all that can be said here with truthfulness is this: Alterocentricity is against the INTELLECTUALISTIC,--definitely so! It is important then to distinguish sharply between the INTELLECTUAL and the INTELLECTUALISTIC: The latter is just a caricature, a hideous travesty, of the former. Intellectualism represents precisely that limited spirit which splits up the real values, makes them valueless. It indulges in an extremism so vain and devoid of deeper wisdom that it becomes an actual outrage to any sound and sober intelligence. Sad to say, it does not at all see man as an inseparable whole, englobing both heart and brain and body. No, to be intellectualistic is to be vainly sophisticated. It is to worship one's own "pure" intellect, despising everything that is simple and practical.

Let me give you an example of such intellectualistic vanity, liable to jeopardize the very foundations of human totality. One of the sacred traditions of egocentric intellectualism through the ages has been that a scholar of high ranking was supposed to be more or less obscure and "scholarly" complicated in his expressions--or preferably quite incomprehensible to the common stock of human beings. Above all he was supposed to make sure that his product be as dry as the desert; that is, humanly speaking, without any zest whatsoever.

Page 36

With such unwritten laws of a secretly ravaging egocentric intellectualism hanging over his head, like a sort of Damocles sword, the scholarly writer seems bound to have a queer feeling of guilt every time he catches himself being downright understandable to quite common mortals. For by many that is considered as an unpardonable blunder. And to be even genuinely INTERESTING to such "uninitiated" readers is stigmatized as well-nigh a crime.

Strange enough, it still happens once in a while that a simple layman does go to a learned work in order to find a most human kind of nourishment for his vulgar (i.e., absolutely non-academic) type of human soul. On such occasions that profane commoner might even happen to show signs of actually ENJOYING his intellectual meal. He visibly refreshes his heart as well as his mind. How does that incredible event affect the writer's reputation? It is immediately taken as a rather bad sign. There must be something fundamentally wrong with that writer's scholarliness. If something of this kind repeats itself too often, he will be doomed forever to bear the stigma of an "ordinary spirit". Nothing worse than that could ever occur to the writer of a scholarly dissertation. For what decides the "true value" of a doctoral dissertation in our super-academic world? It is measured by the degree of its incomprehensibility and its unenjoyableness. Why? Simply because the supreme law of the intellectualistic guild spells: exclusivism. So a scholar who condescends to make himself accessible to the level of common plebeians in some way or other, will always run the risk of being

suspected of exerting a bad kind of influence. He makes any mediocre reader believe that he, too, has the chance to grasp important intellectual matters. A writer who encourages that kind of "illusions" in a reader's mind, is considered by his fellow writers as something very close to a traitor. His guilt is that of having reduced, or even destroyed the age old hegemony of the only ones who really know, a formidable elite of modern gnostics. To them it would be a terribly bad thing if others as well, besides the "born knowers", should arrive at the conclusion that knowledge is possible.

Are these remarks of mine off the point in a reasonable attempt on the part of one who is to give a fair portrait of the role of egocentricity in our culture? I believe not. We need a historical outline of a protracted battle through the ages between the two fundamental motifs. In that outline it is my duty to reveal the remarkable part played precisely by certain exclusive guilds of intellectual aristocracy. One of their systematic efforts has evidently been to remain dim and incomprehensible to the profane lot of common mortals.

Page 37

Even the history of Christianity, the most alterocentric religion any culture has ever known, was marred at times by an intellectual haughtiness so hard and cold that there seemed to be no trace of humanity left in man. I am here referring to the Gnostic societies that even dared to present themselves as Christians. Obviously, at any time, and in almost any community of human civilization, one must be prepared to come across special groups of "supermen," standing out in solitary grandeur above the common mass. Their plan has always been to reveal themselves as a born elite, the ones who "know," as opposed to the miserable lot of ordinary humans who "do not know." The latter are looked down upon as a despicable vermin of god-forsaken creatures, doomed from eternity to simply perish in their ignorance. For according to the great Gnostic ideology, one thing only saves,--infallibly, automatically. And that is a thing a divine minority of elect men are supposed to possess IN THEMSELVES, from the day of their birth,--nay, from all eternity. What is it? It is not goodness, not love. Above all, it is not humility. It is not submission, nor any dependence whatsoever on the other ones, the Other One! So it could not either have any trace of true totality in it. No, what it is assumed to spring out from, is just that "celestial" segment of man, so ingeniously detached from his lower, "terrestrial" segment. It is the great Gnosis; in other terms, it is knowledge PER SE. It is pure, proud, cold, impassive, impersonal knowledge, abstracted from every possible "this-worldly contamination."

I have given you a little excerpt of the history of Egocentricity as a fundamental motif of your culture and mine. We shall have to come back, once in a while, to that history. It is a drama throwing a glaring light upon the essence of Self-centeredness, a dark background permitting Other-centeredness to shine out with majestic glory.

THE SCIENTIFIC EVIDENCE OF MEN'S GREATER POWER OF ABSTRACTION, COMPARED TO WOMEN

What do the figures of dependable investigations tell us concerning men's and women's comparative capacities of abstract reasoning?

Mathematics is the science of pure abstractions. So it must be particularly interesting to compare male and female tests of intelligence in that field. By the way, teachers in all countries know the result of this comparison fairly well in advance. And

so do their students. But we want scientifically conclusive experiments. What is the result of psychological measurements of this differential kind like? They have been conducted in numerous countries all over the world. And the testimonies are highly unanimous. We shall mention some most representative ones comprising various social and ethnological groups.

Page 38

A Scholastic Aptitude Test administered to college freshmen in the United States in 1930 included more than 4000 boys and more than 3000 girls. The results of the mathematical section of the test are given as follows by Anestasi and Foley (6):

Number of Cases:	Average Score In Mathematics:
Boys 4214	511.15
Girls 3362	476.74
Diff./stand. diff.	15.27

So there was a pretty significant difference in favor of males with regard to mathematics in these tests, the critical ratio of the difference being more than 15.

Similar differences were found among American Black students, as well as among Chinese, Japanese, and part-Hawaiian high school graduates tested in Hawaii.

Of course it is not necessary for conclusiveness that boys should always excel as significantly in mathematics as this. A sex difference reaching dimensions about 15 times greater than the established unreliability figure is almost incredibly high. More important is the CONSISTENCY with which fairly significant male preponderance here becomes manifest in test after test.

A test devised by the American Psychological Association for use in the U.S. Army gave very similar results. The boys were superior to girls in three fields only. But those fields were: 1) arithmetic reasoning, 2) number series completion, 3) information. And in those three sections the sex differences were so great that the total scores of the boys were pulled up sufficiently--note this--to give them a general victory! (7)

In the revised Stanford-Binet Test, boys excel consistently in "arithmetic reasoning," "ingenuity" and "induction." ("Ingenuity" here stands for a more difficult type of mechanical reasoning problem. "Induction" has to do with problems in which a generalized numerical rule is to be found.) (8)

And now comes an important question: How does it happen, under these circumstances, that the GENERAL victory of the boys--their evidence of "superior intelligence" as a whole--does not become absolutely crushing,--at least far, far more significant than the total figures indicate? Well, there obviously must be some field of human intelligence--and still counted a such--in which women actually manage to make up for their deficiency in abstract reasoning. That is precisely a

Page 39

more "practical," a more "outward" form of human intelligence.

Through his extensive "Hereditats-Enquete" the Dutch investigator Heymans found these figures for a more PRACTICAL intelligence: Men: 55.5, as against Women: 70.5 (His corresponding figures for "abstraction," or "rumination," or "trend of

being given to philosophical and theoretical cogitation," are for men 18.5, for women 12.4)

So far we want to limit our discussion as much as possible to the ability of abstract thinking. If women have failed here, what has been decisive for that "failure"?

WOMEN'S EMOTIONAL ATTITUDE TOWARD ABSTRACTIONS

To be quite fair, have not many women distinguished themselves as scholars just in the fields of the so-called "true" sciences? And even precisely in mathematics?

The instance of Madame Kovalevskij is frequently cited in this connection,--and with very good reason. Some have then also been anxious to assert that the average woman is NOT really LESS GIFTED for such frigidly analyzing sciences--and for the abstract reasoning generally involved in them--but rather LESS INTERESTED only. In other words, there would seem to be a sort of "aversion" in typical women against these things, an aversion so intensive that their intellect is partially paralyzed by it. This is an interesting question arising. What is the answer to it?

Then, since the name of Madame Kovalevskij has been drawn into the discussion, I think it would be most fair to mention what that famous woman mathematician's own emotional attitude toward the sciences happened to be like. As a matter of fact, she appears to have been highly sensitive to a similar disgust--or at least a considerable weariness-- quite often, placed face to face with her profession: She complains rather despondently in one case:

"Scientific studies do not give joy and do not make humanity progress. It is madness to lose one's youth in such things. It is a true misery to be gifted with an ability for sciences, particularly so for a woman, who is then pushed into a sphere of activities in which she cannot find happiness." (9)

That was a statement made by Sophia Kovalevskij at a time when she had just reached the climax of a successful career.

One of her spiritual sisters seems to agree wholeheartedly with her in this cry DE PROFUNDIS. Leontine Zanta thinks that a man dedicated to science hardly knows any similar emptiness of the heart. The genuine scholar of that sex is SELF-SUFFICIENT ("se suffit a lui-même.")

Page 40

"A man absorbed in the life of commerce, and particularly in that of politics, does not need a home or the sweet intimacy of well-ordered love. He can love in disorder and in rapidity. Emotional life does not mean much to him."(9)

Yes, EMOTIONAL LIFE, that is the point,--or one of the points. Here the abstractions become a poor thing. They have so little with which to nourish the emotions. Emotions in the feminine sense seem to flow exclusively from a living fellowship and from the colorful "external" facts of concrete, every-day existence. Abstractions seem so hopelessly alien to a fresh and fragrant altero-centricity in these important respects. Therefore women simply feel inclined to list them as useless. Or even worse: as virtual enemies of true happiness.

Their life is prevailingly one of practical realities. Their world is a world of tangible nearness. With some sort of mental helio-thropism, they turn toward anything that is human, or anything that can at least, in some way or other, BE HUMANIZED. Finding the things that are human, and "*making* human" those that are not already, this seems to be their specialty.

Accordingly, women feel bound to refute all that appears foreign to their own or other people's actual life situation. They feel bound to refute abstract reasonings on the same grounds. In that form of reasoning they obviously see a suspect tendency of theoretizing away the visible, audible, and palpable world which is the only one they love,--in fact, the only one they know. Such sorcery seems to them dangerous, or at least ludicrous.

Spencer has stated that women's thoughts are lacking in general truths. Of course this too is a rather pointed statement, carrying things to an extreme. And even though there may be a grain of reality in it, the actual implications of that reality may not be as negative and crushing as the immediate impression of the sentence might suggest.

Of course one cannot expect any great amount of subtle generalizations from persons who have little or no inclination toward abstract ideas by and large. But one question of capital meaningfulness which we probably shall have to ask ourselves is this one: Are the truths that matter most to living human beings of a GENERAL character at all? Have generalizations turned out to be a blessed boon or a cursed bane to mankind, as we can follow all sides of the different trends in history? Sometimes even inherently good things degenerate into an actual curse.

Page 41

I have earnestly endeavored to find some kind of reliable answer to these questions in a new approach toward the historical trends observed in the case of certain destiny-deciding human ideas. It has been profitable to start out with a basic question: How much is it at all POSSIBLE for man to know about man? We call that Epistemology. Second question: What items within the range of this possible knowledge is absolutely indispensable for mankind? In my work MAN THE INDIVISIBLE (Oslo University Press, 1971, pp. 189 ff.) I have inquired into the nature of "Symbols and General Concepts", seen in a properly human perspective. Here I admit that the symbol function is an absolutely indispensable faculty for meaningful thought on the human level. Is this in flagrant contradiction with my apparent depreciation of certain abstract thought-forms in our world culture? No. The conclusion of my study has been that there exist two basically different types of symbols, and two basically different categories of abstractions. It has been my aim all the time to demonstrate that the most typically alterocentric human beings on earth, namely our children, possess a tremendous abundance of precisely the kind of symbol function which constitutes the glorious aliveness and spiritual depth--the intensive meaningfulness--of human life. Of course that type of symbol function is a CONDITIO SINE QUA NON for true fulfillment in the life of any person. The other type of abstracting activity presents entirely different characteristics. Why? For the obvious reason that it is naturally doomed to be downright detrimental to that INTEGRATION which is essential to harmonious humanity.

There has from times immemorial been great confusion among researchers, and among human beings by and large, as regards women's intellectual functions and what

they tend to select for their personal enjoyment in the field of the intellect. Mantagezza complains, in his "Fisiologia," that a woman "does not succeed so well in (1) creation, (2) invention, (3) synthesis." He finds it difficult, however, to tell why: for man and woman "have equal intellectual force;"--nevertheless they "differ widely." What can be the reason for that difference?

Probably here, as in so many other cases, the problem for a real understanding is due to a simple lack of proper definitions. Take the concept of "creation" for instance. Is that an unequivocal one? By no means. You may distinguish between some widely different TYPES of creation. The special distinction I shall try to make, may give a workable basis for a solution to Mantagezza's "problem." Women have been accused of cutting a rather poor figure, as compared to men, as "creative artists." But, as well shall soon see, "creation" in art is on various levels. What if women are seen to fail in certain FORMS of creation, and this for certain obvious reasons! The fact that you do not distinguish yourself as a creative genius in the field of COMPOSING music, does that mean that you lack all creative ability as a musician? Creativity is also demonstrated in the art of PLAYING music. Certain creative activities demand a sophisticated degree of technical skill. A fairly uncomplicated type of human intellect may not suffice for creative genius on one level of creativity, but yet be quite sufficient on another level. There is a more modest type of human intellect that happens to excel in a more naively graphic and childishly immediate kind of perception and performance. There are bound to exist subtle fields of artistic creativeness that are entirely beyond (above) that childlikeness. Women, as we shall also demonstrate, are more children than they are adults. For creating a Shakespearean drama, or a Monzartean symphony, a woman's type of creative genius may not suffice. If it had sufficed, women ought to have asserted themselves brilliantly in such fields of creativity. We shall give thorough study to these things in their due places.

Page 42

Now a word about Mantagezza's second point: invention. It is frequently stated that invention demands imagination. Well, what KIND of invention is one referring to? And what KIND of imagination does it demand? Take invention in its common technological sense. If ANY kind of imagination had been sufficient to meet the requirements, then women ought to have qualified themselves as eminent inventors. For their imagination, as we shall see later, is of an extraordinary exuberance. In this, as in so many other respects, women are very much like children. But that rich imagination of the typical women also has limits similar to that of the child. It seems to depend on a certain concreteness of perception, a certain graphic conspicuity. So again we see what tends to be lacking in it. It is that more masculine capacity for pure abstraction, theories as a matter of barren formulas. But precisely that prevailing ability to abstract and to arrive at the theoretical formula seems to be a prerequisite, something absolutely indispensable, for outstanding inventiveness, as we know it in the field of modern technology. That is the way we tend to understand the term of inventiveness most of the time today.

We shall see how much something similar also applies to most fields of an eminently artistic creation.

Now what about SYNTHESIS? Here I think it is particularly misleading to say, without any distinction or any proper differentiation: "Women are poorly gifted for

synthesis." The opposite of synthesis is generally thought of as ANALYSIS. If a similar negative wholesale judgment was passed regarding women's poor ability to deal with analysis, we might not dare to protest so strongly. But precisely in the case of synthesis this depreciation would seem to assume a more serious character. For synthesis, you see, is commonly regarded as almost a synonym for UNIFICATION; that is, for getting things "back together" into a sound and solid bond of totality. And you know the stress we have already put on wholeness as the great wholesome thing for human life. How in the world could anyone imagine then that this wholeness which is the great aim for the whole outreach of the other-centered spirit, could be obtained without the blessed ingredient of synthesis!

Page 43

Of course you never can tell: There might be forms of synthesis, also, so strongly imbued with the spirit of pure abstraction that they would have to be given up as being beyond the reach of a typically feminine mentality. But frankly, in that case, there would seem good reason to doubt that the thing eventually produced by that type of synthesis could have too much in common with just that profound intergration in human life which we are here speaking about. I rather suspect that the "synthesis" we had to do with, might be related to the weird type with which super-speculative philosophers have astonished the world. For details, see my chapter on Hegel's philosophy, contained in my peculiar attempt to make an outline of the history of modern philosophy under the title of "Omega II: The Satanic Dynamics of Modern Philosophies Infiltrating the Endtime Church," pp. 19, ff. Certain brands of spiritualistic philosophy seem to arrive at concepts of "synthesis" that the alterocentric child is far too soberminded, far too realistic, to be bothered with.

What we here have to be concerned about is synthesis as a truly UNIFYING process. And when we speak about the opposite, namely analysis as an equally characteristic trend of human character, the theme we shall have to dwell upon is that of analysis as a dangerously, sometimes in fact fatally, disruptive process in human minds. If the disruption resulting from it proves to be nothing less than a subtle dismemberment and downright mutilation of life itself, then the danger is there, and it is ominous.

In order to understand more easily what that type of analysis really is, it might be profitable first to make clear some points as to what it is NOT.

WOMEN -- EMINENT EXPERTS IN PERCEIVING DETAILS

I like to suggest some prevailingly "extrovert" qualities contributing mightily toward "genius" in a wider and sounder sense of the term than the one commonly thought of. Here is one such quality which appears to be superabundant in women. They noticeably excel in work demanding, above all

Page 44

A RAPID PERCEPTION OF DETAILS.

This may be observed not only in purely practical, but also in rather artistic types of activity. Even as early as in the kindergarten, girls are seen to include far more details in their drawings, for instance, than boys do. That is a tendency demonstrated both in cases of spontaneous drawings and in special drawing tests arranged in such a way as to include special elements of completing figures.

The pre-eminent feminine sense of the details is regarded by some scholars as one of the main reasons why women excel so greatly in office work. And of course the same applies to other occupations demanding minute accuracy in the details,--and FREQUENT SHIFTS OF ATTENTION. We are not surprised to see how experts in educational testing arrange their special tests in order to find out whether a student is particularly qualified, psychologically speaking, for office work. They include points demanding precisely that natural sense of the details, and the ability to move one's attention from one thing to the other quite rapidly. Precisely qualities of this order are strongly emphasized in all clerical aptitude tests. And now, how do women qualify in such tests?

We may mention the Minnesota Clerical Test. It comprises checking similarities and dissimilarities in various lists of names and numbers. According to the reports from American districts using these tests, only 16 per cent of the male participants reached or exceeded the median of female participants regarding those abilities. (10)

One thing is evident indeed: this eminent feminine perception of details must have little in common with analysis proper. For in the field of real analysis, there is just as clear an evidence of a consistent "female failure". It is men who reveal themselves as the great experts in analytical research.

What is analysis then? Does it not consist precisely in breaking down compound units into single units? Does it not have to do with concentrating one's attention on the resulting "details"? Yes, indeed. But notice: that analytical process is invariably a process of typical abstraction. It is prevaillingly a theoretical activity. For tell me, where, exactly, is it that the typical analyst plays his curious game of abstracting them, one by one, those "single parts" his analysis is supposed to deal with? It is in his imagination. In reality no "single" or "independent" parts have ever existed. They have had all their existence exclusively in the composite unit, nowhere else. It was, all the time, a mere "whim" of the analyst's imaginative mind which brought about that cutting up into "separate pieces." Reality knows nothing about any such separation. Reality knows one thing: totality.

Page 45

THE BORDER LINE BETWEEN SCIENTIFIC ANALYSIS AND OUR EVERY-DAY WOMEN'S DETAIL EXPERTISE?

You may quite reasonably ask this most pertinent question. Well, on the one hand we have that funny game practiced by women and children from times immemorial, picking out details, and arranging them neatly, row by row. That "child's play" is perfectly in touch with life as any child knows it. It never gets away from its immediate sources, right within the precincts of practical life and simple humanity. On the other hand, you cannot accuse the scientist of not displaying an activity at least just as intensive. It is a furiously prolific activity, but this time an activity making arrangements which practical reality has never known. Nowhere, and at no epoch whatsoever of human history.

Scientific analysis works wonders today which our culture seems unable to do without. But this is often performed with a sagacity and a sophistication which I am inclined to characterize as obstinate (I must once more refer to the book *Man the Indivisible*, -- pp. 189 ff.)

TYPES OF ANALYSIS PARTICULARLY OBJECTIONABLE BECAUSE THEY ACT AS KILLERS OF HUMAN TOTALITY

One form of analysis women manifestly detest is the one to which a sophisticated analyst dares to subject their personal feelings of deepest affection, or personal feelings of any important kind.

A lack of sympathy for that kind of "objective detachment" may be one reason why women fail to assert themselves as great playwrights. Here I am anticipating on my chapter on literature. But I should point out this item right away: A dramatist is bound to isolate himself, as it were. This is part of his very profession. He has to perform a rather curious sort of analysis and abstraction. We shall discuss it in more detail later on. The long and the short of it is that the dramatic author seems to be in direct need of a high degree of downright introversion and egocentric introspection. This appears to be an actual asset to his literary profession. That he should be bound to possess a per cent "egocentric character" is a statement I would hesitate to make of course. Particularly my boldness would fail me if I were to go still further and draw the radical conclusion: "The dramatist is bound to be a writer of the male sex." And, nevertheless, the very history of dramatic literature seems to tell us a tale which is almost exactly as bold as that. Where do you find any ravagingly successful women dramatists? In what lands? In what eras of world history? Nowhere and at no time.

Page 46

What I mainly want to make clear at the present stage of my study is this: To excel in a properly analytical activity of the human intellect is far from being any reliable indication that the person concerned distinguishes himself as typically alterocentric. Those rare women who distinguish themselves in the field of philosophical or scientific analysis, have not-- eoipso--distinguished themselves as typically feminine. Women by and large are traditionally weak in the realms of self-analysis, or any other kind of analytical activity. They are probably too eager to put their own visible and tangible world everywhere.

A WOMAN IN LOVE VEHEMENTLY REJECTS THE CRUEL WAY ABSTRACTION THEORISTS WILL INSIST ON CUTTING INTO SEPARATE PARTS THE ESSENCE OF HER BELOVED ONE,--TO HER AN ACT OF EVIL MAGIC

A veritable aversion in women against analysis surges up on many strange occasions. Permit me to cite one instance chosen at random. Of course I do not say that this reaction against the abstracting process of analysis is the universal pattern of emotional behavior among women. Nor do I claim that over-reactions of this type must necessarily be described as favorable or exclusively pleasant to observe. What I do claim is that those traditional feminine reactions have tended to be misrepresented by many researchers as something rather unreasonable and scientifically incomprehensible. Leontine Zanta's description is not among the more unsympathetic ones:

"Women in love find it disgusting to ask on what qualities of the beloved person their love is founded. Repeatedly they will assure that such particular qualities do not exist at all. They just love the person himself, not the qualities. And they would love him with the same intensity even if he were different in all things, both externally and internally." (11)

Is this a lack of appreciation of the detail? Is it a lack of a true sense of totality? By no means. On the contrary, it is just further evidence of a feminine ability to conceive the whole as a whole, without having any trouble whatsoever with the details in terms of "separate entities."

Lotze must indeed be right when he says: "Man's knowledge and volition are directed toward the GENERAL. Those of women are directed toward the WHOLE ("das Allgemeine" versus "das Ganze"). We should make a special effort to avoid being confused in our attitude toward these two concepts. The distinction between them is essential for a sound evaluation.

Page 47

"The well-known non-juridical nature ("unjuristische Natur") of women is closely connected with this fact. They feel hurt because the laws very often do not consider the whole of a particular case as a whole, but rather submit it to some general provision,--"in virtue of particular circumstances." To abstract those particular circumstances appears completely arbitrary to feminine reason." (12)

Burdach has said concerning the tendency of generalizations and abstractions: "Women take truth as they find it, whereas men want to create it." That is an interesting statement, showing some of the advantages--and I would freely admit: also some of the apparent disadvantages--of both parties. It opposes quite clearly, to the introspective, abstracting tendency of most men, something naive and childlike which I have called alterocentric, namely the strange habit of taking truths at their face value, accepting them wholeheartedly just the way a woman's or a child's natural senses, their thoughts and feelings, are apt to perceive them.

Obviously neither the Copernican nor the Einsteinian conception of our surrounding world would ever been excogitated by means of a simple woman's childish way of experiencing her environment. In a work on the Relationship between Woman and Children we shall see to what incredible extent the female sex has succeeded in retaining a whole series of the most wonderfully meaningful childlike traits,--in both character and bodily features. Already now we should cease to be astonished at what is not particularly astonishing at all. In the way they perceive reality, women give just another proof of their ineradicable "childlikeness." In the fresh NAIVETE of their open hearts they simply do not suspect reality of having any crafty ARRIERES-PENSEES. Women are too frank, too childishly ingenuous to assume any subtle aspects of reality which their immediate senses have not been able to grasp. (The book referred to is MOTHERLINESS, a sequel to this one and already available.

THE OVERWHELMING FACTS ABOUT SYNTHESIS AND FIELD DEPENDENCE

Women once more amaze the researcher by simply revealing, in their immediate pattern of behavior, an intimate congeniality between self and environment. They manifest, in a physical test situation, reaction of outward-directness significantly superior to those manifested by men.

Page 48

You will easily understand that we cannot leave this discussion of a "perception of the details" and of "analytical forms of perception" without also discussing--from our special point of view--Witkin's findings in his experiments relative to perceptual modes and human personality (H. A. Witkin: *Personality through Perception*, 1954.) Certainly one of the greatest events in contemporary psychology has been this research work accomplished by Witkin, its final publication, and its ongoing application for a meaningful understanding of psychology as a realistic science dealing with true integration of man's life as a person.

Within is convinced that ways of perceiving are congruent with personality (Opus citatum, p. 480.)

And exactly what, now, is the personality trait par excellence in woman that would be bound to determine their peculiar way of sense perception? I am sure you would by now make a definite guess, as to the personality trait I am alluding to. It is other-centeredness.

As Allport, too, had already expressed it much earlier: Perception, memory, and many other mental functions which common opinion would hardly dream of associating with personality features properly speaking, are actually "embedded in a personal life."

You may imagine how strongly my attention was aroused as soon as I learnt that each single one of Witkin's laboratory tests in this connection showed a striking sex difference in performance. What exactly did that difference consist in?

It lies in the very nature of my topic ("alterocentricity") that I am particularly concerned with the modes of orientation any human individual may happen to adopt toward his (or her) external reality. And a major fact established through Witkin's findings was that women are considerably more dependent on the structure of the outer field than men are (Ibid. p. 154).

It has then also been very instructive to learn, from the results of these experiments, what a prevailing part *visual* perceptions seem to play just in women's peculiar modes of perception. I shall soon have many occasions to stress the importance of the *graphical* in the alterocentric character, as I have come to understand it. And here the visual sense is, of course the absolutely dominant one.

So far, however, I am most vividly concerned with the analytical versus the synthetic modes of perception. And in that respect the investigations under review have brought out this remarkable fact: Particular sex differences were consistently observed in tasks demanding an analytical method of dealing with a given field.

Page 49

HOW WOMEN PREFERABLY DETERMINE THE POSITION OF THEIR BODIES IN A TAXING EXPERIMENTAL TEST SITUATION THEY ARE CONFRONTED WITH

Let us now first give an adequate idea about what those special experiments were like.

In the experiment we are mainly concerned with, the subject is required to determine his (or her) body position. And the person may do this in one of two ways.

1) Either: on the basis of a visually indicated relation between his body and the axis of the surrounding field. Personally I would call that a highly OUTWARD-oriented approach.

2) Or: mainly on the basis of bodily sensations. Personally I am just as prepared to give my special name to that approach. It is highly INWARD-directed. It is a mode of perception grasping clues, as it were, that have their center in the person himself. Quite unlike mode number 1, mode number 2 is an approach distinguishing itself as having little or no regard for any relations to the outer field. On the contrary, it is what a somewhat stern (or "unkind") type of vocabulary has branded as "egocentric".

And now, what do we gather from the scores obtained by men and women respectively, in these tests? First, how did women behave?

I have called that an "outward-directed orientation." Their eyes keep going enerringly toward the FIELD, the firm *reality outside themselves*.

"Women are more apt to perceive it (the body) as a VISUAL DATUM, occurring in a given visual field, whereas men are more apt to perceive it in terms of SENSATIONS arising from it." (p. 167, emphasis supplied).

Notice the latter case, that of the men tested. What do they tend to choose as their "load-star" for the travel into a harbor of full safety? It is certain *sensations*. Sensations stemming from what quarters, if you please? The answer is plain and instructive: Sensations arising from that male person's own body. Is that other-centeredness or is it self-centeredness? It is *self-centeredness*!

Page 50

A THOUGHT-PROVOKING STATEMENT EXPRESSED IN THE MISLEADING TERMS OF WESTERN MAN'S TRADITION ABOUT WHAT HAS PRESTIGE AND WHAT HAS NOT

"The observed differences between the sexes suggests that awareness of the body as a separate entity, independent of the surroundings, has progressed farther in men than in women." (Ibid.)

The realization of new insights here arrived at by strong research within modern differential psychology, is wonderfully refreshing. So we can easily forgive the regretful fact that its linguistic and philosophical expression is being weighed down by age-old prejudice. What is it this outstanding psychological researcher describes as "progressive"? It is man's "awareness of the body as a SEPARATE entity, INDEPENDENT of the surroundings." This blessed "separateness" and "independence" is said to have "*progressed farther* in men than in women."

What kind of "progress" is that? We all know what the concept of "progress" generally stands for. It immediately implies an evolution that is rather favorable and positive. But precisely the "favorableness" and the "positiveness" in the case of this peculiar reaction, displayed by male test persons in the mentioned experiment, is what I can hardly accept offhand. It first has to be subjected to thorough and critical new value judgment.

Have you ever heard about a certain "awareness" of body and soul as "separate entities" and a veritable passion for absolute "independence" (perfect self-sufficiency), introduced as top ideals in our Western world culture some two and a half thousand years ago by Plato, the Father of Western Spiritualism and an incurably unrealistic dualist? Since that time "to be separate" and "absolutely independent" are qualities that have managed to acquire top prestige in this most self-centered of all cultures.

In an extended study of the Ego-Altero bipolarity it must be demonstrated that, on the contrary, only constructive concepts, such as synthesis and true wholeness (the very opposite of separateness and independence or self-sufficient isolation) can constitute a balm of healing for our culture, making it truly whole again.

Whenever man develops in the direction of proud humanistic self-sufficiency, including even a religiously flavored independence of the environment in which God has been pleased to place him, that is not a development logically calling for terms such as "progression." No, this is rather a tragic retardation or, downright retro-gression.

What then could be the true reason why women are seen, to a far larger extent than men, to simply fail in that curious art of dealing with the field analytically?

Page 51

I do not believe that even this is due to any kind of downright inability. What arguments do I have in favor of that statement? Well, do you recall what we arrived at in our discussion regarding women's emotional attitude toward radical abstraction, as encountered for instance in extreme forms of mathematical science. I then mentioned the theoretical alternative of an actual *aversion* in women against abstractions, rather than an *inability* to perform them. Why not realize that this alternative is perfectly open, scientifically speaking?

So now in connection with Witkin's perception tests that same question of ability versus inclination has to be raised. What about the deeper reason why women fail to utilize those same bodily experiences which men are seen to utilize in order to determine body position? Sometimes the tested women, as well as the men, were just *ordered* to close their eyes. As the docile disciples they really are, they did this. You may say they did it in spite of themselves. And what significant thing happened on such occasions? Women were simply seen to be just as proficient as men in finding the upright body position, even the way the latter prefer to do it. That must be conclusive evidence against the thesis of women "not being able" to use inward bodily experience as effectively as men. It also has disproved the tempting suggestion that women have a poorer endowment of "body sensitivity." (In my Part 9, on "Sensitivity versus Insensitivity" (p. ff.) we shall have a close look at that old myth as well.)

In short, one may rather say: What the tests have shown quite significantly, is not women's lacking ability to refer to their own inward body sensation as extensively as men do, but obviously rather just a lack of "interest" in so doing. As long as an OUTWARD VISUAL FIELD is present and may be used as a main basis of perception, in order to orient oneself and establish the body position, then women simply--and intuitively--choose that avenue. (See Witkin's own comments, pp. 161-162.)

A TREMENDOUSLY MEANINGFUL CONCLUSION

One thing seems sure, in view of the evidence I have had the privilege of collecting in the various fields to which I have had access: Women's favorite way is

NOT that of introspection, or inward-directedness of any type. Turning preferably inwards--whether this applies to one's body or otherwise--is NOT a typically feminine pattern of approach.

That such inward-directedness is indispensable for a purely analytical solution, is another matter, and an equally indisputable fact.

Page 52

Witkin is of the opinion that ALL the sex differences in perceptual performance can very well be accounted for on the basis of characteristic differences between men and women in extent of active relationships of self to environment. This is worthy of careful attention.

The more searching and momentous then, particularly to our topic, becomes the question: To what are these differences in personality due?

Of course here, as well, the possibility is open for the current explanation to which modern psychology has recourse: The continually pressing influences of definite social roles, conventionally assigned to men and women respectively, are regarded as sufficient to explain the whole matter. In our culture women are EXPECTED, they claim, to adopt an attitude of general dependence. In other words, their field dependence might then be interpreted as just one particular manifestation of this "general cultural convention."

But this is a conclusion I for my part, in view of the other evidence already available, would seriously challenge. On the background of such deeper reflections, it would, from my point of view, be thrilling indeed to see the result of similar experiments carried out in a society where the social roles assigned to women are visibly different. Why not, for instances, just the Tschambuli people in which sex roles and sex differences in behavior in essential respect are supposed to be so "radically opposite" to those found in our culture? Personally I should like our ethnographical anthropologists to please point out one single culture where women do NOT show a consistently greater dependence to their environment than men do, all things taken into due account. I anticipate that, even after any amount of extended investigations have been accomplished within the relevant fields of study, there will still be ample occasion to ascribe a capital portion of the sex differences in field dependence to BIOLOGICAL causes.

Personally I feel confident that deep down in the upsurging well-streams of fundamental biology we have arrived at the very source. And I have the temerity to insist that this is where our gaze should turn even in cases in which we feel pretty sure that the more immediate causes are evidently environment and cultural. Above all, tend to see deeper biological factors than those suggested by Erich Fromm (13). Unlike that famous modern psychologist, I am confident that a woman has greater and more fundamental reasons for developing a spirit of dependence than just her "dependence on the male's erection for her mature sexual pleasures." I protest energetically against an expression of causal relations as unworthy--and as foolish--as that. A woman must have more holistically understandable wellsprings in her "to foster a generalized attitude of greater reliance on factors outside herself." (14).

Page 53

CAN A WOMAN'S DOWNRIGHT AVERSION AGAINST ABSTRACT CONCEPTS BE A SAFE TREND WHERE THE FUTURE PROSPECTS OF CULTURAL PROGRESS ARE SERIOUSLY AT STAKE?

Have not truth-seekers through thousands of years been leaning heavily on precisely abstract thought patterns for the purpose of reaching their most sublime goals of human accomplishment? If a person's perception of truth is limited to what he--or she--can fondle with a literal stroke of literal fingers, will not that person's ability to sound out the depths of truth be hampered in a corresponding degree? This is men's critical question today.

The answer to that question will probably depend on the answer you can give to the age old question that Pilate happened to render so famous: What is truth? An absolutely *exhaustive* answer to that question does not exist to date, as far as I know. Perhaps it will never be given. It would almost be a pity if it was given.

Nevertheless, let us admit one thing: The generalizations and classifications made possible thanks to our abstract thought forms, have contributed immensely toward making the arsenal of knowledge of our world what it is today. Just in mathematics those generalizations and classifications have been pushed farther than in any other science. And this has helped man to rid the intellectual world of a lot of muddled thinking down through the centuries. It has forced thinkers to lay aside their own sympathies and antipathies. Falsifications of reality have been corrected. For now the great aim was that of arriving at the full truth without worrying about the practical consequences, or personal loss, or any sordid lucre that might tempt a human being to deviate from the royal highway of intellectual decency.

On the other hand we must be on the alert against academic pedantry and tricky pitfalls of many kinds. We happen to live in a world formed and directed by a bunch of males with a prevailing ability and training in abstract thinking. There is reason to fear that the superiority of these peculiar thought forms has been overestimated. Their limitations have not been duly heeded.

The modern scientist's research ethics is often characterized by a cold and deadly neutral attitude which borders on total indifference regarding the practical results. It is a serious question whether the truths meaning most of all to human beings can be evaluated at all by that kind of an attitude.

Let us have a critical look at abstract thinking. What it deals with is general truths. But does any such thing as a general truth exist after all? I mean: does it have any existence in itself, quite apart from specific truths?

Page 54

IS THE ROAD FROM THE GENERAL TO THE PARTICULAR A PRACTICABLE HIGHWAY?

Take for instance the syllogism that the great Aristotle has made immortal:

I. All men are mortal.

II. Socrates is a man.

Conclusion: Socrates is mortal.

Here the general statement "All men are mortal" is supposed, together with premise number II, to lead right up to the logical conclusion about a special fact, namely that the individual Socrates is mortal. But, in reality, what is that general statement about "all men" (I) based upon? It simply presupposes, doesn't it, that the final conclusion is a fact already. For how could you ever start by saying that "all men are mortal", if it had not in advance been accepted as self-evident that the individual Socrates has been found to be mortal? In other words, that first statement about all men's mortality, which was supposed to be a sure premise and therefore a safe point of departure, actually proves to be absolutely dependent on the conclusion one hopes to arrive at, being a fact. So the direction of the movement seems rather to be the inverted one. The special, empirical fact about an individual Socrates is and remains alpha and omega.

The impression is somewhat confusing, to express it mildly. The gap between empirical facts (facts based on experience) on the one hand and "a priori" facts of general validity on the other hand must be a precipice more abysmal and bridgeless than currently assumed.

What we seem to have in front of us is, on one side of the chasm, some sort of "ideal" truth (IDEA-TRUTH) abstracted from time and space and all those special forms of expression we are used to in every-day life. On the other side we have the human pleasure of a familiar encounter with truths of a definitely concrete nature, truths that may happen to a person in a special place, at a special time, and in a special way.

This difference between the general truth and the special truth has been most graphically portrayed by Clutton Brock in his booklet "ESSAYS ON RELIGION". Here he points out two ways in which we may consider people and things. I am rather tempted to call one of them the other-centered way. That is the feminine way, the profoundly human way. The other one is definitely more self-centered. It has something cold and almost inhuman about it.

Page 55

THE SUDDEN DEATH OF 10,000 CHINESE IN PEKING RECENTLY UPSETS ME FAR LESS THAN MY PERSONAL TOOTH-ACHE HAPPENING THAT SAME DAY. WHY?

In what two ways is it possible to look at one's fellow men? 1) As individuals. 2) As members of a class. The scientist is more inclined to classify them. To him they are members of a class, numbers in a schema.

But now, what about you, my un-scientific friend? You tell me that you love what is deeply human, or at least what can be touched and handled,--maybe loved, maybe hated. Sometimes however, what actually happens to those persons and things you meet on your way, is that they are simply ignored. But please notice now; who are those whom you treat in that rather ice cold, or let us say, "objective" way? They are, characteristic enough, precisely those whom you DO NOT KNOW PERSONALLY. Those are the ones you classify in that frigidly matter-of-fact way, that super-scientific way. What happens, however, as soon as you get to know them? They suddenly cease to be mere numbers in a system. To your mind and your heart they have become human individuals. The deeper truth about them has finally managed to get through to

you. So here you see what was actually lacking in the case of those 10,000 Chinese who were killed in a disaster,--not with them, but rather with you. They did not seem like real human beings to you. You were unable to fathom the depth of their tragedy. What impressed you a thousand times more at that moment was the toothache you happened to have when you read about them in the newspaper. About that sad cavity located in that upper left canine tooth of yours you had far better knowledge. So its personal importance to you caused the case of the 10,000 Chinese to be almost totally eclipsed. Your compassion with them was practically nil. It takes the love and true pity of an enlightened heart to see the individuals of a suffering humanity as real individuals. It takes a personal knowledge of each specific case.

Page 56

Clutton-Brock shows us man's superiority over the scientist in some well-chosen words: While a mathematician cannot value an isosceles triangle for its own sake, however much he values the discovery of the mathematical truth, we do value individuals for their own sake as individuals. He is perfectly right in what he says about the scientific abstraction. It comes miserably short in life itself. Classification, important as it may be, turns into a ridiculous farce, whenever it begins to take the place of life itself. What is a wife to her husband? Is she just a member of the class of wives? Certainly not. Of course that husband may for a moment abandon himself to a curious game of considering his wife in that way. He may regard her as a mere member of the class of wives; that is, in a purely abstract and scientific way. But what happens at that very moment? She suddenly becomes stripped of all the special qualities she otherwise used to have in his estimation. His own mind is at the same time stripped of every value, every peculiar charm he previously associated with that special woman. She has suddenly sunk down into the grey and contourless desert called the class of wives. It is understandable that he might permit himself an act of impersonalism like that at the moment when he fills out an application form for the internal revenue office. I for my part at least do hope that my wife will forgive me that kind of impersonalism weakness under such circumstances. But otherwise, in my really clear sighted moments, I must now agree with her that this modern scientific Nirvana of routine classifications is even worse than what the Hellenes called Hades, a land of shadows in which no human happiness can ever survive.

By the way, could you think of a more typical example of what a woman could hardly ever dream of doing? How could she make herself guilty of such a tearing asunder of all particular values? And where is the man who would dare to claim that her perception of reality suffers a heavy loss because of this attitude? I would strongly challenge that man's anti-female philosophy.

The truly scandalous onesidedness would be if science pretended that the strange realities it keeps diving down into, are the only ones existing. One pertinent question: Can it be proven that the method of generalizations and abstractions is a method applied by nature herself? What is, in fact, the true goal of that method in all cases among intelligent beings? It is just to provide a purer and clearer conception of those particular truths whose cause we are pleading,--truths having their validity and their reality in themselves.

Let us all agree about one fact: The method of abstraction has something highly indirect in its deepest essence. It constitutes a circumstantial detour. And the medium it

depends on for that detour movement, seems to be a high degree of just masculine self-centeredness.

THE CAPITAL REASON WHY THE HISTORY OF PHILOSOPHY IS SO SURPRISINGLY POOR IN FEMALE CONTRIBUTIONS

You recall the poor result we had in our introduction, trying to find out how many women have distinguished themselves in the realms of speculative thought. We hardly got exhausted in counting them.

Page 57

According to Lotze, philosophy is of all the arts the one in which emotion is most highly intellectualized, and the cultural material most extremely abstracted from the practical concrete.

Perhaps the only objection one might have to this statement would be: How can such terms as "emotions", "arts", "practical" and "concrete" dare to appear at all in close connection with the concept of "philosophy"?

One thing is conspicuous: The female failure in this field seems as complete as any man could ever wish to see it. Whether that failure, however, means "a condemnation of women" or "a condemnation of philosophy", that was a question we felt we simply had to leave to be decided by life itself. The living history of human ideas has made to us its revelation in terms that seem rather unmistakable.

Now, maybe in order to have a more popular illustration of the topic to start with, just let us think of a notorious philosopher such as Socrates for a moment. Could that man be imagined with the personality traits of a typical woman? No,--not with his vices, not with his virtues.

Who is to be held responsible for the curious myth about activity as a pre-eminently masculine phenomenon, I do not know. I am going to admit that emphatically in a later chapter on "Who is the more active, man or woman." But of one thing I am sure: It was NOT Socrates who started that myth. The reputation he left to posterity regarding a life of intensive activity, practically speaking, is too poor indeed. It only helps you to visualize that philosopher just sitting there absolutely motionless. The tradition tells us that he might keep staring at one single indifferent point of the horizon for hours and hours. So completely was he absorbed in the interior and purely intellectual problems, pushing their battles dramatically back and forth in a battlefield not of this world. One rather humorous version of the story puts

XANTHIPPE, SOCRATES' WIFE, IN THE FOREFRONT

That woman represents true drama in the this worldly sense. She is not at all described as philosophical or in an way given to barren efforts of abstract introspection. As one day she enters suddenly upon the scene, she is just furious because her indolent husband neglects the family. And her emotions do not deny themselves an outlet in the form of sonorous scolding. Some would call it nagging or endless chattering. However, that kind of outward-directedness on her part seemed labor lost with her husband Socrates. So on this particular occasion she finally fills a bucket with cold water and gives the meditative figure of that poor unsuspecting thinker a regular shower. But does even that upset Socrates, or make him externally active? No, not seriously. His mental equilibrium is unshaken. And so is evidently his faculty of forming

logical conclusions. He just calmly states: "This is a very comprehensible case: After the thunder comes the rain."

Page 58

THE MODERN THREATS OF AN ATOM WAR SEEM CLOSELY RELATED TO A PRESENT CASE OF SIMPLE ABSTRACTION MANIA

Somewhat less humorous indeed is the obstinacy of masculine rumination as revealed in the twentieth century of the Christian era. On the basis of the abstract formulas hatched out by men's ego-centric brains, we now see a sinister contour growing out of the twilight of the Western World. It has taken the weirdly symbolical form of a mushroom, a mushroom that grows and grows into grotesque dimensions until it finally fills the entire horizon. The vision we have is that of a nuclear holocaust. In front of that specter of looming disaster--the last leap back into chaos--we see modern man standing terror-stricken, very much like Goethe's Zauberlehrling (the Sorcerer's Apprentice). The wild experimenter has got his experiment going. Now he is desperately looking for a new formula, the magic one that is to reverse the process. What he has so far achieved is only that effortless, automatic gliding, on the part of impassive matter, into ultimate dissolution and tragic disorder. But how can he manage to stop that down-hill race? He has failed to provide for a means of stopping.

Is this the final phase of philosophical and scientific impassibility and irresponsibility in our day and age? Is this the maddening power of pure abstraction, paralyzing the sound senses of human hearts, and shaking the destiny of modern man?

WOULD THIS WORLD HAVE BEEN ESSENTIALLY DIFFERENT IF ITS DEVELOPMENT HAD BEEN MORE PREVAILINGLY GOVERNED BY WOMEN?

This hypothetical question may be difficult to answer with any claim of exactness. What we do know with a considerable degree of certainty is that the emphasis laid, by a group of women in this present culture, is essentially different from that of a group of men in the same culture.

Page 59

A German investigator, Walter Hofman, in his book DIE LECTURE DER FRAU, 1931, has made an extensive analysis of women's choice of reading material. Hofman's aim was to find out the intellectual abilities and the mental peculiarities of women, as revealed in the stress they lay on various kinds of literature in their capacity as readers. His conclusion is clear enough. Perhaps it is not particularly flattering to those women who may think that a person's interest in--and grasping of--ABSTRACT CONCEPTS are the decisive indicators of genius and high spirituality. Hofman was in fact forced to admit that the objective world of science is largely a "closed book the the fair sex."

Some may again contend that his result reveals more about women's lack of opportunity than about their lack of ability. That is above all a favorite feminist argument. Nevertheless, dependable tests of modern differential psychology demonstrate that a comparative lack of ability is incontestable, when it comes to modes of reasoning in the two sexes.

What I understand least of all here is why women themselves should insist upon regarding such deficiency as a general stamp of intellectual inferiority. This must also have seemed inconsistent and strange to Walter Hofman. For that writer is quite aware of something tremendously important regarding the "objective" world of science. (We have here called it "the world of abstract human reasoning"): The unconditional validity of that world is today openly contested by both philosophy and education (pedagogy),-- and sometimes even by the natural sciences themselves. We should get these points straight by now:

On the one hand, there has, from times immemorial, been a natural conception of the world such as our immediate senses and our daily experience present it to us. Let our elite among scientist call that "subjective" as much as they like. On the other hand there is what they insist on calling "objective." If men feel duty-bound to swear to that world as the only true one, a world freely created in its entirety by scientific sagacity, well then that is a species of objectivity women can obviously afford to do without.

Perhaps we should be indulgent toward modern man, permitting him to choose the names he pleases for his "two" worlds. But one thing we should know about, namely a remarkable CLEAVAGE which has happened, and goes on happening, to the Western World, century after century: In the minds of students a most confusing duplicity has been created in regard to our conception of reality. Another thing is equally remarkable: Women are the ones who have most successfully kept aloof from that cleavage--that bewildering duplicity in our culture. And in this fact no unprejudiced judge will see any disparagement of womankind, or of anything that is typically feminine.

I have no doubts any longer about the correctness of the following evaluation: Woman's strength--probably also her greatness--lies precisely in this: She still possesses an admirable confidence in her own concrete world. And why then should she undertake to degrade that world of her immediate perception by suddenly placing some "other" world of reality and of general validity beside it, or even above it, as so many men, and particularly the men of science and philosophy, are tempted to do?

Page 60

Some people even fool themselves into believing that this is a higher world in religious respect. What a fateful misconception. Nobody ever had to leave the sphere of childlike simplicity and candid confidence, in order to become more "highly religious", nor in any sense "more highly realistic."

For men in our civilization there is an urgent need to come down to earth again. Obviously we all need a new confidence in our world as it was originally given to us. And women seem particularly able to reimplant, in our disrupted minds, that childly trust which may be the only means of making us whole again. Therefore we are also so desperately in need of genuine women as our educators. Only the true spirit of alterocentric wisdom can give us back the firm foundation that is indispensable for a full and well-balanced life.

TRAGEDY OF AN INTENSIFIED DUALISM HITTING OUR WESTERN WORLD, AS A HUMANISTIC (HELLENISTIC) MIXTURE OF TRUTHS AND LIES INVADE US

The West, even from its earliest days, developed an unrealistic philosophy. In its very essence that trend of thought is disruptive. We call this disruption dualism or

spiritualism. With the dawn of science there ought to have been a new dawn of realism as well. But that never took place. The splitness only adopted other forms, forms equally foreign to the realistic minds of women and children. This is not the triumph of human intellect, but of intellectualism, a miserable sham phenomenon.

It could not fail to bring sadness to the hearts of realistic thinkers who read John Locke's famous formulation of the principles of that new scientific dualism. For just the things that mean most to our lives as genuine children of mankind are here brutally taken away from us. Just try to derive some inspiration from what is left according to the following list:

The particular bulk, number, figure and motion of the parts of fire, or snow, are really in them--whether any one's senses perceive them or no--and therefore they may be called real qualities, because they really exist in those bodies. (Essay on Human Understanding, Book II, chapter 8, section 17.)

This and not one bit more is what the dualist philosopher of sophisticated modern science can accept as reality. And now, what is it he feels absolutely incapable of accepting?

Page 61

But light, heat, whiteness or coldness are no more really in them than sickness or pain is in manna. Take away the sensations of them; let not the eyes see light or colors, nor the ears hear sounds; let the palate not taste, nor the nose smell, and all colors, tastes, odors, and sounds, as they are such particular ideas, vanish and cease, and are reduced to their causes, i.e., bulk, figure, and motion of parts. Ibid.

Now, please do not try to suggest it is the deep fountains of intuitive wisdom, produced by psycho-somatic totality in human lives, that have taught a man to couch his thinking in terms of a dualism as disrupted and as spiritually nonsensical as that. Oh no, a truly other-centered feminine mind would hardly ever have stooped down to giving up its fond belief in those qualities, grasped by the five human senses as absolutely real. For instance what about the color and perfume of roses, or the beautiful song of the nightingale. I doubt that any genuine woman would agree to bluntly exclude the sensations of beauty and delight she experiences from the realms of true reality. No, she wouldn't, not even if a thousand philosophers assured her that these things are unreal.

But here is the essential reason why I would never myself be able to accept, within the realistic framework of othercentered totality, any principle of epistemological dualism as pessimistic as the one suggested by Locke: That dualism means a flat denial of an urge in any person, an urge constituting the great *élan vital* of his human buoyancy and survival; that is, the urge of "getting at" the realities outside himself, the value of basic meaningfulness in this world.

Lovejoy describes man biologically as an "animal whose habitual and paradoxical employment is the endeavor to REACH OUTSIDE HIS OWN SKIN." I am rather confident that this is no paradox whatsoever in the real sense of the term. For this is not something man just endeavors to accomplish. He triumphantly succeeds in

accomplishing it. He manifestly does, to the same extent as he fulfills his inborn prerogatives as a human person.

A MAGIC RADAR IN FEMININE MINDS: INTUITION

I mentioned that the thought forms of man's theoretical abstractions represent a sort of round-about movement, a virtual circumstantial DETOUR. But if there thus does exist a DETOUR, is it not also likely that there exists a SHORT-CUT? Certainly. And that "short-cut" has received its technical designation. It is called intuition. This, in fact, is the alterocentric--or "feminine" alternative to speculative rumination among men. Feminine intuition has helped many a mother to save her child. It is a sort of HOTLINE of inter-human communication. Not a "hotline" between Moscow and Washington, a direct telephone line intended to avert a catastrophe, such as a third world war, in the last moment. Not a "hotline" between Michael Gorbachov and Ronald Reagen, heads of delegations who have reached diplomatic expertise in the "noble art" of NOT understanding one another. No, feminine intuition is a shortcut of a pretty different order. It is a channel of human understanding so intensive and so penetrating that in cases of dire emergency it can communicate messages saving millions of lives.

Page 62

But, you say, is not intuition too a means of perception one is bound to describe as INTERIOR? Granted! It is an "interior shortcut." But it is an interior shortcut toward EXTERIOR things. It helps the intuitive person to concentrate his entire attention on the reality he (or she) has to look for outside his (or her) own self. It makes the inward micro-cosmos and the outward macro-cosmos into one single cosmic reality. Nowhere in this world has there ever been a more complete means of turning outwards. So please do not fall into the error of thinking that intuitive reasoning is just another type of self-introspection. The introspective philosopher gives evidence every day that he possesses less of this incredible means of perception than anybody else. Why? For the simple reason that he leans too heavily on his own infallible theoretical logic. So how could he have recourse to intuition as a channel of perception?

What the intuitive person perceives is both total and specific at the same time. Here there has been laid down in a woman's cradle--or in the cradle of any extremely alterocentric genius--a "radar" system so delicate and so masterly in its construction that an inveterate male, or a typical egocentric of either sex--does not have the slightest chance of any fair competition.

But what IS intuition then? How is it related to facts, to nature, to inter-human communication? And, particularly, what are its relations to the biological factors in the molding of feminine minds? Why should women have a more abundant supply of it than men?

Here the relation of intuition to other-centeredness becomes conspicuous from the very first moment: Nothing could be more helpful in making a mother identify herself with the most important part of her proper environment. Intuition makes it possible for her to respond instantaneously to the mute appeals from her helpless child.

Page 63

Evidently from times immemorial we men have taken a ridiculously over-dimensioned pride in our simple logic. We insist on parading logic as THE distinctive feature of intellectual eminence. But how would this formidable logical acuteness of

ours be suited for the needs of the nursery,--just to take one relevant example? Let us take the case of a "dumb" infant in some serious emergency. What is necessary in order to take one's stand toward the acute problems of such a wee creature? Probably something far, far more expedient than those symmetrical structures of logical thought which have for so long time been the pride of the strong sex. Before a complete set of man's best aristotelian syllogisms could be made available, there is some reason to fear that the poor little one under his care might be stiff and cold long ago. Logic is O.K. in its right place. But in certain cases of human emergency something infinitely more efficient is a desperate necessity. If a mother's problems are to be solved at all, they must be solved with extreme urgency. Here and now, for heaven's sake, not after ages of passive rumination or logical meditation.

In the case we are facing it is a question of grasping another person's whole situation at a moment's notice. I am not speaking about grasping that helpless infant's personal thoughts and feelings. For in that unfinished creature, there may not yet be, thus far, any such thing as thoughts and feelings, except in their most rudimentary form. For any mother then it is essential to perceive, in the flash of a lighting, desires so secret that it would be almost presumptuous to call them desires at all. Still it is a matter of attending to needs so crying and so acute that neglecting them, even for a moment, might sometimes mean certain death. Notice, though, we are speaking about personal needs, specific emergencies. Such personalism and such specificity--I may tell you for sure--have never, never been the proper field of general logic or philosophical reasoning. So here my course in philosophy--I admit it humbly--is bankrupt.

ARE WOMEN'S FORM OF INTELLECT THEN MADE FOR THE NURSERY ONLY?

By now you have perhaps graciously admitted as biologically reasonable that a goodly share of intuitive powers should naturally fall to the lot of women. But watch out, you may still be saying, that no one take the bold freedom to extend such a theory too far. Remember that this blessed intuition must be *reserved for the nursery*. Who has given any "authorization" for that exceptional faculty to be carried OUTSIDE the realms of caring for an infant?

I understand your fears, my dear fellow male; for in my temerity, you see, I have precisely been bold enough to presume that all potential mothers have at their disposal an almost unbelievable amount of intuition in every congenial field of feminine activity, even things that go far, far beyond the proper realms of any maternal emotions! How could I have the impertinence to go that far?

Page 64

Let us keep to what we see and know indisputably: A mother does have a desperate need of something as direct and as expedient as intuition. So why should we begrudge her the privilege of that gift as a general faculty standing her in good stead as a wonder guide in any appropriate field of every-day life? Let us have the courage to postulate that.

At the same time, let us be prepared for a certain depreciation of such a faculty on the part of sundry members of the academic elite. They will probably call your attention to a "related" phenomenon on an ANIMAL level, popularly called the INSTINCT. This association may have contributed particularly toward giving to intuition

a certain tinge of inferiority, as compared to the "highbrow" phenomenon of pure logic. Some call intuition the "unlearned capacity." And you may guess what those "learned ones" see in that: nothing but a "blind unreasoning impulse." The philosophizing type of person will constantly tend to consider intuition--please note that fact down--as an element more or less foreign to man's real self. Some sort of veritable "alienation" is believed to have taken place. Intuition is frequently described as the "NOT OURSELVES which is in us and all around us" (Matthew Arnold). Could it be portrayed more paradoxically than that? To Carlyle it was "an unfathomable Somewhat which is NOT WE."

Certainly the most serious argument against intuition, as a positive force of true intellect in women, is this on the part of doubting males: "Do we see any evidence whatsoever of that assumed 'directness' and 'rapidity' in feminine thought and action?"

I have a definite hunch concerning what those critical menfolks are driving at. It is a question of resoluteness:

WHO IS MORE RESOLUTE,--MAN OR WOMAN?

First a general evaluation of that quality, the simple ability to make rapid choices. Is it a good one to possess right in the midst of the well-known bustle of human life?

"To be sure," answers our male reader with conviction, and then he adds with a somewhat ironical smile: "But frankly, I have never been tempted to consider resoluteness as a typical feminine feature."

Well, the only thing we seem to agree upon so far is the theoretical assumption: A truly reliable intuition OUGHT, quite naturally, to reduce to a minimum certain most terrible battles people otherwise seem liable to fight against the demons of *irresoluteness*.

Page 65

I admit that there may seem to be some ambiguity in the matter at this point. It is not without some degree of trepidation I anticipate a good deal of solid input, on the part of people as naturally entitled to have an opinion, and give their vote, as husbands must be said to be. Witnesses as close to women in their every-day life as that have remarkable things to tell. I am referring to those among them particularly who have had the questionable pleasure of "shopping around" with their respective better halves. After having run from one store to the other with them for some time, they will not hesitate to inform you that women need hours to make decisions even regarding mere trifles. And it would be astonishing if the store-keepers had not made the same discovery. They have. Everybody has. So what is here the evidence of exceptional resoluteness? When did women ever acquire any fame for making quick choices?

Here then there is something, alas, there is something we cannot just explain away. But please wait a second. Don't let us leave out of our account one important fact: Numerous resolutions a woman, as well as a man, has to face every day, are of such a nature that they seem bound to fall entirely outside the proper sphere of simple intuition. In fact, they have to do with matters requiring a purely reflective and properly logical type of consideration for their satisfactory solution. What do you really expect to happen when a typically intuitive mind is suddenly confronted with problems of that category? Irresolution of a rather painful kind, of course, is the inevitable result.

In other words, it would hardly be fair to make incidents of this baffling sort a measuring standard for intuitive resoluteness.

Moreover, we should keep in mind another "drawback." Women have their strong emotionality to cope with. Emotionality does NOT, necessarily, favor resoluteness. To this you may even add one more "handicap:" Women "suffer" from a considerable lack of self-confidence, compared to men. The figures produced by modern measurements are more significant here than in any other field of psychological testing.

Do we realize now what heavy odds feminine resoluteness has to battle against? If it still manages to keep up a fairly equal competition with masculine resoluteness, then it must have an admirable buoyancy, mustn't it? Well, straight to the general findings. What are they like? They are remarkable:

WHERE REALLY MOMENTOUS QUESTIONS IN LIFE ARE TREMBLING IN THE BALANCE, WOMEN ARE CONSPICUOUSLY MORE RESOLUTE THAN MEN

This must not fool us, however, into the onesidedness of thinking that feminine resoluteness is necessarily always a positive phenomenon. I never claimed any extreme dogma of that kind.

Page 66

SUPERIOR RESOLUTENESS FOR GOOD OR FOR EVIL

I do not at all intend to claim that the remarkable promptness with which women may make up their minds for instantaneous action are necessarily of a favorable character in all cases of existential emergency. Sometimes this may be far from the actual reality. The Italian anthropologist Cesare Lombroso has studied a large number of double and multiple suicides. He asserts that the predominating partner in such regrettable instances is almost always the woman. Where two lovers for instance commit suicide together, the woman is, usually, the most resolute. In many similar cases female emotionality may become a bad spur rather than a good inhibition. The upwelling waves of intensive feelings will tend to give the impression of the moment so strong an emotional emphasis that secondary motives are not even permitted to arise before the act has already been perpetrated.

Of course resoluteness of the dubious kind is hardly anything to be so enormously proud of. But don't let us lose sight of the more normal aspects, the cases of positive choices in women's lives. The historical facts are irrefutable. Again and again the prevailing feature of superior female resoluteness, increasing its impetus through strong emotionality, is seen to apply precisely to cases in which some ALTEROCENTRIC element (the element of feminine other-centeredness) is allowed to enter the complex and speed up the resolution.

Then, more than at any other time, a woman seems to establish a mysterious contact with the deepest forces in her nature. A remarkable integral connectedness asserts itself then in a woman's actions. That is an element of victorious totality which overcomes painful conflicts of the disrupting kind. That ingredient of wholeness in terms of inner coherence, so deeply rooted in a mother's (a potential mother's) nature is undoubtedly a momentous factor in her resoluteness in all its positive aspects. Just here the secret resources of intuition seem to have unlimited sway. At a given moment--some will say an unexpected moment-- the FIAT of the élan

ALTEROCENTRIQUE is pronounced, and there, right in front of an amazed public, is the masterpiece of creation: woman, a total being, a being who knows exactly where she is going, and why.

Page 67

Attentive students of the human mind are always overwhelmingly impressed when, one day, they have the unique experience of observing a human creature triumphantly breaking out from the quagmires of a paralyzing half-heartedness. It was evidently this wonder that also overwhelmed the French philosopher Bergson. It actually caused him to evaluate intuition as a form of intellect far superior to that of logical reasoning. And it is the same phenomenon that overwhelms openminded investigators as they carefully conduct their comprehensive tests of the human mind today. But here again we must be entirely fair and entirely well-balanced in our research.

UNFAITHFULNESS, AS WELL AS FAITHFULNESS, A MORE TOTAL PHENOMENON WITH WOMEN THAN WITH MEN

I am speaking about faithfulness and unfaithfulness in the relations between the two sexes. Let us first look at this from its most positive point of view. The totality phenomenon we are here concerned about becomes particularly conspicuous in all matters having to do with women's biological functions. There is nothing very surprising in that. Still it is remarkable, for instance, with what singleness of purpose, and with what wholeheartedness, a woman will attach herself to the person whom she has once really decided to consider as her rightful and lawful husband. It has often been observed that a woman can only give herself wholly, or not at all, to her partner. Therefore, if she breaks her fidelity "externally" and sexually, she has most probably also broken it in the deepest of her heart and spirit.

I am not particularly happy with the latter formulation. For, of course, any distinction between "external" and "internal" breaks of fidelity will tend to be rather illusory in the marital relations, whichever spouse you may be thinking of. Nevertheless, there does seem to be particularly strong reasons for concluding that women's adultery may be regarded as a tremendously total rupture.

Here I must add one more serious word: Personally I am inclined to think that even a MAN'S assumed ability to cut up his life into "separate departments" of that kind has been strongly exaggerated. The idea that a man can really maintain his "inner fidelity" to a woman toward whom he has been "externally unfaithful" is just one of those spurious conclusions I must consider as contrary to the very gist of the great principle of totality in human life. You are either faithful or unfaithful. Make no mistake about that matter.

Still it is with the keenest interest I have noted the fact that popular opinion, in our culture at least, has shown an undeniable tendency in one definite direction. And I do not doubt that there must be a most realistic reason why popular opinion, in any culture, would tend just that way rather than the opposite. Let us have a frank look at it.

Page 68

What exactly is that tendency of the public opinion polls? It is just to consider a woman's infidelity as more serious than a man's. Let us quote the answers obtained by "Fortune," August 1946, to this question: "Which do you think is worse, for a wife to be unfaithful to her husband, or vice versa?"

	Mens' answer	Women's answer
Unfaithfulness of the husband is worse:	3.7%	5.8%
Unfaithfulness of the wife is worse:	22.5%	19.4%
One as bad as the other:	66.9%	69.5%
Refused to answer or "don't know":	6.9%	5.3%

Admittedly, it was a minority only among both women and men (among men 33.1%; among women 30.1%) who did think there is a difference in the degree of seriousness here. But among that minority, at least, the trend was significantly clear: Most of them, by far, were convinced that infidelity is a more serious matter when it occurs in women's lives than when it occurs in men's lives.

But just WHY then do such a large percentage of this group--both women and men--judge women's unfaithfulness more severely than that of men?

Some will perhaps say: "Well, this is just the usual trend in our milieu, and not a too intelligent one. It is the common dogma developing rampantly in all patriarchalist societies, namely that men should be entitled to a greater liberty assigned to them as a matter of course. What is granted to men is denied to women as taboo or a crime.

Maybe that explanation, reminding of a more or less feminist origin, has no evidence whatsoever to support it. If so, then what about the following attempt to explain the matter? In all people there is some sort of intuitive--or should we simply say common-sense realization of the general condition we have already pointed out: Men do have an inherent greater potential of internal splitness in their lives. Women do have a correspondingly greater potential of completeness. Some will tend to express men's part in that deal in a rather positive way. What they see in men in this case is nothing but a certain quite admirable "mental acrobacy," enabling them to create, in themselves, and whenever urgently needed, some sort of "separate sections." Viewed from that rather "deplorable deficiency." Women "suffer from a sad lack of elasticity of flexibility." The fair sex is basically doomed to be "inexorably whole"--in evil as well as in good.

Page 69

That argument does not impress me so greatly. It has too much of vain sophistry in it. But it is dangerous enough. It constitutes, in its turn, just another case of false dualism. It is a fatal thing to imagine that a human being--of either sex--can perform the super-human trick of remaining "ideally" good (also called "internally" good, or "spiritually" good) at the same time as he allows himself to become "materially" (also called "externally" or "corporeally") evil. Gross error! No man can realistically separate his "external" life from his "internal" life. Man is a whole. He does not exist any other way. If you permit yourself to be externally unfaithful, you will be so internally as well. Don't try to fool yourself.

In conclusion just a summary statement regarding the intimate relation there is bound to be between that superior totality I have here postulated to exist in the feminine mind, and its intuitive mode of perception. That perception distinguishes itself as an

absolutely integral one. It is an embrace including, not only the external world in its entirety, but also an embrace engaging all parts of the embracing soul itself, comprising both intellect and emotion. More than that, even the very body. Any field or object grasped by intuition is totally grasped. One might say that there is a certain fresh smell of fertile soil about intuitive perception. Its roots go so deeply down, right into the farthest recesses of very nature. And when I here say "soil", that is of course not just ordinary "dead matter." On the contrary, everything is bound to become alive under the embrace of intuition.

And what do we here see precisely in the case of woman? The intuitive mind of that creature, so intensely alive herself, has a sort of life-giving virtue: As soon as she fathoms any part of her proper environment--that is, her entire visible, audible, palpable world--immediately she seems to fertilize and vitalize it. This must be a thorough mode of perception indeed. I shall explain what I mean:

THE MARVEL OF PERSONIFICATION

IS A CHAIR A CHAIR AND A HOUSE A HOUSE-- NOTHING MORE? THE MIND SAYS YES. THE HEART SAYS NO. WHICH OF THEM IS RIGHT?

Never has there been a more strikingly alterocentric or a more strikingly female faculty than the marvelously creative one called personification. Some observers, it is true, are not impressed by that either. They simply regard it as just another direct consequence of women's "overpowering emotionality" and "incurable subjectivity."

Page 70

Why does this "unpredictable sex" attach such immoderate "sentimental value" to things having little or no "real value" in themselves? To a sober-minded fellow a chair is a chair, and a house is a house. But to a woman that chair often becomes something infinitely more than a chair. And her old ramshackle cabin is not just that inadequate piece of construction which any critical carpenter would see in it. Of course, to HIM it is a building, nothing more, perhaps even a bit less. To the woman, however, it is far more than a building,--especially if she has happened to experience something great in that cottage.

Certainly one may object to this that something very similar applies to a man. He too will probably, by and by, get into the habit of considering that building as his home, a thing quite familiar and dear, suggestive of peculiar moods and memories.

Nevertheless, he will also--as a general rule--have far less difficulty in parting with that inadequate dwelling. And if someone offers him a good round sum of ready money for it, he will probably let it go without any too serious heart-ache, even though this may imply that he will never see his "dear little cabin" again. To his wife, however, the hour of separation will not be quite as easy as that. A part of her intimate life seems to be torn out of her bleeding heart from the moment when that cabin is lost for ever.

Or think of a little girl playing with her dirty old rag-doll--or some other insignificant and lifeless object. To a far greater extent than her boy playmate, she will furnish each one of her little playthings with a living soul. Those pieces of wood or clay around her will all have the thoughts and the feelings of a little girl. They are so intensively alive.

And perhaps, strangest of all, that poor old grandma of hers, tottering with decrepitude in the same backyard, heartily agrees with her in every essential detail, as far as these mysterious things are concerned. How CAN she? That is the question you ask headshakingly. You still accept that an immature little girl may be that unreasonable,--a "scatterbrain." But how can her grandma, a sedate old lady be equally misguided? SHE, at least, ought to know better after a long life in a hard school. Or what in the world is this curious fad of "thinking a living soul into dead matter"? Are all women-folks bound to be that way? The only conclusion I can now draw, says the male would-be realist who observes them, is that this romantic mania can hardly belong to a certain age. It must belong to a certain sex rather.

Page 71

How can you and I understand all this and logically defend it? Let us try somewhat harder. A woman's task is to give life to new men. Is it so strange then, after all, if this process of giving life has become an ineradicable "passion" with her. Breathing human life and living spirit into the most inanimate parts of one's surrounding world is probably the summit of alterocentric art. That is the explanation. That is the basis of reasonable defense in the case at hand. We are simply finding ourselves face to face with the mysterious forces of creation,--or procreation. What constantly happens is no more than could naturally be expected: The most inanimate and prosaic objects will acquire vital properties between a woman's hands.

Still you have, my dear reader, a perfect right to demand a more concrete and well-ordered form of documentation. Let us turn then to INDUSTRIAL creation. What happens here? And above all, what happens in the various fields of ARTISTIC creation? We all know that the artist, too, "bears children." Any material he ingeniously molds in his own artistic fashion becomes a child of his imagination, a "Mind Child." With women there ought to be particular good reasons for that kind of "child births" throughout their lives. What wonderful children ought not to be born out of women's mysterious sense of a certain deeper connectedness between all things? However, a most fascinating study, comparing women and men in the field of artistic creation, has to wait until we are better prepared. We shall presently devote ample time and space to most striking phenomena shedding rather unexpected light over the topic of other-centeredness and artistic creation.

First, however, we shall have to find out important differential facts about a matter that most people tend to find far less fascinating than artistic creation, namely simple everyday labor. To some, work is the most tedious thing in the world. But who knows. Maybe the author's treatment of this topic as well is so controversial that the very tedium is magically alleviated. One main issue at least which we have to face is this one: Who is the Great Laborer, Man or Woman? A more philosophical-sounding and scientifically dignified headline for our new chapter would be:

PART 6

Activity versus Passivity

But right away the element of controversy rises to the surface again with the following subtitle:

THE MYTH ABOUT "WOMAN AS THE PASSIVE PARTNER"

The old myth, you see, about women's general inferiority has evidently developed a particularly screaming dogma: Women are not only "less intelligent" than men; they are also, and above all, "less active."

Page 72

I do not intend to speak lightly, or mockingly, about that dogma. Not at all. For it does have its serious time-honored reasons which we must all try to understand. So let us have a straight and frank look at that new thesis. If it should still have a grain of actual truth in it, this is no negligible matter. To my general theory in this book, about women as the other-centered sex, the above-mentioned claim would indeed be a shattering stroke. For what would you be fully entitled to expect where a living other-centeredness is prominent? A mighty activity, of course! It stands to reason that a truly outward-directed and self-forgetting attitude toward the environment must necessarily stimulate the desire for "digging into" that environment with energy and joy.

In the same way it would seem equally reasonable to take for granted a lesser eagerness to engage in that kind of laborious "digging" on the part of a self-centered person. He would seem to have enough with himself and his own "internal world." A man who indulges in selfintrospective ruminations could hardly be expected to give himself up to any very energetic engagement with the world outside the tip of his own nose.

And now straight on to what our everyday experience teaches us about these two types of human beings and their respective trends of "laboriousness."

I can fully understand--and therefore also to a large extent sympathize with--those who feel that the moment has come to protest strongly against what I seem to be insinuating here. Am I not in fact launching an indisputable and most sinister insinuation against one of the proudest strongholds of traditional masculine self-assurance? Frankly speaking, what is this boundless eulogy of women's postulated industriousness? Does it not come very close to an open accusation against the members of the "strong sex" of being a bunch of lazybones?

I can easily imagine my most indignant opponents making this counter-attack against both my unheard-of insolence and my flimsy reasoning. "How could any serious investigator really dare to hallmark MAN as some kind of indolent and isolationist creature? Just think of it: man, the head of the race, the protector and sustainer of the family, the fierce and gallant warrior of the nation, the unflinching pioneer and explorer of unknown territories! How could anyone be blind to the terrific amount of tough work, the glorious deeds of patient heroism, performed by MEN in the course of history? Could a poor indolent "ego-centric" be imagined at all as responsible for performances of that grandeur? There must be some elementary consistency lacking in the thought of this present writer. Otherwise he insists on regarding the main questions from a BIOLOGICAL view-point. Women are "biologically predisposed" for reacting in such and such an ideal way. That is his beautiful phrase. But has he ever observed certain peculiarities of a male body? Since he is so eager to turn outward, let us simply go to some visible outward things. Just have a look at that superior agility and strength indicated by a man's physical features. Does anything there betray a biological predisposition for indolence and passivity?

Page 73

A good question. It should be considered with full fairness and realistic accuracy. It is not so strange at all that the anatomical fact of men's greater muscular strength has led to the conclusion that his activity also must be greater. No. This is an illusory conclusion any one among us might be tempted to draw.

The physiological facts just alluded to, you see, are conspicuous and indisputable. Muscular strength does show a consistent difference in favor of males of all ages. H. E. Jones, in his investigations on "Sex Differences in Physical Abilities" (16) shows that boys, from early infancy on, exhibit greater "muscular reactivity." In early childhood the average lung capacity was found to be about 7 per cent greater than that of girls (This is of course reckoned in proportion to body weight). A grown up man shows even a far greater superiority with respect to this capacity of the lungs, so important for sustained energy output, in fact, an excess of around 35 per cent, as compared to grown-up women.

No doubt, that greater possibility of producing energy, and of performing energy-related maneuvers, is also one of the reasons why boys show greater ability in using heavy tools and manipulating mechanical objects.

So, generally speaking, we do have, in these fields, an undeniable quantitative superiority, as far as male anatomy figures are concerned. And of course it would seem most reasonable to assume that, along with this undeniable quantitative superiority of the males, there would naturally go a certain greater need of a more vigorous masculine activity. In fact, modern psychologists are likely to be quite right in ascribing an equally undeniable greater AGGRESSIVENESS in boys, partly at least, to that same muscular superiority.

NOW WHAT ABOUT THOSE BULGING MASCULINE MUSCLES AS A "PROOF" THAT MEN ARE MORE FOND OF WORK THAN WOMEN, OR EVEN THAT THEY PRODUCE A GREATER QUANTITY OF WORK?

What we positively do know so far is sure enough. That superior masculine strength of the muscles is an indisputable reality. It certainly means a potential of greater energy output in men than in women. We have also agreed that it probably has a lot to do with the significant fact of a conspicuously greater aggressiveness in boys than in girls.

Page 74

But to be quite frank now, was that male aggressiveness the type of demonstrable "energy output" we particularly had in mind? Certainly not. Our present topic is that of feminine laboriousness compared to masculine laboriousness. And in this positive field, what evidence do we have of men being superior to women? Men's muscles are strong, admirably strong. There is no doubt about it. But are they strong enough to prove that men are more laborious, or even more productive, quantitatively speaking, than women? I do admit that a certain strength is here at work, visibly and indubitably, in the gradual production of stereotype human ideas. But apart from that, where is the proof or the circumstantial evidence?

To claim that a man must be more fond of work, simply because he is more physically apt to produce work, is just as poor logic as an argument in the opposite direction: I am thinking of a boss who had happened to notice that the strongest and bulkiest fellows in his special work team also distinguished themselves as being the

laziest. Such phenomena do happen ever so often. But taking them to "prove" that the strongest men are generally--and necessarily--also the most inactive ones, that would be a strange science. A "conclusive evidence" in either direction would be equally unwarranted.

But one thing then can at least be fairly well established, you may claim:

"MEN DO HAVE A GREATER POTENTIAL POWER OF PRODUCING WORK--IF THEY SO DESIRE!"

Is that irrefutable? It all depends on what we agree to understand by "work." Knowing the varying meanings the same term may adopt from author to author, I would hesitate to be too dogmatic about even that. What we know for sure is rather this: The result of men's activity will generally tend to be more CONSPICUOUS. So what is the decisive criterion then for your question and mine: "Are women more active or less active than men?" That simply depends on what we mean by great activity.

The statistical records of modern differential psychology give a clear picture of what kinds of activities men and women, respectively, choose and appreciate. The "Femininity"/"Masculinity" findings of Terman and Miles (17) indicate very consistently--at least in our culture--what I would call a definitely other-centered trend in women's choice of activities.

Page 75

In other words, the whole question is here: Will we recognize such activity as really active? Examples of "being active" in the case of men are given as follows: (1) RUSHING INTO RECKLESS VENTURES AND THE MOST NECK-BREAKING FORMS OF SPORTS AND GAMES; (2) DOING TEST PILOT JOBS; (3) HANDLING MOTOR RACE VEHICLES--AND THE LIST HAS NOT BEEN COMPLETED.

Well, if this is "being active", as the term of "activity" goes in a masculine world, then evidently women are "not so active."

However, in a different world, "being active" might mean: (1) WEARING ONESELF OUT IN SELF-SACRIFICING LABOR, (2) ADMINISTERING TO THE NEEDS OF THE YOUNG, THE POOR, THE SICK, OR ANY OTHER HELPLESS CATEGORY IN SOCIETY (AN ALTERNATIVE LIST, ALSO TAKEN RIGHT OUT OF THE ANNALS OF DIFFERENTIAL PSYCHOLOGY).

Now, if this is "being active" in the case of typical women, then they must be tremendously active, and quite significantly MORE active than typical "mansized" men in our present culture. Their superiority is a statistic fact of undeniable general validity.

I shall never forget the great boredom expressing itself in the face of a male student of mine. All the time he seemed to think he could impress me as being particularly active, simply by enumerating the different types of reckless sports he had been practicing lately. At the moment there was just one he still managed to get a certain "kick out of". That was skydiving. He did his best to make me understand what the "kick" consisted in, namely that glorious free fall after having jumped out of the air plane--as far down as he could dare to delay the pulling of the string that was supposed to open the parachute for a safe landing.

WHAT IS GENUINE EVIDENCE OF LABORIOUSNESS?

In spite of their greater muscular strength, men have NOT been proven to produce "more work," or even the same amount of work, as women, by and large. In fact it may be rather narrow-minded to oppose one pile of production to another pile, saying: This one is larger, this one is smaller. What we really want to evaluate is not at all the amount of labor, but the degree of laboriousness. And then the question to be asked will be: What are the criteria witnessing in favor of true laboriousness? Is it decisive to know for instance the rapidity with which a given person gets his allotted tasks done? Some rush through their work with a speed beating all previous records. Is that convincing evidence of inherent laboriousness? Furthermore, what about the joy and the enthusiasm with which a person performs a given duty? Is that decisive proof? In many cases not even that. Some people are seen to unfold their muscular, as well as their mental powers in certain activities with a delight that comes rather close to a downright intoxication. Is that infallible proof that they are naturally industrious?

Page 76

I am afraid not. Often it is the very opposite that reveals itself. Frankly, what kind of work is it that would be more likely to furnish conclusive evidence that a person is actually consumed by the deepest spirit of lasting laboriousness? It is precisely the work that tends to go on and on. It is the work that costs infinite pain and endurance. Many kinds of work may impress the worker as extremely pleasant and extremely exciting. But that does not constitute the proper touching stone. The work that puts you to the test is rather the more or less lengthily, and even somewhat tedious type, the more or less painful type. Many men tend to avoid with care every effort of that kind. What they search with eagerness is the kind of work gliding along "like a game". This is a dubious sign. It has no very favorable tale to tell as regards my true affection for work AS SUCH, my passionate attachment to activity as a general trait.

The "homo ludens" (the playing man) and the "homo laborans" (the working man) are two human types to whom I am bound to pay due attention before my study of self-centeredness versus other-centeredness has come to an end.

But just at the present moment the one on whom we should like to focus our search-lights is, above all, the "homo laborans." Let us turn to a quite famous representative of the species.

THE RARE FAC-TOTUM ("DO-ALL") OF MENIAL SERVICES, CALLED A "SIMPLE HOUSE-WIFE"

Housewifery is the occupation of the vast majority of women in most countries. The greater part of the time when she works, a housewife is engaged in her current household duties. Take a "specialist" in that field of household chores, called a washer-woman. She is constantly on the go. All floors are made neat and shining through her industrious contribution. But please come back a couple of hours later. Where are then the shining floors? Where is the visible result of her skill and industry? It is all gone.

Or think of a woman spending the entire forenoon preparing a meal. A well-tasting dinner is placed on the table. But what has become of it all half an hour later? What is left to look at and admire? Just a heap of unwashed dishes, a dirty table-cloth. Is this among the things making for fame in our world?

Page 77

That woman's well-nourished husband--if I am not mistaken--has already retired to his most comfortable posture in an easy-chair. Here he is sitting peacefully smoking his pipe. Or perhaps he is drowsing on the sofa, already snoring shamelessly,--storing up strength, impressive muscular strength,--I do not doubt it. But will he also find a worthy outlet for that strength? I am not quite as sure about that. In some dens of masculine entertainment he will NOT find it, at any rate, that is absolutely certain.

In the kitchen, however,--and here doubts are superfluous--his dear wife is still busy, cleaning the dishes and putting all things to order. When her last chores are finally done, then--and then only--she has got as far as... well, as far as what? As far as the starting point if you want to know the process with exactitude. And then for the next meal it is the same thing over again. It is a perpetual goose-step.

But that is all just apparent. The results of that woman's work are very real. It is only so difficult for you and me to see them and measure them.

Of course, the distribution of work between the sexes, as we happen to find it in our present society, cannot be considered, necessarily, as an original assignment in all cases. It is rather, in many respects, a purely derivative sex role. But even looking at conditions as they prevailingly present themselves here and now, we may establish one indubitable fact: Women are regarded, by many men, as a sort of child-bearing and child-rearing machines; perhaps even as nothing but a bunch of house-work utensils. By a few, however, they may still be regarded as elevated spiritual contributors to the great welfare of mankind. In any case, one quality must be assumed to be indispensable in women's nature. They must simply be devoured by an undying fire of activity, a force pushing them toward work, we are tempted to say: work FOR WORK'S OWN SAKE. If they were not, how could we get along at all in this world of ours?

A DUBIOUS TERM: "WORK FOR WORK'S OWN SAKE"

I am very much afraid I expressed myself in a way there which is not at all in conformity, strictly speaking, with the philosophy of other-centeredness. On the contrary that expression may be dangerously misleading. We shall soon arrive at a topic called "Art for Art's Own Sake." Only then shall I be able to render a full account of what a fateful matter we are here up to. So far I must content myself with a few general remarks, in order to explain the most pressing of my heavy scruples.

Page 78

To say, unqualifying, that women adore work for its own sake is improper for the following reason: In the kingdom of a truly alterocentriclife nothing is done FOR ITS OWN SAKE. Nothing has its existence FOR ITS OWN SAKE. A thing having its goal, its RAISON D'ETRE in itself, that would be the ultimate absurdity. To the genuinely other-centered person it would indicate that meaningfulness has simply come to an abrupt end.

I am telling you something that has been an unwritten rule among women as long as such creatures have existed on earth. Believe me or not: Something painful, or even fateful, happens to a woman at the moment when she is--most unexpectedly--told that a thing exists FOR ITSELF ONLY, IN ITSELF ONLY. Fortunately, it is most likely she will not believe such a messenger at all. But if she did, her heart, I can assure you, would sink within her. For what is it that messenger has told her? It is the old sad story. It is a story of ultimate meaninglessness. Please try to be more reliably informed, the

sooner the better, about this. You should know that true meaning is only possible where a person is allowed in his life to GO BEYOND. Go beyond what? Go beyond the immediately given, go beyond any limited scope of material necessity; that is, beyond the schemas of theorizing men. To the truly other-centered person things have their meaning in goals transcending, by far, all such narrow limitations. For women such transcendence seems indispensable for all happiness. There must be something to hope for farther out, a meaningful goal in the future, enriching the present with real sense.

It is a woman who has said: The fire with which a woman has been created is forced to die out as soon as there is no longer any person, or any living cause, for which that fire may be kept burning.

Can this as well be seen then in the light of biological teleology (purposefulness)? Of course it can. Just think of the thousands of duties incumbent upon a mother, big and small, and most of them, in themselves, hopelessly trivial and monotonous. Under such circumstances we understand perfectly well that an on-going current of constant action is here bound to be a biological MUST.

Women must be able to draw on forces no scientist so far has ever been clever enough to locate or explain. Nor has any sophisticated philosopher succeeded in making it sound reasonable.

Anyway, my only provisional theory at the present moment will have to be: A woman, in her capacity as an alterocentric person, finds the very source of her activity, not IN herself, but invariably OUTSIDE herself. So it is in the depths of the other-centered spirit we may still hope to find some illuminating glimpses of the secret forces which all human totality must contain. But all the time it is in the tangible world of every-day life we can hope to acquire realistic knowledge of the fabulous depths in which the alterocentric spirit finds its up-welling sources.

Page 79

One fact remains: deep, deep down, under the strange cover of that unobtrusive every-day femininity, so modest and mild in its outward manifestations, there must be hidden a hearth of glowing embers, a fire of untiring action, presenting itself as nothing less than an imperious biological necessity. It must be the tender voice of the CHILD that has taught women's hearts the art of working. And don't forget: one of those "children" of hers, do you know what he is called? His usual name is "husband." And his childlikeness may not constantly be all that "tender." But she knows perfectly that he too is HER child. He needs a mother throughout his life. And who should be able to act as a mother to him during those many years after he has been for ever separated from his original mother? Well, who, if not his wife? And now the final result of this endlessly varying type of motherhood: How could a variety of so many different kinds of "kids" fail to inspire a mother in one specific direction? She is simply bound to be permanently laborious.

And now the other side of our present argument:

IS THERE REALLY SOME "PRESUMPTIVE EVIDENCE" OF A "LESS CONSUMING PASSION FOR WORK" IN MASCULINE ENVIRONMENTS?

For a considerable time already I have been feeling the irritated impatience of some protesting male voices: "Well-well, of course," I seem to hear them saying with

something like an ironical sneer,-- "Women ARE industrious creatures. We have no intention of denying that precious fact. So let us get straightaway to the negative side of the picture, Mr. Johnsen! Why not jump right into the dark chapter the sooner the better? You must be longing furiously by now to show us the seamy side of the lesson; that is, the sad story about the lazy ones,-- laziness, of course, as an inherent quality. The laziness of whom? Of all male creatures, we must naturally assume. That seems to devolve implicitly from what the author explicitly says: If the fresh activity in this world is feminine, then the indolent passivity is bound to be masculine. Is not this the tacit implication of the whole argument?"

Page 80

To this I would first answer: My real topic in this book is FEMININE ALTEROCENTRICITY; In other words, MOTHERLY OTHER-CENTEREDNESS. It is not what some would call MASCULINE SELF-CENTEREDNESS. But, if it should actually be found that my controversial view-point is in dire need of a corroboration by means of an argument in the inverted order, then, sure enough, that negative implication here suggested might demand an equally open and adequate formulation. For instance something like this: Do we, in the male sex, demonstrably find a certain indolence, constituting part and parcel of men's higher degree of general egocentricity? And does that indolence happen automatically, so to speak, whenever the more positive forces of other-centeredness fail to assert themselves? Finally, what visibly suggestive indications do we have that men suffer from a definitely greater lack of precisely the spirit of laboriousness than women do?

WHO INVENTED THOSE GAMES AND "PASTIMES" WE MEN ARE SO WILD ABOUT?

I am contenting myself, for the time being, with this one simple question. In my opinion it is a question that might furnish some significant indication regarding the searching inquiry we have on our hands. It is a question formulated in a somewhat vague and general way. Still it is pointed enough to stir up an ocean of reflections; perhaps even a maelstrom of more or less jocular controversy (At least I do hope it will remain at the stage of the jocular):

Who has invented, in the course of the history of our civilization, that almost infinite number of games and pastimes with which our world has been blessed,--or cursed, as the case may be? I am here particularly concerned with the more or less internally exciting and brain-racking games. In my language that would come very close to saying: the more or less egocentric ones. I may mention CHESS, just to give a well-known example.

"Oh, that goes without saying," would be the answer dropping from the lips of many a fellow without hesitation. "Who would have brains for inventing things at all, if not precisely men? When did we ever hear about women inventors? I for my part do not know one single invention of any importance to the world which was made by a woman."

This, of course, may be a somewhat unbalanced, and even quite irreverent, way of putting it. Some critics would perhaps even say that the answer smacks of a definitely boyish pride and presumption. Still we have to admit one thing: It also contains a kernel of truth. The statement has a general validity that seems bound to

strike us with wonder,--and admiration. Man is the great inventor; there is no doubt about it. But let us, so far, remain at the specific field of invention we have mentioned: the invention of GAMES.

It is not purely accidental that we here come back to an old topic, that of play, and of the "playing man,"--the HOMO LUDENS. This is a fascinating field, particularly to the student of egocentricity as a fundamental motif. And here the games of hazard, and the games of meditation, occupy a place all by themselves.

Page 81

How superfluous, indeed, it is to ask who has invented those pleasant PASTIMES--in our culture,--or in any culture. Who would it be, if not those who have also been found, from times immemorial, to wear out both the seats of their pants and the seats of their easy-chairs, just sitting there, in front of their chess boards, absolutely lost to the rest of the world. Their senses were oblivious to the gamut of practical realities surrounding them. For they had given themselves entirely to the one thing that had caught their minds, namely the fierce battles of the "interior man." We have a tradition of calling those interminable mental dramas just "plays of patience." And we seem to imagine that it is, here, the player who is supposed to be "patient." We seem to forget that, more often than not, it is rather his wife who is going through a mammoth test of angelic patience.

In front of men so totally in the grip of the passion of introvert "activities", do you think it necessary at all to ask which of two worlds such men feel attracted to? Is it a world *with the others* or a world of perfect *isolation*? This is too obvious. No intelligent person would ever claim that such games are "social." Are they apt to be outward-directing, alterocentric, in any meaningful sense of the term? Hardly.

Do you know the world-famous Italian expression: *il dolce far niente*? Literally that means something like "the sweet `activity' of DOING NOTHING." Would it be reasonable to think that a spirit of that kind has no share in this business?

Let us rather sum up our conclusion as follows: It would be more than naive to assume that everything is laudable in that genius of masculine inventiveness. Take any invention for that matter within the realms of common usefulness. You need not be a hopeless misanthrope because you happen to think of some close relationship that might exist between many a case of technological progress in our world, AND a certain besetting desire, in certain introvert minds, to reduce activity to a bare minimum. Of course there may be various incentives pushing men forward in the direction of greater and greater inventions all the time. But a fellow would have to be pretty devoid of good old masculine humor-- and also of common self-analysis--if he should prove incapable of admitting one obvious fact: That lurking obsession of obeying the persuasive voice of the "law of the least effort" is more than sufficient, all by itself, to urge natural men forward along the road of ever more ingenious master-pieces of invention. Energy-saving is a great motif--it has always been--with men.

You may rightly marvel today at some of the prodigious time-saving and work-saving devices called forth from the sombre depths of passively

Page 82

musings masculine brains. Thanks to those devices, some fellows in our society today who perhaps hardly did a stroke of honest labor in all their lives, may yet convey the

impression of being real plodders. They produce enormously--and this almost without wagging a finger.

Anyway, there are relations here that are bound to make the investigator circumspect. To interpret the outward phenomena of "masculine activity" correctly may be a delicate task indeed, probably just as delicate as to interpret correctly the outward phenomena of "feminine activity"--or what a myth calls "feminine passivity."

THE "SEDENTARY SEX" (SIC!)

Ashley Montague (18) has found a pretty remarkable reason to account for the bias we have just described. (I have dubbed it "the myth of feminine passivity"). From my point of view the way he expresses it may be considered as a particularly humorous one: Women's biological functions, he says, have made them "more sedentary" than men!

MORE SEDENTARY! Isn't that an amusing expression? Who could ever have selected a more incredible term as an epithet intended to portray the typical woman. The verb in Latin is "sedere". That means to "sit down". About whom is it used here? It refers to a creature who never took time in all her life to just SIT DOWN.

Did you ever hear about a genuine woman who thought she had time to spend in just being sedentary?

Otherwise Montague's reasoning in this context is plausible enough. Traditionally the mother was always obliged to keep near to the premises of the home. The father could roam far and wide. In fact, he was often simply supposed to do so. And evidently he enjoyed doing so. He was not a Jacob. He was rather a typical Esau, the famous haired hunter.

And now, what was, to our traditional woman's life, the ensuing result of that "sedentary existence" which she was forced to adopt? Or I should rather formulate my question differently: What was the result for the reputation she was to "enjoy" in the world in which she voluntarily opted for the home in which her service was so desperately needed? Well, the historical fact is clear: Here concentration around the hearth of the home was constantly interpreted, by obliging men, as a CONGENITAL LACK OF ENTERPRISE IN FEMININE MINDS. Women were all the time looked upon as lacking the normal desire to "go places and see things." Their "sedentariness" was evaluated as a deficient ability to explore unknown regions. They never managed to shake off their indolence sufficiently to turn resolutely, body and soul, toward that exterior world, a world more filled with light, adventure and reality than their domestic turf. They preferred to keep clinging to the traditional things, the narrow horizons. Why? Well, the interpretation was fanciful and thoughtful: Women were believed to shy away from all those new and unknown (foreign) values simply because they were new and unknown (foreign). The "over there" was shunned just because it was "over there."

Page 83

Does that sound convincingly other-centered? Certainly not. It is simply based on a gross misinterpretation, a downright falsification of the real facts. It is due to the observer's onesidedness and inability to comprehend those strange ways of a maternal heart. He does not realize one curious fact: In a woman's world, other-centeredness does not present itself as one solid block. On the contrary its structure rather englobes a whole hierarchy of mutually ordered, other-centered ties of affection, something to

choose from all the time in a meaningful way. You may also speak of varying degrees of feminine affection. It is the sacred affair of the individual woman's heart to weigh and evaluate--one against the other--those different ties of affection, binding her to the external world. In a woman's life that differentiating evaluation may prove to be an amazingly sober-minded matter. For it is of prime importance to her *élan vital* to make sure which tie is to be granted decisive priority in any given case.

One thing, at least, becomes evident to the careful historian of ideas when he considers that weird stereotype of public opinion about women's "sedentary life," and their "natural trend" toward a "lower degree of activity": It is an inveterate and ineradicable misconception. There seems to be no danger whatsoever that this old "sweet femininity" legend should run the risk of dying out for lack of people who are more than eager to give the most "benevolent" interpretation to women's customary behavior in this culture of ours.

WHAT IS THERE ABOUT INTENSIVE ACTIVITY THAT EXERTS A PARTICULAR ATTRACTION ON WOMEN?

With all people, evidently, an enormous lot here depends on more accidental factors. For instance: what are the circumstances under which you may happen to abandon yourself to your special activity? Zasso and Julien, two French scholars, have conducted an investigation applied to children of pre-school age. The results have been recorded in their "Contribution à 1 Psychologie Differentielle des Sexes au Niveau Préscolaire" (19). This touches most essential points, I think, as regards the elements that tend to make activity particularly attractive to females, considered at almost any stage of their lives. The boys were found to surpass the girls in "Restlessness and solitary activity." The girls, on their side, surpassed the boys in "Shared activity" and in "Verbal communication." Further, the girls examined in those experiments generally showed consistent trends toward more "Physical contacts" with each other in the course of their activity, than was the case with the boys. In fact, the number of those contacts were seen to increase with the growing age of the girls. With the boys, the number of physical contacts remained more constant; that is, at a comparatively low level all the time.

Page 84

Our interpretation of these findings ought not to be too difficult, in terms of sex differences in alterocentricity versus egocentricity.

Now, the higher scorings of those boys in the field of "solitary activities" do not, of course, necessarily mean, even in the case of boys, that they enjoy working in "solitude". In fact, no children do. On the contrary, they are more sociable, or dependent on companionship, than grown-ups are. But obviously boys do BEAR that hardship of isolation more easily than girls do.

And now what about the boys' higher degree of "restlessness"? The answer is easy to find for one who has studied the general characteristics of self-centeredness. A spirit of a certain turbulence--and a downright feverishness--whether in action or out of action--this is often a clear symptom of egocentric reaction,--in children as well as in adults.

THE REMARKABLE ROLE OF EXTREME EXCITEMENT AS A DISTURBING FACTOR OF OTHERCENTEREDNESS

Please keep this fact in mind. Over-excitement is a definitely disruptive phenomenon. It is definitely egocentric in its nature. That applies whether the supertension manifests itself in a religious context or in a purely artistic one. A while ago we discussed the meaningfulness of a house-wife's activities. Few people would be tempted to qualify those as "exciting." At least no typical man would tend to think them exciting. Most types of purposeful work tend to distinguish themselves as rather "soundly non-exciting." Why do I qualify that non-exciting character as "sound"? Does my health depend on my staying "non-excited"? Isn't there something here that harmonizes badly with the drama-filled motions (and e-motions) of true other-centeredness? Well, if you want to stay "fit as a fiddle", that is, actually "bursting with health", then please do not think the way you are going to be enabled to continue along that nice road of being "alive and kicking" is by means of abandoning yourself to extremes in excitedness. Here, as everywhere, a certain "mediocrity" is what characterizes the other-centered life-style. A certain balance is indispensable for keeping you have and hearty, that is really bouncing in terms of a rugged robustness, a sturdiness that keeps you going where others fail and fall.

Page 85

One thing should here be admitted regarding the Zasso/Julien investigations, generally speaking: They were hardly sufficiently broad to be scientifically conclusive. But similar investigations on a small scale have been conducted again and again. And every time the same pattern seems to assert itself. There is a consistent tendency indicating what I would not hesitate to call the "alterocentric trend" in female activity. It is above all the desire to SHARE and the desire to COMMUNICATE that constantly characterize such activity. Whether that sharing, or that communication, is "verbal", or it manifests itself by means of an irrepressible urge toward "physical contacts," this makes no virtual difference. The female trend invariably remains alterocentric.

Some far more extensive investigations by Terman and Miles (20) appear particularly informative to me in this most relevant respect. Wherever a certain "motherliness", or any genuinely altero-centric attitude toward the environment, is allowed to unfold itself in any given activity, girls invariably tend to excel and "feel at home." This particularly asserts itself in what those authors list under the heading of "activities more directly administrative to the young, the helpless, the distressed."

My readers will understand me when I permit myself to sum up such activities also under the epithet of "motherly." Obviously that is a "motherliness" which cannot be limited to any definite age in life. Its inherent virtue is lifelong.

By way of conclusion, I seem to be pressing on and on, toward one and the same general rule. Its definitive and explicit formulation, however, is a serious matter I have wanted to postpone until I shall have discussed, in much detail, the attitude of women toward some particularly problematic issues, namely those of ART.

Nonetheless, I do feel confident that I can speak very freely, and very authoritatively, about a most essential characteristic inherent in all othercenteredness as a fundamental motif. I establish this fact indisputably in the history of mankind, as well as in any human person's individual life. It bursts into an almost explosive revelation in a value that can be expressed very simply. Its contours are also very visible already:

PURPOSEFULNESS

No genuine woman would be easily reconciled to the inherent meaninglessness of an activity destitute of a final goal. If there is no visible purpose in it, she can never give herself wholeheartedly to it. Herinborn *élan alterocentrique* demands that meaning inexorably. But once that primordial urge for other-centeredness has been properly satisfied, there is hardly one single "mumbling word" of serious complaint from her lips. No work she performs is then felt as "tiresome" or "tedious" or "unbearably painful."

Page 86

What do women who have been publicly challenged to give a reply, openly state regarding their frank and honest feelings about a housewife's work? Is it possible that modern women, right in the midst of an era as abundantly blessed with feminist movements and career equality for the two sexes, still manage to find happiness in the daily routine of a housewife's duties? Yes, to an astonishingly great extent.

"IS RUNNING A HOME A FULL-TIME JOB?"

This is evidenced by the results of a comprehensive poll conducted in characteristic and fairly representative circles of our present Western culture.

Factual information of considerable interest was given by a cross section of the American people, regarding the occupation of homemaking as a "full-time job." Housewives, asked by a public information agency, if they would take on some activity, either voluntary or paid, outside the home, if they found one that interested them, replied as follows:

Running a home is a full-time job:	61.6%
Could take outside activity:	28.6%
No answer:	9.8%

Of course what is here mainly reflected, is perhaps not necessarily women's response to the idea: Is housewifery worthy of the great title "a full-time job," but rather this question: "Is there time and energy left for another job, when the obligatory one has been done?"

More decidedly a regular evaluation of two kinds of jobs, was contained in another public inquiry:

"On the whole,

WHO DO YOU THINK HAS THE MORE INTERESTING TIME, THE WOMAN WHO IS HOLDING A FULL-TIME JOB OR THE WOMAN WHO IS RUNNING A HOME?"

Of course the answers here, as well, may tend to be rather subjective. For our subject, however, that most personal evaluation is precisely something we want to get a fairly accurate idea about. It will at least tell us something important about that more or less subjective notion taking place in the minds of women in this culture and at this present time.

Page 87

And now, what was the result? Only 32 per cent of the women asked, did answer that they thought the women with a full-time job had a more interesting time. 49 per cent opted for the "running of a home." (7.8% "No difference," and 10.5%: "Don't know.")

So even in these ultra-modern days, you can see fairly clearly in what direction women's main interests tend to go.

It has also interested me a good deal to have an approximate idea, statistically speaking, about the somewhat different way in which men and women appreciate LEISURE TIME. This, to a certain extent, comes out in a public opinion inquiry (22). According to the findings, more women than men found the advantages of workers in "more varied, more interesting activities," whereas more men than women found the advantages in "more free time."

Brun-Gulbrandsen, a Norwegian researcher's inquiries, arranged for Norwegian continuation schools ("framhaldsskoler"), has this question in one of the questionnaires:

"DO YOU HELP OUT SO MUCH AT HOME THAT YOU THINK YOU GET TOO LITTLE LEISURE TIME?"

If we sum up the figures for answers indicating "too MUCH leisure time," we find that the girls showed a somewhat greater tendency to consider their position in those terms (namely 44, against 37 for the boys). It obviously is a more masculine than feminine tendency, by and large, to find a capital value in "leisure time." Would you blame me if I am here tempted to put the term IDLENESS in the place of "leisure time"?

Other data of the same investigation seemed to confirm the prevalence of this attitude among the female subjects. Their answers become the more striking when we take into account the general impression intimated by the direct results of the inquiry:

MORE WORK IS DEMANDED OF GIRLS IN A HOME THAN OF THE BOYS BELONGING TO THE SAME FAMILY

At least this rule was consistently found to apply to the environment studied by that Norwegian scholar. The author sums up his tentative conclusion in these words:

"One is left with a definite notion that girls would have to spend a considerably longer time than the boys in order to meet the requirements and expectations of their parents. Just how much this may amount to is not easy to express on the basis of the available data." (23)

Page 88

I think that impression of the author applies fairly well to the existing conditions in most countries of our culture at the present time: Girls are, by some strange international consensus, given a more rigid, rather than a more lenient working program at home, as compared to their robust and more husky brothers. Girls are given less leisure time for play and recreation. And, maybe most remarkable of all, to an astonishing extent they ACCEPT this discrimination without any too serious utterances of complaint. Cases of open rebellion on their part are particularly rare. They do not rise up vindicating their "inalienable rights" to obtain "equality in work, and in vacation."

But why then, do women of all ages have that greater tendency to "fail to appreciate" their leisure time? Various reasons have been suggested. Brun-Gulbrandsen himself is eagerly looking for some plausible explanation. There must be some more or less intelligent reason why girls happen to be so much less dissatisfied with the burdens laid upon them by their superiors than boys are. The author finds it in

the simple fact of their more positive attitude toward the commandment: "Thou shalt honor thy father and mother."

Of course that too is an alterocentric reason good enough. But say, would it be inadequate to suggest an explanation as plain and as close at hand as this one: Girls are more fond of working than boys are! Exclamation mark.

Especially this invariably applies to work assignments which may, in some way or other, enter an altero-centric pattern of behavior. Women are more genuinely interested in HELPING OUT.

HOW TEACHERS IN ALL CONTINENTS ARE KNOWN TO EVALUATE THE INDUSTRY OF BOY STUDENTS AND GIRL STUDENTS RESPECTIVELY

We should start by admitting the fallibility of teachers, or any superiors who think they are able to evaluate students objectively. In the school room, a more or less intensive desire on the part of the student to win praise from a superior--as well as other easily disregarded factors--may sometimes tend to perturb the absolutely correct and dependable picture of a student's inherent "laboriousness" (or "laziness"), properly speaking,

Nevertheless, the judgment of teachers in this matter is too unanimous indeed to be without any real significance.

Page 89

A School Inquiry, comprising 45 Dutch high schools and colleges with a total of 2757 male and 1103 female students, was conducted by Heymans and Wiersma. I want to cite just a few items of theirs, concerning "activity." (5)

Question 2	BOYS	GIRLS
Regularly industrious at work	52.2	65.4
Lazy	13.2	6.9
Question 3		
Generally attentive	51.8	64.0
Inclined to play during lessons	16.8	9.7
Question 24		
Immediately starting on tests	54.5	64.5
First dawdling (idling)	9.5	5.8

Of course it may be a most complicated task to tell exactly how much has here been contributed by other factors than laboriousness, etc. The treatment of those factors will have to come later in a chapter on order versus insubordination. But I should say this at once: We must of course make due allowance for possible prejudice in the minds of those who judge the characters of students in tests of this kind. Moreover, for an objective evaluation we must take into account an indissoluble complexity of "disturbing" factors in the minds of the students themselves. At the same time, however, it has to be stated emphatically: Nearly every single one of those "disturbances" of the pattern of evaluation (such as daughterly sense of discipline, docility and conscientiousness) presenting themselves in favor of an alternative interpretation, is actually seen to have the strangest tendency to end up precisely where the objectors would hardly expect them to. In the final analysis they simply lead us back

to one and the same source. It is a source I am constrained to regard as original, not derivative and environmental.

PART 7

Art versus Artlessness

Before I assume my full responsibility of making a decent apology for a chapter headline as odd as that, I want to permit myself a temporary jump right into the midst of practical problems we have to face in every-day life regarding the fascinating topic about Art and Women.

Page 90

HOW DO WOMEN GET ALONG WITH ART GENERALLY?

Here any decent observer will immediately find himself face to face with an inevitable question, a decisive question. We shall meet it frankly and openly. One thought may strike your mind right away, as soon as you visualize in front of you that woman artist side by side with her main competitor, and the rather pitiable position she actually has in so many a field of artistic genius. Would this perhaps be the most shatteringly impressive reason of all why women have had the old traditional label of "inferiority" attached to their sex in our civilization? Of course one should be realistic enough to welcome with eagerness every opportunity presenting itself for an honest study, and a more thorough understanding, of the ways that inferiority myth has managed to establish itself.

Now a male chauvinist may immediately say: Is there any foundation at all for you to go on using that more or less ironical term "myth" in this special case? Is not the feminine inferiority in this glorious field of human genius (Art) an indisputable fact?

Well, let us not try to push any of the authentic data under the rug. That warning of course does not mean that I have already made a whole-sale statement: "Women are general failures in the field of art." By no means. But suppose now, quite theoretically, that something not too far from that was actually the conclusion we were realistically to arrive at,--would that necessarily be a tragedy?

There is something here that seems to be pregnant with great trouble. I know several women who would tend to feel that way very keenly. A downright tragic stamp of crushing inferiority would seem bound to fall to their lot--in glaring contrast to the intensive hopes they have been clinging to all the time, at the very moment when it had to be stated indisputably that they could not pose as TYPICAL WOMEN and TYPICAL ARTISTS at the same time.

But here I have a more general and most serious, question for you: Would it, after all, be such a bottomless tragedy to admit openly once in a while: Women are inferior?

WHICH SUPERIORITY IS REALLY SUPERIOR?

Here one thing should be remembered: Inferiority, even if it has to be admitted, is, in the final analysis, a term of relative human evaluation. A person is simply bound to be inferior in some fields in order to be superior in other fields. So the important question might rather be: In which field is it more important to be superior? There too

of course the evaluation may seem to be a matter of boundless human subjectivity. Yet the true philosopher, and above all the true religionist, cannot help but inquire, with fear and trembling. Is there no absolute standard for human values? Is man doomed to grope in the dark regarding the most existential matters in his life?

Page 91

The problem confronting us is among the oldest ever registered in human history. It goes back to the age-old problem of good and evil. Nothing less than this is bound to be the pivotal point of my present study.

There is a definite distinction that has to be made between "different spheres" of artistic genius. Ethically, as well as esthetically, this has to be made clear. For the realism and the relevancy of my personal approach this distinction has to be pointed out and duly defined. But so far we are just picking out practical titbits that will make the need of such a general philosophy of art a self-evident matter.

When the common stock of men in our environment demand to have the female sex rigorously tested on their natural abilities in the field of art, what is the kind of art THEY are obviously thinking of? It is rather art in the classical sense of the term. Could I for my part simply leave aside that category of art inquiry? Of course not. I must make that, as well, one rigid object of my honest examination.

But even if we are thus agreed on the SPHERES of art, still the suggested exams will have to be broken down into two naturally separated departments. That corresponds to the following two fairly distinct questions:

CREATION OF ART VERSUS APPRECIATION OF ART

- 1) Are women particularly able to CREATE art themselves?
- 2) Are they particularly able to APPRECIATE the art already created by the OTHERS?

The former of these two is obviously the question arising most vividly and most spontaneously in the critical examiner's mind. So let us focus our attention, in the first instance, on that trying inquiry about women as creative artists. What endowment do they generally manifest, as compared to men, in the field of original artistic creation?

Havelock Ellis (26) calls our attention to an interesting fact. In primitive societies it is precisely women who have in their hands the RUDIMENTS of most arts, namely the industries. But what happens when it comes to a really artistic development of these? THEY INVARIABLY PASS INTO THE HANDS OF MEN.

The fully differentiated arts, even among savages, are almost exclusively in the hands of men.

And do we not, by the way, see the very same tendency in our civilized communities? Cookery has, from times immemorial, been the occupation of women in almost every culture. But what happens when that prosaic activity by and by adopts the character of a highly refined art?

Page 92

Then all of a sudden you witness a strange metamorphosis: The supreme command in the kitchen has passed over to a man. Women are now just helpers, not the bosses any longer. The great CHIEF has entered upon the throne.

And what about the exquisite Parisian phenomenon we call "la haute couture"? Bow down deeply, Madame, before the great "King of fashion." Have due respect for a Dior, or his successors to the throne at any time. This is what the world exclaims. Very few will remind you that what these men are unfolding is an art so sublime that it finally develops into a veritable terror regime. Terror against whom? Against women, women lying prostrate in front of their own torturists. Their posture has been compared to that of submissive adorers. They seem to love being led and ravaged, hauled hither and yon.

THE GREAT ANTHROPOLOGIST'S BAD BUNGLER

Some differential psychologists specializing in ethnographical studies of the sex roles seem to charge both men and women respectively of being a sort of cultural weather-vanes without any fixed principles whatsoever in their own intrinsic beings. Are such scholars right in their indirect accusation? If not, then what has led people as learned as that into their fatal misconceptions about women and men?

One of the books by Margaret Meade, *SEX AND TEMPERAMENT IN THREE PRIMITIVE SOCIETIES* (24) gives a most fascinating information about the Tschambule people, one of the three peoples she studied in New Guinea, Women appear to take care of the main occupation that society depends on for a living, namely fishery. In other words, they do not have fishermen. They have fisherwomen. And by whom are the most important articles for exportation, the mosquito bags, manufactured? By women! On the other hand, who are in charge of the ARTISTIC activities, such as carving, painting and even dancing? Men! Not bread-winners, but entertainers, beauty-seekers.

It is understandable of course that our good anthropologist immediately thinks of these phenomena she unexpectedly comes across, in terms of a certain contrast. They seem so "fundamentally different" from all conventional features observed in our own Western society. No wonder the author thinks the time has come to teach you and me an important lesson. Those more well-known Western patterns which WE have come to consider as the only "normal" ones, are not necessarily more normal than the ones that have sprung up in New Guinea. Our distribution of the sex roles are not necessarily more fundamental to human nature than theirs.

Page 93

In this new environment we are suddenly confronted with something that seems to break up all common rules of decent behavior that you and I have been accustomed to "rely on" as "universally human" and biologically inevitable.

Quite obviously Margaret Meade feels convinced that she has discovered, among the Tschambulis a strikingly NEW thing. And that "novelty" is going to give you and me a good shock right in the midst of our biased, unscientific thinking. It is good for us to have certain naive beliefs thoroughly shaken regarding a certain set type of fundamental rules governing human nature. Such delusion must come to an end.

But frankly, who is here the deluder and who is the deluded one? Are we forced to consider those role distribution customs of the Tschambulis as a revolutionizing pattern of sex roles, compared to that of our own?

Could we not consider that "sensational breach" in a fairly different light? In my opinion, what the Tschambulis have "permitted themselves to do" could just as well--or

even far better--be looked upon as NOT surprising at all,--as NOT breaking the great general rule in any way. More deeply considered there may be NOTHING so extraordinary about them whatsoever. Let me give my reasons plainly:

In fact, we may here simply keep to one general rule of natural original biology all the time. That rule has no surprises for us in any part of the world, or in any age of history. We have observed its practical functioning again and again. As I continue this present study about feminine other-centeredness I shall have to come back to the point with increasing insistence. For the distribution of respective roles between the sexes, this is a main concern of my study also. I too want to find out exactly what has caused men to choose certain occupations, and women certain entirely different occupations. Is it the different basic natures of the two sexes, or is it some accidental role distribution that just happened to establish itself, and then gradually imposed itself upon that special society in a rather arbitrary and hap-hazard way? Well, what did I soon discover? What conclusions was I forced to draw? Simply this one by all means: you may place our women wherever you like. To them the hard work will never, never be a deterrent. On the contrary they get on familiar terms with the toughest challenges. That applies infallibly whether they have to meet them in the asphalt jungle of Euro-American metropolitan ghettos or amid the surf-splashing reefs of some little island, lost to the rest of the world somewhere in the Pacific Ocean. What their "bold masters" carefully avoid, women throw themselves into with courage and perseverance, because it has a meaning behind its ruggedness.

Page 94

As for the "strong sex", you will recall what I had the audacity to proclaim about some of their weaknesses. I even insinuated that they seemed prone to give themselves up to certain extravagances which I could hardly help qualifying as sentimental. Anyway, if I have any conviction about the correctness of the general image I have so far portrayed of the male sex, then why should I be so terribly surprised to find that precisely this sex--even among the good Tschambuli people-- reveal themselves as the ones who take charge of the artistic embellishments? And notice, I do not find anything necessarily blameworthy in that as a profession. Beauty is not a thing we should downrate as a simple luxury. True beauty has the same beneficial effect wherever it turns up: It tends to make life an enrapturingly worthwhile affair. Good that someone is there to take care of that side of the business. For women evidently have no time for it. They are the working ones who strive and pain to do their JOB,--"far beyond the call of duty."

After all this, the only thing I still fear for my readers is that they might ask one not too encouraging question:

ARE WOMEN THEN JUST A GANG OF PROSY PHILISTINES?

This reminds me of another student of primitive societies, writing at a much earlier date than Margaret Meade. I am referring to Mikluch Macleay. He too is a keen observer. During his travels in North-East Guinea, Macleay was surprised to find no ornament whatsoever on the pottery of the Papuan people. He first wondered greatly about this. For the clay, he thought, ought to lend itself readily to all kinds of ornaments. But that whole pottery industry, as he soon discovered, was, characteristically enough, carried on exclusively by women. In the island of Bibi-Bibi he asked the girls, and

women of more mature age as well, why they did not ornament the pots. The reply he regularly got was this: "What's the use? It isn't necessary."

Of course, Macleay's conclusion in this case may be a grossly exaggerated generalization: He simply remarks: "Women's prosiness or realistic sense is sovereign. It does not permit them to give themselves up to any artistic extravagances where life can do just as well without them."

That may be a simplification of the matter which cannot be fully justified. Some will perhaps think it wiser to leave all cheap explanations alone and just marvel, as the great musician Rubenstein seems to do. At least in his work *MUSIC AND MASTERS* he says something remarkable. Music is of course the field of art closest to his heart, and so this is the matter he wonders most about. He says:

Page 95

"It is a mystery why it should be just music, the noblest, most beautiful, refined, spiritual, and emotional product of the human mind that is INACCESSIBLE to woman who is a compound of all those qualities." Emphasis mine.

Rubenstein's statement about music is undoubtedly very striking and to the point. Is his statement about women equally striking and to the point? That depends on what is meant by "inaccessible." In Rubenstein's language here it may not have been used in an absolute, categorical sense. It might refer to women's capacity for COMPOSING music, alleging that this is comparatively limited. To state as much as that, would, to all appearance, be no serious exaggeration at all. At least the number of really outstanding woman composers is not too impressive, is it? I mean even if women's social handicap in our culture--asserting itself in so many other departments--is taken into due account.

When it comes to women's ability to APPRECIATE music and heartily enjoy its incomparable ways of expressing beauty, things seem to be very different. We shall pay ample attention to the modern tests devised by educational psychology in order to examine the different facets of a given student's proficiency within the music sector.

How decisive it must be to properly understand the true meaning of those statistically revealing figures that have come to us from the laboratories of modern testing in the field of differential psychology! For such deeper grasping of the offered revelation, however, it seems indispensable that we should first take the trouble to build up a theory of Art that more accurately delineates the all-important relationship between ART and OTHER-CENTEREDNESS.

Later on we shall come back, with a more broadly enlightened mind, to a general documentation regarding women's aesthetic sense, but also to such specialized batteries of art testing as the Kwalwasser-Dykema Music Test. But now first then:

A TENABLE THEORY OF ART VERSUS ARTLESSNESS

"Art versus Artlessness"! What is the logical sense of an antonymy as strange as that? My reader must be perfectly justified in asking some special explanation here. For the opposite of ARTISTIC is otherwise not the ARTLESS is it? Your suspicion is understandable. We all know the sudden freaks of that capricious imp who sometimes springs up from the curious depths of etymology, and seems to have specialized in perverting the logics of current linguistic usage. Who else could be responsible for a bipolarity as unexpected as the above one: "Art versus Artlessness"?

Indeed, let me openly admit one thing: I am here actually operating with two fairly different meanings of the word "art." To be eminently ARTISTIC and to be absolutely ARTLESS are, both of them, quite laudable qualities, although each one of them, of course, in its own specific sphere. In the same way an INGENIOUS person and an INGENUOUS person may both be perfectly praiseworthy, without having too much in common when it comes to the respective ways in which they favorably distinguish themselves. Ingeniousness is the character of the typically artistic. Ingenuousness (childlike candor) is the character of the typically artless. (Latin: ingenuous==free-born, frank)

But both are surely values of human excellence. In other words, "art" and "artlessness" do not present themselves immediately as antonyms in the ordinary more or less belligerent sense of antonymity. Nevertheless, to me, their antonymous (controversial) character is as clear as I could ever wish any antonyms (opposite terms) to be. For, to me, the former is just as egocentric as the latter is alterocentric. And, in my estimation, this IS an essential contrast. Now you may of course very well hesitate to agree with me in the statement that ART is egocentric. This must be somewhat difficult to swallow down.

On the other hand most people, I think, will easily understand that the latter term, "artlessness," must have considerable right to be classified as alterocentric. For it is the peculiar quality of the simple, naive, candid, ingenuous mind. And these are prevailing tendencies of the EXTROVERTED mind. And I have no hesitation in adding: the CHILDLIKE mind, the FEMININE mind.

But what now about the "opposite pole"? Is ART, as a general phenomenon of human culture, rather EGOCENTRIC? To many people this would seem an almost incredibly daring accusation. Great humanists have always reacted most vividly against it. For to them art would present itself as the grandest cultural manifestation of this world, whereas the term "egocentric" has a definitely derogatory connotation. So how on earth could any man in his good senses, they seem to exclaim, dare to qualify art as essentially egocentric?

Well, let us proceed slowly and safely in this matter. Let us consider without any prejudice or preoccupation the natural relations between Art and Egocentricity:

First, what is art, humanly speaking?

Is it an indubitable human value, or is it rather a dubious value? I should not insist on appearing more controversial than I really am. No, here I may with full sincerity state the following as my immediate personal attitude toward art as a general value: I tend to look upon art -- in its true beauty and its true grandeur--as one of the crowning glories of any culture worthy of the name.

However, the concept of ART in this case has to be viewed from several different angles. True, the most natural and the most common conception of the term is, at the same time, a most elevated, a most noble one. I say "art," and immediately I think of, for instance, a symphony by Beethoven. That all sounds perfectly positive, doesn't it?

But this is just ONE of the several meanings of the word "art." If we take the Germanic word for art: "Kunst," we may easily convince ourselves that it is simply

derived from the verb "konnen" (in Norwegian: "kunne"). I CAN. That is, I have the ability, the practical know-how, to do something. This at once leads our thoughts toward a far more PROSAIC conception of art, as it were. It suddenly becomes far more related to "skill." So now the field is rather that of a simple practical ability of any kind, or just "cleverness", if you do not mind.

Precisely that latter word, however, gradually leads us over to the semantic sphere of an Anglo-Saxon word of intriguing significance: To be "clever" is often very much the same as to be "cunning." This word "cunning", however, is of course etymologically a most close relative to the German "konnen," - - and consequently also to "Kunst." In other words, it is a far cry from anything that is candid, ingenuous, childlike. It is ingenious, rather than ingenuous. It is what I call "sophisticatedly ADULT" rather than candidly CHILDLIKE. The emotional climate is growing more chilly; there is no doubt about that. We are in the land of the ARTFUL.

In fact, we may now say that we have moved along at least three rather different "climatic" regions:

- 1) The most exalted one, that of real ART ("the art of Beethoven").
- 2) An "intermediate" zone, - - not quite so exalted. Some may say: "not so spiritual." At least it is considerably less "glorious," according to the evaluation of certain "spiritual aristocrats." To be sure, many a highbrow of our proud Western culture would be very much inclined to qualify that form of "art" as rather MEDIOCRE. It is simply PRACTICAL. Do you notice the somewhat depreciative sound of that term in our language. The "practical," you see, often means something very close to "despicable." The art of growing potatoes does have its legitimate place of course, although a lowly one. But what place are there for "prosaic" potatoes in the elevated regions of the parnassus, the great summit called artistic creation?

In other words, that "intermediate representative" reveals himself as a rather "rustic" type, doesn't he? There is some reason to fear that the proudest advocates of "les beaux arts" would look upon that "boorish" companion there as not only a bit too MEDIOCRE, but even as downright BASE. Don't misunderstand me. Probably no one would go the length of claiming baseness here from a moral point of view. Some artists are known to take a handsome distance from anything that smacks of moral evaluations.

Page 98

- 3) It is only in the third region, the sphere of the somewhat shrewd and peculiarly "artful" that we strongly feel the taste of something reminding seriously of an ethical dimension. Only with the concept of the "cunning" do we feel justified in speaking about the morally inferior. But at that stage something definitely negative can hardly be explained away. Art in terms of artfulness clearly has to do with a certain deficiency of the heart. There is something humanly lacking, in that coldly intellectual respect, which definitely leaves a good deal to be desired in a warmly emotional respect. Certain ways of expressing oneself artistically seem to leave serious doubts, when it comes to the question of good and evil. The person who is artistic in the sense of cunning and artful has testified to a certain lack of goodness in his life. That is not so much a "goodness of the brain" in which he has been found lacking. No, it is definitely rather a "goodness of the heart."

It goes without saying that the motif of othercenteredness must be quite differently related to the three "regions" rubricized above. Yet they are all included in what is commonly understood by the word art. Obviously a differentiation is bound to be made then for a proper analysis from our special view-point.

A BULL IN A CHINA SHOP

Let us go over those "regions" again, one by one, but starting this time with the second one, the intermediary, the mediocre, the quality of practical skill. That type of art is artistic only in the "profane" sense of a technical proficiency, the German "KONNEN;" the simple status of the one who CAN, that is, a certain know-how of everyday practicalness. It is not difficult to see how that BURGEOIS - - or "boor," as I just described him - - tends to be evaluated by the other two. On the one hand the noble representative of a really "artistic art" and, on the other hand, the somewhat sophisticated representative of art in the sense of something rather artful, both of them have a marked disrespect for him. They naturally look down upon that "clod-hopper" with a virtual disdain in their eyes. To them he is just the mediocre one. He is too practical indeed to be anything but that.

Page 99

And to me, also, he is first and foremost the mediocre one. However, there is one essential difference between us. With me that MEDIOCRITY acquires a much broader and far less vilifying sense. As a matter of fact, I am not at all disturbed by the quite piteous position that kind of art happens to enjoy in the scale of values (or the scramble for prestige) of this present culture. What I have noticed with the greatest interest is this: That mediocre status with which practical arts have been forced to content themselves, has one remarkable advantage: They get along quite splendidly with the other-centered trend in human lives. The bare fact of the case is that alterocentricity herself is just this: She is typically mediocre. She is a damsel notoriously mediocre in a sense that has hardly been duly noted: the sense of true lowliness. I shall have to refer to this simple and noteworthy fact repeatedly. So I may as well make it crystal clear the sooner the better. Alterocentricity is not only mediocre, but she enjoys her mediocrity of a full heart. Alterocentricity is congenitally of a LOWLY BENT, perfectly straight-forward and frank, perfectly candid and childlike, perfectly sober-minded and down-to-earth.

So why should I, in my attempt to state the essential facts about this astonishing fundamental motif, be less straight-forward and frank, or less sober-minded and down-to-earth? There can be no honest reason why any cunning device should be employed in order to hide away the plain truth that alterocentricity and mediocrity thrive wonderfully together. Therefore they both delight in giving themselves visible manifestations in artisanry more than in art proper. An "art" in the sense of an artisan's trade is of course a cultural phenomenon of such humble extraction that it is hardly apt to strike the haughty minds of ultra-Occidental men as anything outstandingly grand and glorious. If alterocentricity has nothing more spectacular and high-flown than that to recommend it to the favor of a sophisticated 20th century civilization, then it runs no risk of stirring up the minds of us ultra-Westerners. For never have men had a poorer appreciation of the mediocre and the lowly.

THE GREEK "TECHNE" - - A STILL SURPRISINGLY ALTEROCENTRIC TERM FOR ART IN CLASSICAL ANTIQUITY

My students know I am not famous, in the lecturing halls of the history of ideas, for sounding the praises of sophisticated thought-forms in our culture, having their origin in the speculative philosophy of ancient Greece. But it is a wicked defamation (a sort of muckraking slander) that happens when we are all given the impression that this vain sophistication machinated by a handful of geniuses constitutes the original nature of the Greek people. It is you and I, members of a modern Western World, who have stooped down to the foolishness of making the weird thought-forms of those geniuses part and parcel of our cultural heritage. WE have made them popular. You and I are the ones who have finished by persuading a whole world today that a sophisticated loner such as Plato, with an interior disruption, bordering on madness, was a typical representative of the average Greek. But to say that this high-flown spiritualist dreamer typifies the common Greek is a lie, --in my opinion a veritable insult against that Greek. In my work on "Totality versus Disruption in European Thought" (MAN THE INDIVISIBLE; Oslo University Press, 1971) I have tried to get a closer look at Greece, the ancient culture to which all men in our modern world, from the very dawn of the Renaissance until today, have been looking back as the great model of artistic perfection. And what did I discover? I was highly surprised to observe a comparatively high degree of other-centeredness, a downright naive type of human extroversion, still preserved by those first and really unsurpassed Hellenes. They were seen to have something wonderfully candid and childlike right in the most splendid efflorescence of their artistic genius (23). In our modern world a thoroughly falsified pursuit of that nostalgic dream is a ridiculous inconsistency. In fact, our hellenized modern world does not even know what it is longing back to.

Page 100

In connection with our present topic it would be particularly illuminating, at this juncture, to learn a lesson from the simple testimony delivered by a piece of classical linguistics:

The Greek term for ART was "TECHNE". And what did "techne" mean? Nothing but sheer "craftsmanship." That is, the plain skill of manufacturing ANYTHING. And why not a pot just as well as a poem? ART in our proudly sophisticated sense of the term, is a high-brow concept which was simply unknown to classical Greek. Did you know that? Modern art is a brew of the SENTIMENTAL and the hopelessly INCONSISTENT. Believe me, the ancient Hellenes were a comparatively realistic and soberminded people.

Now, this may look to you like an argument from pure linguistics. I may assure you, however, that, in the substance of the contents as well, there is something exactly commensurate to it.

What were they like then, in reality, those popular every-day Greeks? I am here including all their true values, even those Olympic peaks of an incomparable beauty with which Greek art was destined to astonish the world. Do you know how Schiller, the famous German poet, characterizes that art? He says it is first and foremost precisely NAIVE! And he proves his point in a masterly, but little known dissertation.

But just how, then, were those "inaccessible" peaks of artistic beauty reached, after all, by human minds in an ancient community? That wonder, says Schiller, was accomplished precisely by means of a PERFECT SIMPLICITY.

Page 101

Do you grasp the full implications of that strong contention? In my opinion this can amount to one thing exclusively. I am referring to the simplicity pertaining to one single type of human being: the CHILD. But the simplicity of the child is just that gracious "mediocrity" which is the properly blossoming beauty of the alterocentric heart. That peculiar lowliness is endowed with an apparently paradoxical quality: It attains the unattainable, the highest pinnacles of realistic grandeur, not by means of any convulsive climbing endeavor, not by means of any elaborate incantation scheme, but naturally and unobtrusively, - - through simple GRACE! This is the very term selected by Schiller, as well, in order to make the incredible proficiency of ancient Greek art understandable.

You will readily realize then that it is not with any sense of shame I say: "Alterocentricity is mediocre." It is not with any sense of vain pride either. It is with a sense of plain realism. And the reality here so graciously received is, exactly as it has been portrayed, neither grand nor glorious in any spectacular modernist fashion. No-no, simplicity is for ever the secret of all true beauty, and the essence of all excellence in the kingdom of othercenteredness. Hence also my sole basic conclusion about art:

ONLY AS FAR AS ITS NATURE IS UTTER SIMPLICITY DOES ART HAVE ANYTHING WHATSOEVER IN COMMON WITH THE TRULY ALTEROCENTRIC

Other-centeredness is in itself the supreme art of human life. And precisely the COMMON-PLACE, the extremely PLAIN and PRACTICAL are inherent modes of its manifestations.

It goes almost without saying, after this, that the other two elements contained in the general concept of the "artistic,"--each one at its respective side of the "middle road", the "aurea mediocritas"--cannot in any way be compatible with the properly other-centered. Let us now give a moment's attention to those two as well, as they have unfolded themselves in our incredible culture. For they surely have unfolded.

COMPLICATEDNESS A CURSE TO SUPER-CULTIVATED MANKIND AS WE KNOW IT TODAY

I. First the complications caused by the element of grandiose artistic genius, properly speaking. This element--in its titanic climb heavenward and its elaborate type of perfectionism--is precisely what has made it so hopelessly problematic to women as a prevaillingly other-centered sex. It has revealed itself as too punctillious, too superb, too aristocratically haughty to remain in agreement with the child that lives in every woman. Just think of the enormous amount of TECHNIQUE it all demands. In fact, its super-complication in this respect is one of the main reasons, as we shall soon see, why it fails to appeal to women. Please notice my expression. It is not the female sex that fails,--and falls. It is art! Who knows what masterpieces of marvelous depth and human inliness have been lost to a world needing them desperately today! Why did they not appear? For the simple reason that some women, the only ones perfectly able to perform them, were fatefully discouraged by the rather inhuman rules of composition imposed by men.

II. Secondly art of that other super-tense type, more properly described as ARTFULNESS. That is an art filled to the brim with SMARTNESS. Here is where sophistication bears sway supremely, this time, however, with a tragic lack of anything that is genuinely artistic, anything that truly elevates the human soul. If it possesses any refinement at all, it is not that of true spiritual nobility; it is rather a refinement that falls too easily into the dubious track of astute duplicity, a spirit more proper to the sophists than to real truth-seekers. Any "art" of this kind is bound to alienate itself from everything that is modestly mediocre and congenially ingenuous (childlike). Its very atmosphere becomes so sharp and cold and pitiless that the spirit of alterocentricity has no chance to survive.

It is precisely with this kind of a threatening Damocles sword hanging over my head in a modern Western world I feel the need of crying out: Alterocentricity is ARTLESS. It can only thrive among people in whose hearts there is "no guile." (John 1:47, combined with Psalm 32:2.)

So in the last analysis my odd term of "artlessness" still vindicates its perfect right to be accepted as a respectable ANTONYM to the "artistic."

SO BACK TO THE LABORATORY TEST BATTERIES

To what do the modern research tests of differential psychology testify as regards MUSICALITY IN WOMEN?

We had come to the question of women's ability to appreciate music. And very close to that ability of theirs as connoisseurs, is their ability as executors of that same music (produced by the other ones). In this matter two faculties seem to be of great importance:

- 1) Auditory discrimination.
- 2) A good memory of the auditory impressions once received.

Of course neither of these proficiencies demands the originality of invention required in order to be a creative composer. Still they are both certainly indispensable to musicians on any level. And now, how do the two sexes compare in this field of contest?

The modern tests of musical talent register no significant sex difference with regard to simple auditory discrimination, nor with regard to memory. This has for instance been the consistent result where the Seashore Test of Musicality has been applied. (29)

And what happens when it comes to a deeper evaluation of women's general capacity of enjoying and appreciating music? Is it found that they possess a profound gift of taking real pleasure in music? We are now speaking about the precious privilege of gathering from it the deep personal values that give new dimensions and untold wealth to human life.

Now, of course, even with the fabulous technical progress of modern psychology, it would immediately appear rather problematic to really measure, in a satisfactory way,

things as delicate and as profoundly spiritual as that. But to the extent that scholars have managed to devise reliable methods of measurement, the present experimental findings are captivating indeed: Women actually to EXCEL even here.

And why shouldn't they? Women are more sensitive than men in a general way. So we are not surprised to hear that they are more sensitive to outstanding beauty. Modern research has revealed interesting facts about feminine superiority as a general rule regarding the appreciation of aesthetic values. This superiority has been established as a fairly consistent tendency. In other words, we should not think that music forms an exception. No it rather constitutes a special confirmation of the validity of a general rule, valid for a wide spectrum of aesthetic sensitivity in the fair sex.

PARTICULARLY CONVINCING DOCUMENTATION OF WOMEN'S SUPERIOR AESTHETIC SENSITIVITY

In the year 1949 three American psychologists tested 400 male and female students in some colleges in New York. The object of the investigation was in reality to examine differences between races (and varying cultures) with regard to personality traits. It so happened, however, that the results for boys and girls were reported separately. So I have taken the opportunity to consider the reports from the special viewpoint of sex differences, rather than race differences. As a matter of fact, the finding would seem even more dependable in this respect. The three national groups originally compared -- namely Nordics, Alpines and Mediterraneans -- were somewhat unevenly distributed for any quite fair comparison of the nationalities. If, however, -- as in our special case -- not the national groups, but the two sexes, are compared, the "fairness" should be perfect (30).

Page 104

Now, according to my own computations, eliminating the distorting factor of unequal groups, a comparison of the sexes regarding aesthetic appreciation gives the following scores:

Male students:	27.52
Female students:	34.11

This gives a critical ratio more than sufficient to be significant in favor of the girls.

Other investigations have also shown a fair consistency here. The Meier Art Judgment Tests, for instance, administered to men and women, show a clear female superiority for the appreciation of aesthetic values in general.

As for music in particular the tendency has nothing sensational. The Kwalwasser-Dykema Test administered to a group of 1000 students in 12 colleges in Eastern America showed a slight female superiority in average scores when the total groups were compared. When a differentiation was made, selecting only those of each sex group who had received musical training, this female superiority tended to vanish, but women at least never dropped below men (31).

But now we must also come back to the rather dark side of the picture:

ARE WOMEN NOTORIOUS FAILURES AS CREATIVE ARTISTS? IF SO, THEN TO WHAT EXTENT AND WHY?

What is it that happens when women face the tasks of eminent artistic creation? I am dealing of course with ORIGINAL creation, not reproduction. The facts speak for themselves. If we look at the world of music in particular, the testimony is too eloquent to be mistaken. Before anyone can be asked to play a symphony, that symphony has to be composed in the first place. Now, who sees to it that symphonies are being composed in this world? Is it men or women? Statistics are absolutely superfluous in this case. About the contribution made by the female sex in the realm of composition we all know one thing. It is significantly poor. Why is this so? Well, one reason is evident. Once more the same old insurmountable barrier is there:

Music is perhaps the most ABSTRACT of all arts. Its production also requires a high degree a THEORETICAL knowledge, as well as a formidable TECHNIQUE. Here, as in so many fields in which great abstraction and an elaborate amount of expert ability are demanded as indispensable prerequisites -- a certain female mediocrity of that blessed kind we have discussed so thoroughly, seems inevitably bound to appear.

Page 105

This of course applies, not only in the case of music. It applies to creative art in all possible fields. We shall have a close look at one of them after the other. The story is the same one all down the line: The more typically artistic a field of art happens to be, the more creative contributions on the part of women will tend to become negligible.

I do not blame anybody who has a hard row to hoe, striving to get away from the stubbornly returning feeling that there must be something profoundly negative about that mediocrity, that sad failure to reach the highest peaks of artistic creation. It has every appearance of miserable defeat. How could an ever so clever apologist manage to mobilize any real excuses -- or even any attenuating circumstances -- to make that deficiency appear in a favorable light?

As you already know, I am not apologetic. I feel no need of producing any attenuating circumstances. No one should be left with any serious misconceptions respective to the fundamental character of that mediocrity. The peculiar genius of feminine art is by no means inferior. It just cannot bear an atmosphere as barren and meaningless as that of a frigidly discursive intellect or any subtle trend of the excessively complicated. To avoid all misunderstanding here I have agreed to substitute a religiously impeccable term for "mediocrity"; that is, the cardinal Christian virtue of lowliness. Humility in the Biblical sense of "down-to-earth-ness" ("humilitas" derived from "humus") has nothing that could be declared contrary to the most sublime. The first class artist, as well as the first class scientist, can produce nothing worthwhile if he fails to be humble. Women's typical art is an art frankly admitting its dependence on the other ones, the Other One. And it rejoices in being thus dependent; that is, submissive. In this it is bound to differ conspicuously from the art that basks superbly in a sunshine of its own making. I am speaking in the latter case of an art -- and a science -- "gnostically" conscious of itself only, and perfectly content with that self. First and foremost it is content with its own perfect "KNOWLEDGE" ("gnosis"), a glorious know-how supposed to make its elitist possessor the infallible master of a vertiginous technique, a master of the world. But what kind of world is it he then manages to master. It is a world totally contained in the interior of his human mind. So it is a world which, in its turn, has its center IN ITSELF. It has its sole purpose IN ITSELF. It is per

cent self-contained. Self-sufficient is another term I frequently use. That is a main synonym to self-centeredness. It is the Eros philosophy of pagan idealism fighting the Agape of Christlike humility to the bitter end. It is in this sense that our present super-culture reaches higher peaks of "sublimity" and "perfection" every day. It is growing furiously artistic from day to day; that is, with a maddening trend of the ARTFULNESS of the self-intoxicated Adult, rather than the ARTLESSNESS of the ingenuous Child.

Page 106

I have already pointed out one way in which that pagan idealism manifests itself. It claims that human values -- such as work for instance -- find their goal IN THEMSELVES. Therefore there would be nothing wrong in suggesting that they may rightly be loved "for their own sakes." I called the reader's attention to the important fact that this apparently innocent form of expression springs out from a humanistic type of idealism, bearing the obvious stamp of simple self-centeredness. Hence it should be shunned as a pest of man-centered philosophy (barren humanism). Now the time has come to present the most nefarious sample of this species that has ever haunted the history of ideas. As we find ourselves at the very door-steps of literary art, a new topic seems to be right on target.

ART FOR ART'S SAKE -- WHAT IS WOMEN'S ATTITUDE TOWARD THAT FAMOUS SLOGAN?

I have already warned you: This is "idealistic" abstraction; not "idealism" in the sound popular sense, no-no, this is "idea-ism" in the purely Platonic sense. How could women be expected to understand and appreciate an art having its purpose "in itself"? It would surprise them greatly to hear that anything really worthwhile can have its goal in any other place than OUTSIDE itself. Here it is once more the other-centered *élan* of GOING BEYOND. If anything in literary history has ever proved self-destructive and tragically isolationistic, it is the "art for art's sake" movement. We have sufficiently demonstrated that a woman will intuitively look OUTWARD, not INWARD, to discover the deeper meaning of all things. And what is the ultimate purpose, the great "master purpose", toward which all things are found to converge? It is LOVE.

A FAMOUS EROS ARTIST ANSWERING A SEARCHING QUESTION: "SHOULD LOVE (AND THE BEAUTY IT FEEDS ON) LEAD MAN ON A ROAD OF TYPICAL SELF-CONTAINMENT?"

A striking example of the two conflicting attitudes at issue is indeed afforded by Flaubert on the one hand and a woman on the other hand, to whom he writes some almost incredible letters. Let us first listen to the exclusivistic man, the super-artist Flaubert, one of the prominent founders of the "art-for-art's-sake" movement.

Page 107

"There is nothing to me in the whole world but beautiful verses, well-turned, harmonious and musical sentences. The beautiful sunsets, moonlight scenes, colorful pictures, ancient marble, -apart from that there is nothing."

To another friend he writes:

"The only means of not being unhappy consists in enclosing yourself within the realms of art and considering the rest as nothing."

To Flaubert even love becomes a mere shadow beside art. Notice what he goes on saying to a woman friend, Mme X, who was blessed by her correspondence with him:

"Oh no, please love art, rather than me. Let us love each other in art, as the mystics love each other in God, and may everything else grow pale beside that love."

Leontine Zanta, a modern writer, confronted with that masculine frenzy of artistic isolationism--or whatever you would like to call it--clearly expresses how utterly amazed her own sex is at it.

"Ask a woman who loves, whether artist or not, if she wants to be loved for her own sake or for art's sake. Ask her at what times the beautiful verses, the well-tuned sentences, the lovely sunsets and the moonlit nights, or the colorful pictures, really inspire her passion. She will tell you that it is at the moment when her soul is filled with another love. THEN nature begins to take on life. Sunsets adopt the hues of fairyland. The moonlight causes creative intoxication to surge up in her. A woman is a real artist when her emotions are stirred by another emotional stimulus than that of pure art."

It is once more the passion of the PARTICULAR that asserts itself with its mighty realism. Its tangible reality lends colors and shape to the GENERAL, if you think we should pay any attention at all to the philosopher's "pure" idea. To a woman the contingent world with its tangible cases of every-day love is the self-evident end of any idea and its sole RAISON D'ETRE. Unless there is some purposeful reaching out for a literal goal, the means in itself becomes an utter absurdity.

I have already pointed out THE GOAL par excellence, the only thing that needs no ulterior haven, no further sphere beyond its own: LOVE.

And just here it is a revelation to see how strikingly two types of human beings disagree: on the one hand our typical woman; on the other hand the typical artist of that radical "art-for-art's sake" school. There is no doubt about one thing, says Cassagne in his classical dissertation L'ART POUR L'ART EN FRANCE:

"The school of art-for-art's-sake has considered love, whether happy or unhappy, whether legitimate or illegitimate, as downright harmful to the development of the artist." (First edition 1906, p. 220.)

Page 108

Flaubert must have been one of their great ideals in this respect. At least Theophile Gautier, another notorious member of the "club," seems to have admired him immensely just because of his attitude toward women and love. Feydeau, in his work on Gautier, quotes him as saying: "He (Flaubert) has had the wisdom not to get his life disturbed by any woman, legitimate or illegitimate,--nor by children." (p. 127.)

Here there is something almost unbelievable. Was that extreme "idealist" in the field of aesthetic philosophy, really convinced that any woman, if he had been careless enough to open his heart to her, would have "killed in him the artistic feeling" ("tué en lui le sentiment de l'art")? Or what does Flaubert really mean by that famous saying of his: "Aimons-nous en l'art, comme les mystiques s'aiment en Dieu, et que tout pâlisse devant cet amour." ("Let us love each other in art, as the mystics love each other in God, and may all things grow pale beside that love there.") (Flaubert: *Correspondances*, edit. 1898, vol. II, p. 286).

One thing, at least, we do know for sure. That is the audible cry of discontent, or bitter disappointment and pain, from one of his mistresses, describing him as a "bad lover" ("un mauvais amant.") And we also know the artist's strange answer to that woman (Her name was Louise Colet):

"J' ai voulu t' aimer et je t' aime de' une facon qui n' est pas celle des amants. Nous eussions mis tout sexe, toute décence, toute jalousie, toute politesse à nos pieds, bien bas, pour en faire un socle; et montés sur cette base, nous eussions ensemble plané au-dessus de nous-mêmes." (Corresp. II, p. 398.)

("I have wanted to love you, and I do love you in a way which is not that of (common) lovers. In that love we should have put all sex, all decency, all jealousy, all politeness at our feet, oh, far, far down, so that it might all make a foundation on which we could rise up, soaring high, high, even above our own selves.")

Perhaps the full truth of the matter is rather this, if I am permitted to express my own thesis about it without reservation: That great masculine artist does not in reality love either his woman or his art. What he loves is not even his own self. What he is actually wild about is just enclosing himself within himself. It is losing himself in himself. Even Narcissus was not as miserable as that.

Page 109

ROMANTICISM--THE PERENNIAL MAD REVOLT IN THE HISTORY OF OUR CIVILIZATION AGAINST ALL REALISM, IS AT THE SAME TIME A REVOLT AGAINST THE BASIC BASTIONS OF ALL CIVIL HUMAN ORDER:

The revolutionists call that order contemptuously: "BOURGEOIS."

Cassagne has clearly shown us to what extent the art-for-art's-sake movement had the worst fruits of its exclusivism in common with another more general artistic movement--I would say another EGOCENTRIC movement, namely ROMANTICISM. Entirely romantic is also that "Satanism" which urged Beaudelaire, another "club" member, to personify and actually "deify" Evil, as a sort of multi-form and "omnipotent" force (op. cit, p. 331). Entirely romantic is also that supreme haughtiness characterizing each and every one of those aristocrats of the super-artistic world, so proudly self-sufficient and radically introvert. They detested everything susceptible of equalizing human beings and of leading them heartily close to each other (Ibid., p. 170). Flaubert expresses his disdain for any kind of fellowship in these terms:

"Je veux ne faire partie de rien, n'être d'aucune académie, d'aucun corporation, ni association quelconque. Je hais le troupeau, la règle, le niveau." (Correspondance II, p. 368)
("I want to belong to nothing, no academy, no corporation, no association of any kind. I hate the flock, the rule, the (common) level.")

Particularly romantic, furthermore, is that incurable spleen (bitter weariness of life) which seems to be Beaudelaire's only faithful companion throughout his existence,--an existence whose changing episodes are nothing but an "oasis d' horreur dans un desert d' ennui" ("an oasis of horror in a desert of boredom").

It feels comforting and liberating to finish this expose on a note one might qualify as a sound type of flight, in other words, not an "elopement" by any means, not a "French leave" in the not so favorable sense of the term. No, the liberation we are to have the pleasure of speaking about is one that helped a contemporary writer to escape triumphantly from the lugubrious and all-engulfing pessimism always found right in the wake of egocentric sentimentalism, wherever that pest threatens to inundate any cultural movement. Remarkable enough, it is the case of a WOMAN artist. George Sand writes as follows to Flaubert himself, informing him about the great miracle of her CONVERSION:

"I cannot forget that my personal victory over despair has been the work of my will and a new way of understanding things, a way entirely opposite to the one I used to have." (Correspondances, Lettre de décembre, 1875).

Page 110

At what moment did this transformation take place in George Sand's life? It happened just at the time when, like Victor Hugo, she finally decided to place her art at the service of humanity. Giving up "le lyrisme égoïste," she fixed her eyes on "l'idéal en dehors d'elle," ("the ideal outside herself"). Thus she sought and found, says Cassagne, in the altruistic action, an effective means of diversion."

What conclusions can we draw from the art-for-art's-sake movement as regards the nature of extreme self-centeredness and the nature of extreme art?

"ANTI-SOCIAL" TURNS INTO "ANTI-MORAL"

What here catches our attention is the MORAL angle quite as much as the SOCIAL one. Not only the famous (or infamous) author of "Fleurs de Mal," but the entire artistic movement he represents, is unquestionably antagonistic to moral standards in any traditional sense of this culture, after all a culture more or less influenced by Christianity. As Aron Schaffer expressed it in an article of the "Swany Review" (October/December, 1928, p. 409), the movement's conception of art was definitely "un-social, un-moral, un-religious and anti-bourgeois." Accordingly, it was also bound to be anathema to the great reading public of the middle of the nineteenth century. And it is bound to remain anathema forever to the sound spirit of lowliness (I have taken the freedom to call it mediocrity) characterizing Christian other-centeredness through all ages.

THE SUPER-ARTISTIC SNOBISM OF REGARDING EVERYTHING USEFUL AS A KILLER OF ALL BEAUTY

We should not think it strange or inconsistent at all that human art, in its ultimate humanistic formulation, would have to land just in the extremes I have described. And I could not better sum up its downright enmity against the USEFUL than by simply quoting Theophile Gautier's new artistic credo, contained in his illustrious preface to ALBERTUS, 1932:

"En general, des qu'une chose devient utile, elle cesse d'etre belle. Elle rentre dans la vie positive, elle devient prose, de libre esclave. . . Tout l'art est la. L'art c'est la liberte. . . La peinture, la sculpture, la musique, NE SERVENT A REIN (Emphasis mine). Les objets dont on a le moins besoin sont ceux qui charment le plus."

("Generally, from the moment on when a thing becomes useful, it ceases to be beautiful. It enters the realms of positive life; it turns into prose. It is no longer free, but a slave. . . That is what art is like. Art is freedom. . . Painting, sculpture, music--these serve no purpose. The objects one needs least are the ones that are most charming.")

Page 111

And that new art, so perfectly useless--i.e., so "gloriously liberated" from all bonds of usefulness in a bourgeois sense--was destined to liberate the artist himself, in his turn, from every "wretched dependence" on the prosaic things of practical life, every "crafty crutch" that would "spoil his liberty."

Fortunately it was found by some more realistic lovers of beauty that there was the greatest need of being LIBERATED FROM THAT "LIBERATION"! We have cited the woman writer George Sand. She was among those who, by and by, found freedom in useful service.

But most characteristic of women in general is this: They sense no need at any time of either one of those liberations. They are free already. No matter what the feminist emancipation movements say. There may be a feminine category of freedom our women's lib heroines have not yet discovered.

To understand this better, let us turn to one particular art. It is among the very few in which women have shown themselves able, not only to compete with men, but I was on the point of saying to outstrip them triumphantly. That ought to bring us somewhat closer, also, to the reasons for women's general inferiority in so many other fields of artistic performance.

WOMEN ON THE STAGE, EXCEPTIONALLY SUCCESSFUL

What is it then that the art of Thalia offers to women?

1. IMMEDIATENESS: There is an immediate and spontaneous contact with other individuals, whose expectancy and applause incite actors to EXPAND and GIVE their utmost. That is of prime importance to the fresh ingenuousness of other-centeredness. How could such spontaneity fail to inspire a feminine heart?

2. TOTALITY: Every bit of the individual's personality is absorbed by the new life to be lived, the new character to be represented on the scene.

To compose a piece of dramatical art is a very different matter. For that again is a rather tough piece of creation. It requires a certain aloofness in fact,--a weird attitude of "objective observation." More than that, it requires, in the mind of the dramatic author, a sort of downright DISRUPTION, if I may reintroduce the term I have selected to represent the very opposite of totality. The person who writes the drama will probably know this better than anybody else. He is actually constrained to maintain an attitude of downright INWARD DUPLICITY. Or I had rather say: MULTIPLICITY. The author of a drama is to "objectify," as it were, the feelings he personally has. This "objectification" never imposes itself as a similar necessity upon the mind of the actor,--or rather the actress, since it is about her we are mainly speaking at the moment. She is under no such more or less painful constraint of what I would call a "mental alienation." It may seem strange to you that I am here going to the extreme of associating the activity of the dramatic writer with some degree of "mental insanity," but I shall soon justify that apparently rather monstrous analogy I have thus dared to establish.

Now do not think I am here trying to stir up the hallucinatory vision of a white-winged angel versus a horse-hoofed devil just to produce a fascinating contrast. No-no, I do not at all claim--I would not dare to claim--That the dramatic actor, the living person performing his--or her--part right in front of us there on the theatrical scene, in his--or her--turn, is necessarily exempted from the "duplicity" I have "insinuated." On the contrary, full frankness demands that I should warn against any internal disruption of the very foundation of totality in human beings. The actor, as well as the author, runs a definite risk. In my book GOD THE SITUATION ETHICIST I have a straight and scrupulous look at the whole gamut of serious implications so rarely realized in that risk. In fact acting out certain theatrical roles does imply the potential of a terrible risk.

However, at this juncture, I shall rather limit myself to admitting an indisputable advantage which the actor does have, compared to the case of the dramatic author. The former is, at least, permitted to lose his personal identity in ONE SINGLE alien character. The author is not that lucky. His mind is mostly bound to be disrupted (split) by the very inter-play of two--or quite a number of--different characters.

This may turn out to be an "alienation" more serious than you have ever dreamt about. However, as we shall see, our other-centered woman seldom has the misfortune of being that author. She is far more likely to be just the actress (most likely of course not even that).

At any rate, it is the reactions of the actress we have here thought it most illuminating to have a look at. In acting out a role any outward-directed (other-centered) person may satisfy a natural urge, namely that of expressing the peculiarities of a given character. On the stage a woman is permitted to give herself, body and soul, to that character of the other one. In fact, she is supposed to do just that. The theater will praise her in the same degree as she manages to put herself unreservedly in the place of that other one. But in a way this is exactly the very function of the other-centered mind. True enough, theater is make-believe. As such it is bound to be, to some extent, an illusory and basically unrealistic act. Nevertheless, there is some definite room for a

laudable totality right in the midst of the acting person's relative splitness. The one playing a part in the drama is allowed to remain "whole", - within the scope or the perimeter of that one character he is asked, at a given moment, to represent on the stage. You may of course call this an imaginary personality. But it is, just our good actress who is supposed to identify herself with that personality. And of course there is no one like a woman to identify herself totally with the life of "the other one."

EVERY WOMAN A VIRTUAL ACTRESS

Here someone may bring in a strong objection. All women are not actresses, are they? Granted. And yet, do you forget that life itself is a sort of theatre? In that most realistic theatre women are the prominent actresses. In the same degree that they are particularly childlike, or particularly sanguine in temperament, they will have the child's or the sanguine's tendency to project their thoughts, their feelings, and all there is in them, OUTWARDS, as it were. That rule seems to go into effect whenever a woman finds a suitable public in front of whom she has a great opportunity to play out her private little drama-with all the artistic effects at her disposal. Life itself has become a play, enacted in more lifelike and realistic settings than any theatre can offer.

A PLAYING CHILD--NOT A "PLAYGIRL"

There I dropped a word providing a lot of information,--and in more than one direction. Of course PLAY is a phenomenon we usually associate with children more than with anybody else. But the typical sanguine, too, is for ever a child. And so is the typical woman. She never grows up. She never grows old. She never grows sophisticated. I have found it necessary to dedicate a whole book to a study of the special relationship between women and their children, and a special chapter to the character of childlikeness, the child as a peculiar type of human being. That certainly is not an exhausted topic in our culture. For the Western World in which we happen to live, has fallen in love with adulthood, not childlikeness,--I can assure you. (See MOTHERLINESS).

Page 114

So far I have spoken mostly about trends of childlikeness. I have tried to give at least some clues to the secret of the many Sarah Bernhards we do have, after all, in this world. For they are surprisingly numerous. What we still have not spoken very much about is the topic of:

WOMEN AS READERS AND WRITERS

We must now get to a capital point. How do women--that "un-aesthetic sex" (Schopenhauer)--tend to behave when confronted with a field of art particularly significant to our history of ideas: literature. Literature includes such an infinite number of genres. There ought to be, in this wide spectrum, something adapted to almost any taste or any tendency. What do female readers choose, then, in that multiplicity of artistic fields? In their very choice there must be the best indication of feminine faculties and affections.

We have already mentioned women's special handicaps as playwrights. Their contribution to dramatic literature is revealingly poor. The great dramatists are men, even the most masculine of men. Very commonly they are extremely introverted. Quite conspicuously they belong to what Kretschmer used to call the Schizo-thym type of

human personality. To a dramatist that would actually seem to be a downright advantage. I mean if we were to think onesidedly of his fame and success as a writer. For the introvert artist has a rare degree of objectivity right in the midst of his fiery passion. That icy coldness which the famous drama writer Strindberg found in his own soul impresses us as so ghostly and fantastic just because it manages to live and thrive side by side with the most overwhelming sentimentality. The tragic side of this picture cannot be left without any comments. The "schizo-thym", to Kretschmer, is the type of person who, if he turns mentally ill, will naturally become SCHIZOPHRENE. The trend of mental splitness (indicated by the prefix "schizo") seems to proceed in stages. The end stage was bad enough in Strindberg's case. He landed in the sad wards of the insane asylum. And what kind of "success" is that? What kind of worthwhile *fame* is that?

Oscillating between extremes of the mentioned kind hardly testifies to any great degree of wholeness and harmony in a human soul. But creating a great drama may require of its author nothing less than this: a multitude of heterogenous qualities joined together in one and the sane mind. The artist who writes the play, unlike the one who plays it, had to deal with a complexity of different characters almost simultaneously. His consciousness is forced to divide itself up, as it were. Playing those characters off, one against the other, this constitutes an essential element of drama. Accordingly, a certain complexity, or actual splitness, in the artist's deepest interior, does not necessarily become a hindrance in the case of dramatical authorship. On the contrary, it turns out to be a promising asset. But what it promises is also, in the final analysis, perhaps a dubious complexity of fateful things.

Page 115

I describe a similar interior disruption in the case of mystics, such as the pre-renaissance theologian Meister Eckhart. See my book *"Evangelical" Mysticism, its Charisma and its Costs*. There I try to explain the enigma of precisely that mystic "cohabitation" between ecstatic fervor and glacial chill, as a case of fatal perversion in the history of religion. (See p. 15.ff.)

A noteworthy difference, however, is: In the history of literature this pendulating movement between the extremes has been accepted as "legal tender", one might say. It has received the full blessings of experts in literary criticism. Psychiatric medicine seems far more reluctant to normalize it. As characterologists seriously worrying about the normalcy of modern minds, we are getting to a point where it reminds us of some seething volcanos erupting from the summits of certain extremely high mountains. In the depressing solitude of the mountain desert's coldest nights the customary silence is suddenly broken by the hissing sound of molten lava mingling with the pallid snow of the steep mountain side. Intermittent tongues of the fire make their way, specter-like, along the bleak silhouettes of the snow-clad giant.

If this is the image in nature that is most evocative of the spirit demanded in a human soul in order to create successful drama, then "success" and "creativity" must have turned into values of a rather ambivalent kind.

Some may poetically describe that ultra-objective aloofness demanded by the dramatic genius as a harbor of wonderful "calm" and peacefulness." But then the "peace" they are speaking of can hardly be the peace of life. It must rather be the peace of death.

One thing should be granted: That pushing of a person's internal conflicts to an extreme from which there is no return, does constitute the culmination of tragedy. And tragedy does constitute the culmination of dramatical art. It may be even be true that this same cunning incantation or sophisticated calculation of modes and means--a sort of weird impassibility and objective aloofness right in the midst of sentimental passion, is necessary for the composition of any piece of art evaluated as eminent today. But then we also fully realize why those more immediate sensations of the harmoniously "cyclothym" character, to use Kretschmer's term, just do not make it. Evidently, for typical artistic creation a long process of decantation is desperately needed. "Disturbing" trivial elements would mean a flat anti-climax. So they must be carefully disengaged from the "essential values."

Page 116

We have here been touching some eerie aspects of the SCHIZOIDE-- that is, extremely egocentric--mind at the stage where it acquires prototypical dimensions. It constantly has to do with pushing an individual's already disrupted soul toward an extreme, past return.

Larnac (38) expresses the essence of artistic genius in this way: there is an absolute need of a certain "crystalization of living matter into plastic matter." How could you expect a genuine child to tackle processes of artifice like that? It would be equally absurd to look to women for expertise in similar connivance against nature. It would be tantamount to asking them to isolate themselves and keep aloof from everything that fills their hearts. Just notice how little women have in common with the famous "esprit" of the French "salons litteraires."

THE FRENCH EPIGRAM--A DEMONSTRATION

The epigram has always remained a typically masculine field of literature. Here as well, you see, there is a forbidding distance between natural feeling and artistic form. The elegance and "esprit" of epigrams actually imbue them with a downright chill. Irony is a very common feature in them. The atmosphere is that of the distinguished Parisian SALONS. It seems saturated by "bons mots", or even a touch of sarcasm, at least a certain dignity and reserve that make you homesick for a more congenial literary heaven somewhere. For this is bound to be a pitifully poor nourishment for an alterocentric person longing for the comforts of the warm human heart.

But who, then, finds his refuge in those exclusive literary clubs? None but the stiff, "battered-up" introvert. Probably his theoretical ideal would be total hermitage. But for some understandable reasons he cannot bear to be quite alone. Nobody can. So he realizes the second best: He selects his narrow circle of distinguished "friends." Around that circle he builds up his towering barricades. Here he need not worry so much about his privacy. No boorish and indiscreet person will dare to peep through the keyhole of his secret chamber. Precisely the irony of his epigrammatic style is a favorite weapon in his hand to keep any possible intruders at a respectful distance.

We understand perfectly why women have never excelled in a literary genre as permeated as that with the frigidity of ironical esprit. Among the 2000 epigrams selected by L. De Mauri, only 12--twelve--are seen to be of female origin!

I do expect a serious critical question here: You do not mean to say, do you, that genuine women are excluded from having any part in the peaks of human art, cultural glories as exquisite as for instance lyrical poetry?

Page 117

No, I do not claim that the alterocentric spirit excludes any person from enjoying the gorgeous pleasures of genuine poetry. And still we must probably accept the inflexible rule applicable to all exceptional genius. The Dionysian outbursts of that genius do demand a considerable degree of that curious splitness for which Kretschner has erected a stern monument in his very term "schizothym" (the mind of the mentally split).

In lyrical literature is presumably very much the same bipolarity as in so many other realms of the spirit. I feel that this must be exactly what the great German poet Schiller speaks about in his dissertation "Über Naive und Sentimentalische Dichtung." (See MAN THE INDIVISIBLE, p. 90 f.f.)

"NAIVE" VERSUS "SENTIMENTAL" POETRY

What great intuition does this distinction in Schiller's vocabulary actually stand for? The remarkable conclusion the great German poet here arrived at was the result of a profound crisis in his personal life. His career as a writer was still a rather vacillating one. So it was natural for him to compare himself to a far more immediately successful writer in contemporary Germany, namely Goethe. That secret comparison, undertaken by Schiller, between the two great rivals, is one he performs with a remarkable endowment of deep self-analysis. The battle-field in which he measures strength with the overdimensioned genius in Germanic literature, Goethe, would seem to be a rather ideal one. It reminds me about a secret battle the Norwegian poet Henrik Ibsen, in his younger days, had with his contemporary countryman Bjørnstjerne Bjørnson. Schiller (like Ibsen) is the more dramatic personality. He is the introvert genius, harboring in his breast that perilous tendency of bringing his inner conflicts to a point past revocation. Psychologists claim that this emotional discharge, successfully managed in the person's imaginative world (in this case the world of artistic or philosophical writing) will save him from undertaking it in the more dangerous realms of real life. I do hope this "safety valve" is a really safe mechanism, letting some of the "steam" off, when it otherwise threatens to burst the "container."

Anyway, the opposite of this "steam-generating" SENTIMENTAL, in Schiller's sense of the term, is the NAIVE. He generally has a far more easy-gliding course--in his professional career, as well as his life, by and large. What he seems to generate, *in* him and *around* him, is harmony.

Page 118

I shall have to confess, it is true, my serious doubts concerning the perfect "NAIVETE" of Goethe's mind (and that of Bjørnsson, too for that matter). Goethe was definitely not any model of the harmonious totality which is free from the "schizo" problems of life in our Western civilization. By the way, where in this world of today did a pure specimen of that absolutely un-problematic "naive" personality turn out to be an eminent poet? Goethe was, in fact, a particularly outstanding LYRIC. And when has exceptional lyrical genius ever been engendered in the totally harmonious naive (i.e. a person of faultless candor)? Besides drama, lyrics today is still the great genre at the

very summit of the Parnassus. And notice: this is not the lyrics of David, the shepherd of the Lord. Oh no, the lyricism this world of ours knows is not a bucolic one. It is the lyricism of Dionysius.

THE ELEMENT OF GREAT HUMOR IN LITERATURE-- AND IN THE LIVES OF MEN AND WOMEN

We have already mentioned irony. Is humor just as foreign to the feminine spirit of irony is? How does humor distinguish itself as a feature of human personality? How does it weigh--up or down--in the egoaltero scale of human values? And then naturally this question: Is humor more feminine or more masculine in its peculiar essence? The answer to that question is no common-place one. In fact, we now have to face some matters of a strangely contradictory appearance. Of course an ingredient as spicy as humor must play an important part in many fields of literally art. There can be no doubt or denial about that matter. I do not either doubt or deny the role of humor as a significant feature of human life as a whole.

ARE WOMEN A HUMOR-DEPRIVED SEX?

The Italian author G. B. Ughetti has written an interesting book on what he calls THE LACK OF HUMOR OR OF THE COMICAL SENSE IN THE FEMALE SEX: Here he makes the point that there must exist in women a certain "lacuna mentale." That mental gap is not an significant one. Women simply manifest a general indifference toward--sometimes even a regular aversion against--a "fine and keen form of art" namely the art of the comical, the art of humor. Signor Ughetti's complaints are full of sadness and disappointment:

"Why do not women, who otherwise laugh and smile with such frequency and such facility, also laugh at that which provokes laughter in men? Why do they not appreciate elements of true humor? Among us men certainly humor is regarded as one of the most vivid literary forms of expression, and one of the most graceful and subtle manifestations of the spirit." (35)

Page 119

These are the disenchanting male's puzzling questions. He admits that he is unable to come up with any satisfactory answer himself. Do we have a solution, at least an intelligent theoretical one?

WHAT CAUSES WOMEN TO LAUGH HEARTILY?

First, do modern personality measurements reveal anything that might give us a clue in these matters? Everybody knows that women laugh frequently and easily. But what does that prove? Perhaps it cannot be taken as conclusive proof of anything but sheer emotionality. The fact that women do have a superabundant degree of strong emotions in their system has never been seriously challenged. The peculiar modes and manners of that emotionality will be discussed in our next chapter. Even then there will be no need of proving convincingly that women particularly enjoy satisfying their emotional urges. They live normally only when they are allowed to give expression to the feelings they do have. According to public opinion research in various cases (we shall cite some American ones), women are the ones choosing humorous films with the

greatest eagerness. But please notice, they are just as eager to choose sad movies. What could be the plausible explanation of two so opposite phenomena in the same person? Well, I can hardly think of any more plausible one than this. What is needed is emotions. That need is paramount in women. Whether those emotions find their outlet in hearty laughter, or is a stream of tears, this often seems to be almost a secondary matter. Having emotions,--and being allowed to express them, above all all, this is the great thing.

It should not be inferred from this that women make no selection at all among the emotions presenting themselves. Of course they do. And considered from our special viewpoint, we are not surprised to find just what KIND of emotions they are seen to select.

HOW DO WOMEN PREPARE "GETTING HIGH" ON EMOTIONS? DO THEY REVEL IN THIS HABIT INDISCRIMINATELY?

Brun Gulbrandsen asked his Norwegian test subjects, 83 boys and 91 girls (all pupils in a "continuation school" in a city in Western Norway) the following questions (Questionnaire C, items and 11):

- | |
|--|
| 3) How do you like to see films about criminals and war.
11) How do you like to see love films? (op. cit., p. 99) |
|--|

This first question gave the figures 1.34 for boys and 0.03 for girls. That represents a rather marked sex difference in attitude indexes. And the same is true for the latter inquiry, only in the opposite order. Boys 0.29; Girls 1.20.

Page 120

We may supplement these questions with American data, covering an infinitely larger constituency of test subjects, but showing exactly the same tendency.

In the "Public Opinion Quarterly" for the summer of 1949 we find an inquiry arranged by FORTUNE. This one also deals with sympathies and antipathies in regard to films. It is the one I referred to above as showing female preferences in the emotional field. It does show that women embrace SOME emotions with eagerness. However, it also shows with what horror they shy away from OTHERS. Afterwards we shall add some explicit details, including also the question of humor.

68 per cent of a national sample in the United States said they had been to the movies during the preceding months. These were further asked:

"Are there any particular kinds or types of moving pictures you would rather NOT see?"

All those who could give an affirmative answer, were then asked: "Which kinds?" Among the results we may cite as follows:

Horror, murder, gangster pictures:	Men 19; Women 42
Love, romantic pictures:	Men 10; Women 2

These are, in fact, the only two questions in that questionnaire showing a significant sex difference in the result. One fact remains: there is a difference

significant enough between the two sexes, as to certain things each of them DOES NOT want to indulge in, things NOT worth "wasting one's emotions on."

52 per cent of the same national sample could name a movie they had "recently seen and particularly LIKED." They were further asked, "Would you use any of these words to describe this movie?"

	Men	Women
Romantic	11	24
Exciting	29	24
Humorous	29	33
Sad	<u>11</u>	<u>20</u>

Page 121

IS THIS RELISH FOR SAD EMOTIONS "JUST ANOTHER EVIDENCE" OF WOMEN'S "INTROVERT HANGUPS"?

In the above list I have again underlined the item "SAD." Now, of course, anyone would hesitate to register sadness--PER SE--as a particularly favorable emotion, generally speaking. Do women really have a peculiar urge for emotions as negative as that? Do they actually look for sadness? Well, strict realism forces us to keep faithfully to the factual data. Women do show a stronger trend than men to dwell upon some themes of downright sadness. How could we manage to give to this fact a favorable interpretation in terms of other-centered buoyancy? How could it in any case be interpreted as a viable spirit of "feminine cheerfulness"?

This is a serious question. For who would dare to elevate sadness, as such, to the worthy level of "life-promoting emotions"? No, that would be too bold indeed. There is one thing, however, we are here all tempted to forget. And that should, on the contrary, be carefully kept in mind all the time: Sadness is very closely related to COMPASSION! This permits us to grant to it a definite place in the sphere of a positive other-centeredness as well. Compassion is, in fact, an outstandingly other-centered emotion. It is a MATERNAL emotion of the highest rank. We shall discuss this important topic further in our special chapter on sensitivity versus insensitivity. We shall then face more boldly than ever the task of finding out just WHY women so often seem to have an even greater predilection for feelings of a certain melancholy mood than for what is humorous and gay.

Anyway, what we do know, so far already, is indisputable. There do exist SOME negative emotions against which women show a CLEAR AVERSION: This becomes conspicuous enough whenever we compare their figures to those given to men's reactions in the same fields. Our first-mentioned item "Horror, murder, gangster pictures" made the issue evident. Here, then, there is something we may as well face rightaway and with decisiveness. For there is hardly any room in it for ambiguous interpretations. Women's reactions against scenes of horror is simply the reaction against the absolutely UNBEARABLE.

Page 122

IS IT A WOMAN'S CULTURAL CONDITIONING TOWARD THE SEX ROLE OF BEING A "SISSY" THAT ONCE MORE "PRESSES HER" INTO AN AVERSION AGAINST PHENOMENA THAT NORMAL MEN DO NOT RESENT AT ALL?

Of course I do not close my ears to any reasonable suggestions of alternative interpretations. And I would not be surprised if our ethnographic anthropologists once more suggested an explanation in terms of long term social pressure. In other words, these special sex roles, as well, might be culturally determined; that is: girls have a stronger aversion against scenes of violence and murder, simply because they have been taught, through generations, to "play that role of feminine delicacy" whereas boys have been "taught" to adopt a "tougher attitude." Of course this alternative theory is worthy of being considered seriously. It would be a poor science to deny bluntly the very possibility of women having developed in a particular culture, through ages of social tradition, some particularly eloquent ways of manifesting their disgust in front of scenes of cruelty and crime. Some specific social environment might encourage such anti-violence manifestations among women with particularly influential emphasis. Almost every one of us preferably does just what he is expected to do, and therefore conditioned to do. But to regard that sociological mechanism as the only reason--or the main reason-- why women react more strongly against scenes of violence and outrage--no, that is a thesis I could hardly ever buy. It is too cheap, too lopsided indeed. For that, the sex differences here registered are too marked and too universally recognized. That greater repugnance against violent sensations among women is a fact established in all known cultures.

Similarly it is MEN, in all cultures, who indulge more freely in the contemplation of imaginative and theatrical spectacles of that ferocious kind, so filled with horror and nerve-racking incitement. In my vocabulary that sentimental indulgence is just "schizothym" and "egocentric." It happens to be a "schizo" phenomenon and an egocentricity against which women prove to have been made pretty immunized. That immunity is a most remarkable thing. Let us admit it. Its true causes must be searched and found.

So far, let us sum up our conclusions in a rather cautious and tentative way: Pictures dealing with violent and horror-provoking sensations-- sensations indulged in almost for the sake of violence and horror itself-- are consistently seen to arouse considerably less disgust in men than in women. This is a fact that has to be faced, consistently. And consequently a word of fairness--but also firmness--should be addressed to the cultural anthropologist, as well as to the general reader:

I am the first to admit the presence of a formidable social TYRANNY, shaping one individual this way, another one that way. "Social pressure" is almost a euphemistic term for this monstrous mechanism on many occasions. And now once more this searching question: Why does it happen to be just men who, in all countries examined, permit themselves to "be pressed" by society into that particular role of an indulgence I cannot help qualifying as ultra-egocentric? I am sorry I do not have any statistics from the darkest of Africa. I wish I had them. But I don't. So I must keep realistically to the ones I do have.

Page 123

A similar cross country investigation of American public opinion research deals with the kinds of radio programs American listeners would rather NOT listen to (36).

The items "Mystery, detective and horror" obtain the following figures: Men--14; Women--33. Here too we experience the same AVERSION in feminine minds against indulgence in cruelty. This actually furnishes the one striking sex difference in the whole table we have in front of us.

However, the special emotion on which we now intend to concentrate our attention, is what all will call an innocent one. It is the case of "humor" we are now prepared to examine more closely.

WHAT IS THE ACTUAL NATURE OF HUMOR?

First something we all know immediately about it: It is a sensation sometimes provoked in us when we hear what is commonly called WITTICISM. Women are not insensitive to the witty ones, are they? True--and that may be important enough to register--women's ability to produce such witticism themselves, and to really enjoy it--may be rather limited. It seems to depend on circumstances. On what circumstances? I can tell you as much as this offhand:

The more that witty remark requires of brilliant inventiveness, fighting acuteness, logical abstraction,--the more notorious becomes women's INFERIORITY in the field of humor. Once more the old experience repeats itself. Women cannot bear the atrocity of being too far removed from the immediate NAIVETE and the sturdy emotional PLAINNESS of an extrovert mind.

In the case of downright irony and sarcasm the issue is, of course, entirely clear: Women's reaction against it is heartfelt and keen. They rarely resort to such forms of mirth themselves. Producing brilliant answer, turning people down in a laughable way, that is not a characteristic of female genius,--believe me! And if anybody attacks THEM with that subtly cruel weapon, their resentment is intense. It is, in fact, even more intense than their usual sensitiveness would entitle us to assume.

Sometimes teachers do indulge in giving to their critical remarks about their students a somewhat satirical form. But believe me, those teachers will not for very long remain ignorant about the effect that type of reproach tends to have. At least not if it happens to be a girl in the class whom the unfortunate school master's ironical remark hits right on the head. Her reaction will not wait. As a general rule it will not be a well-hidden secret either. The whole class will soon know about the deep felt unhappiness of that girl.

Page 124

A similar repugnance is also observed in the field of literature. Schuking states bluntly:

"Whenever satirical traits determine the nature of a literary movement, the feminine influence is remote." (37)

It is most interesting, in this respect, to observe the case of Byron and his "fans." The romantic and sentimental verse stories of that author were actually adored by a female public. Notice, however: his DON JUAN, so strongly penetrated by cynicism--and perhaps far more characteristic of Byron's own personality--has always remained the reading of MEN!

HUMOR, PROPERLY SPEAKING: DO WOMEN EXCEL IN IT?

What we are particularly interested in here is that simple and certainly far more harmless SENSE OF HUMOR which has won universal praise in literature, as well as in life. Could that too reveal itself as far more egocentric than alterocentric in its deepest nature? One should think that peculiar form of mirth is far removed from the hard and merciless excogitations of satire and irony, at least.

Yes, it is. But let us now get some essentials about humor as it is generally understood. First some circumstantial evidence. What nations are especially known to excel in it?

Here one curious side-step back to Ughetti. That good Signore seems quite anxious to protect his own people from a certain "unjust depreciation" they have had to suffer. It is with vivid disapproval he cites some writers who have dared to claim that "Italians are completely destitute of humor." The author of L'UMORISMO ET LA DONNA cannot swallow that pill. He is firmly convinced that his compatriots enjoy just as much of that noble quality as any other people. Above all, he refuses to accept the suggestion that true humor should be "an exclusive property of the British, just like London mist and the pound sterling."

ARE ITALIANS LESS GIFTED FOR HUMOR THAN ENGLISHMEN? IF SO, THEN WHY?

One thing is historically incontestable. The Italians have never enjoyed anything even remotely approaching the world fame of the British in the field of humor. And they probably never will. Why? For the simple reason that humor has never been, and will never be, any striking characteristic of naively extrovert and strongly emotional people. Humor is the closest associate of dry and ruminative phlegmatics. For one of the non-negotiable prerequisites for genuine humor is the ability in a person to reach far, far beyond the data that are immediately given. There is a need of diving, down, down, down!

Page 125

Could a normal sanguine (such as the typical Italian) afford to spend his time and his energy, his tiny bit of patience, diving down as deeply as that? Probably never. Only a tough phlegmatic can afford it. To him, you see, that special quality of a more or less dry humor is not only one of his exquisite glories. It is rather one of his direst needs. It is the lubricating oil in his inertia. It is the reconciling smile right in the midst of his toughest stubbornness. How could that man do without his humor? He just could not survive without it.

But does it have anything to do with alterocentricity? I am sorry to say: very little, as far as I can see. Humor is too self-analyzing and introspective to be alterocentric. It is also too passive and ruminative. We have seen clearly enough, haven't we, that the alterocentric character must include ACTIVITY and SYMPATHY. Irony, it is true, does have activity and zest; but, alas, without sympathy. Humor does have sympathy, it certainly does; but, alas, it lacks activity. Do you see the unfortunate shortcomings? Evidently a very different type of sunny gaiety is needed to satisfy the fulness of a smile that could manage to be entirely congenial with the deepest nature of the woman and the child. As usual, I add the case of the child. I have to do that, simply in order to remind myself what this is all about. The true alterocentric edition of human mirth or merriness is that of the genuine child. The child laughs of a full heart, sometimes just

because it finds a wonderful satisfaction in laughing--and in living--precisely as it is heartily thrilled to see other people laughing, --and living.

Humor engenders no ringing laughter of that kind. It rather reduces itself to a mere chuckle. It is a sort of "horselaugh." You can hardly tell for sure whether the humorous person is really laughing, or he has just caught a laryngitis type of cold.

Our general conclusion may look somewhat disappointing. We have had to establish, in spite of ourselves, an apparently disconcerting fact: The great humor is not likely to cause, to either the woman or the child, any world-wide fame that might threaten to demoralize them. This almost begins to be a discouraging story, to some maybe even a dull story.

In other words it may be high time we pass on to something that might cheer our heart. Why not turn to a matter that promises encouragement to all well-wishers of womankind:

Page 126

A LITERARY FIELD IN WHICH WOMEN HAVE REACHED SURPRISING MASTERSHIP

What is the branch of literature in which the female sex has distinguished itself admirably? It is often called fiction. But this sounds too much like the very opposite of fact. I would like to call it simply story telling. For what women have here devoted themselves to is not necessarily something fictitious in the sense of delusion or a downright distortion of the actual facts. Far from it.

Now, look at the very number of women novelists. That, in itself, might provide sufficient evidence that members of the female sex have found a field of literary production here where they feel marvelously at home.

And what do the sternest critics say? They admit that women are past masters in novel writing. Notice: this is even admitted in a day and age when literary competition is harder than at any previous time.

What does all this indicate? And what can be suggested to account for it in an intelligent way? What peculiar features distinguish the novel, as compared to other genres?

In the first place, it is strikingly preoccupied with matters of social intercourse, with human fellowship and family history. All these matters, of course, are favorite fields of feminine genius.

Another thing, too, must have made the novel a rather sympathetic realm of literary activity for women. George Elliot says, in her reflections on "SILLY NOVELS AND SILLY NOVELISTS":

"No educational restrictions can shut women out from materials of fiction, and there is not a species of art which is so free from rigid requirements. Like crystalline masses it may take any form and yet remain beautiful." (38)

Good that the matter of educational restrictions was mentioned openly by the pen of a great woman writer, George Elliot. Her modern sisters of the women's lib might otherwise have launched out into that topic in their own conventional way: "Women in a man-dominated culture have been prevented from obtaining the educational facilities that would help them to excel."

And still they HAVE excelled! This is the verdict formulated by the eminent author of THE MILL ON THE FLOSS and SILAS MARNER. How could an unexpected thing like that happen? What was there just in the field of novel writing that helped women, even in a sex discriminating society like ours, to manage beautifully? Or did they have the "shameful" experience of having to capitulate even here? If so, then in front of what monster discriminator?

Page 127

Occasionally there arises a novelist who gives his novel a particularly artistic form, making it into a superb poem, so to speak. Do you know the sex of that novelist? Most probably we do not have to do with a woman. Particularly in France the novel is known to have reached a remarkably high level of artistic perfection and sophisticated elaboration. And what is immediately seen? Precisely in that domain the female contributions tend to be exceedingly rare.

Do you see something here that is more decisive than cultural traditions? Let us seek wisdom and understanding in the historical facts:

Have women always been able to compete with men in the capacity of story tellers like today? When did their great triumph take place. What made the novel a tremendous novelty? Poetry--of any kind--was formerly molded into particularly severe forms. To be a poet required quite a bit of technique. The result was inevitable: Those rigid requirements simply deterred women aspirants from the precincts of the Parnassus.

At the same time, however, just the NOVEL--probably thanks to its slower evolution and its numerous digressions--was temptingly free from elaborate rules of composition. And so what happens? Women gradually turn to the novel. They come by the dozens, by the hundreds, today even by the thousands. They come to the field of the greatest simplicity. They come to art just where it is as little artistic as possible. They come to "mediocrity" (I persist in using my "bad" term) and feel splendidly at home there.

This may not seem too flattering. I realize that more and more clearly. And it makes me feel more and more sorry for those who seem to see beauty and great artistic performance, something really worthwhile, only in the complicated, the sophisticated, the rigidly elaborate, the almost unattainable. I know their clamor, their bitter complaint. "Why do not our women conquer poetry precisely where it is poetic in the extreme? How can the female sex bear this 'shameful failure'?"

Something seems to be deplorably symptomatic of certain feminist zealots of the ultra-radical type: They do not content themselves with proving that actually there is nothing shameful whatsoever in this "failure." Oh no, they will attempt the impossible in order to explain away the FAILURE itself. That blind madness makes them nearly as disrupted as any man could be. And it is just one of the dubious signs that prevent me from thinking that certain women's lib strategists can still deserve being labeled "truly feminine." Their anti-realistic disruptedness does not spell femininity. By no means.

Page 128

In fact, it is NOT indicative of femininity, as a general rule, to go around all the time, just being so wretchedly conscious of the painful fact that you are "just a disregarded female" in an outrageously male society. There might be times when it would prove more helpful NOT to talk continually about the "dreadful misfortune" falling

to a woman's lot in this world. It might be better NOT to go on telling the old tale: "Women never had any fair chance of asserting themselves in this culture."

I do not by that suggest that the feminist movement has no great cause to vindicate. Certainly it does have causes galore. For of course there HAS been prejudice--terrible prejudice--in the field of literature, just as in almost any other field.

McCarthy admits that a real struggle was required before women could obtain anything even approaching acknowledgement in the Parnassus. In fact, for a considerable time social conventions caused a women author to be looked upon as a rather indecent phenomenon.

IS THE OLD PREJUDICE ARGUMENT AN ENTIRELY FAIR ONE THEN?

We should attentively notice what Ellen Key points out in this respect:

"For more than a thousand years all over Europe the convents delivered women from the fetters of the hearth and the family, and it was certainly the most gifted and developed women who sought the convents. No prejudice hindered them from devoting themselves to science, art, and literature. In fact they so devoted themselves. Yet all the famous names in the annals of the convents were men's names, with the exception of Hroswitha. And the age only produced one great feminine genius, the Swedish Bergitta." (39)

In other words, it does not help one bit to try and explain away the fact of the failure among women to assert themselves in the sciences and the arts. That failure is there, and it demands a more fair and a more reasonable explanation than the one so often attempted. At the same time, however, there is a corresponding degree of actual success just in one particular area of literary art, as the history of literature takes its course. That fact, as well, demands its fair and reasonable explanation.

I am still speaking about the art of plain story telling. Why should I call it "fiction," as if the real facts were here necessarily excluded. Etymologically the term "novel" may seem a more positively suggestive one. For it speaks about "NEWS" ("nouvelle").

Well, what is a NOVEL then? How does it distinguish itself as a literary genre?

Page 129

THE ART OF STORY TELLING A UNIQUE PHENOMENON

Fielding used to consider the following qualities as indispensable for a good novelist: genius, conversation, learning, --and, finally, "a good heart." (40).

I. He describes the first quality, genius, as "the quick penetration into the true essence of the objects of our contemplation." This, at least, should not be foreign to alterocentricity, should it?

II. The quality of "conversation" here means "being conversant with," --or "having an experience of." An experience of what? Of LIFE. Here once more we can be reassured. There is no plausible reason why alterocentricity should frown upon that.

III. Nor should there be any doubts about another prerequisite. Sure, alterocentricity can manage to meet the requirements of "the good heart." Particularly good care ought to be taken, as far as that is concerned.

IV. There is one point left. And that may appear to be the great crux in specific cases in which alterocentricity is called upon to gain the battle. I am referring to the

issue of "learning." George Elliot, speaking about the case of women in the course of the centuries, was certainly quite right about that more or less problematic thing: LEARNING. For evidently this also includes the problem of learning how to tackle the more or less intricate rules of composing a literary work. But we have already pointed out the plank of salvation for women in the present case. The artistic rules for composing a novel were not always so rigidly maintained. And even if they had been ever so deterring, I doubt that any such deterrent, in the long run, would have managed to keep female writers entirely away from story writing. What could be more natural for a woman than telling a story? What could be more natural to any other-centered being than just that? Other-centeredness means communication. It is bound to mean that. And when was communication really prevented by a simple lack of learnedness? Never. At least not in the case of "the full heart." That is obviously what Fielding implied when he said the GOOD heart. Of what is that heart full? Of motherliness, of general othercentered femininity. Othercenteredness and motherliness are just two names of the same quality, indisputable synonyms. So, with a quality of that kind in her, how could a woman be kept permanently away from the task of composing some kind of a "novel." "Novel," as I reminded you above, is derived from "nouvelle." And nouvelle means news. Now, what is the great news to a woman? Biologically--and existentially--speaking, it is the news about the baby, --its birth and its tender development. Such news has to be told. How could that be otherwise? And the telling of that news is the story. The mother's first great story is the story about the child. The next one is her story TO the child. That story too had to be told. And who could be expected to tell that story like a mother does?

Page 130

Maybe the first really attentive listener to whom a woman was destined to tell her story, was her little child. For he could grasp the fulness of it just like that. And, as soon as his mother contrived to give literary expression to that exuberant alterocentric joy of telling stories, what do you think would have to be the inevitable outcome? A novel, of course, or something reminding very much of a novel.

A TRANSFORMATION OF LITERATURE DICTATED BY WOMEN

One historical fact has mostly tended to remain obscure among those who handle literature today: It was women's tenderness and motherliness that actually transformed that literature. For it WAS transformed--at least to an astonishingly large extent--namely, into a literature having LOVE as its center. I do not here merely think of women's love for men. Even more important than that--let us admit it--is the mother's love for her child.

But when did that transformation begin to take place? Obviously, even before women had the courage yet to write one single page, they had already set about to revolutionize literature. Did you know that? At a time when a woman writer was still looked upon as almost an abomination, the feminine influence upon literature was already an invisibly transforming factor in human society. For then, as now, women did constitute the *majority of readers*; do we fully realize that? Authors were simply obliged, then, to reckon with these "passive partners," in their business. For, tell me, what is the use of writing, if nobody reads the stuff you write? Even our most super-masculine and

super-"idealistic" authors do not write exclusively for themselves. There are certain limits to self-centeredness too.

Well, what has been the main trend caused by that numerous female constituency on the literary market? It has been to simply favor, and actively advance, a most wholesome development. I am speaking about nothing less than a veritable humanization of fiction. But the act of favoring what is genuinely human is one of the most glorious qualities of age old other-centeredness.

Page 131

Readers today are little aware of the downright INHUMAN character of those first super-human heroes with whom ancient story readers were forced to content themselves. It certainly was not always congenial stuff women readers, at this stage of the development, were supposed to find their heart's delight in, just swallowing it down the best they could. Only little by little did they manage to impose their own ideals, thus revolutionizing the entire "publication business." But the historical facts are indisputable. It was thanks to the imperative demands of a multitude of female "fans" that this earliest masculine production of epical works was radically changed, and new ideals introduced. By and by the superhuman giants turned into men and women of flesh and blood. A new type of heroes had been created. From a literary point of view an immense gain had been achieved: The characters of imaginative tales reached a hitherto unknown level of VERISIMILITUDE. What a victory for simplicity, authentic character, and the ideal of truthfulness, after all. We should never forget: Whatever renders a cultural phenomenon more trustworthy and more profoundly human, this means at the same time a mighty stride forward in alterocentric direction, generally speaking. It would be difficult to appreciate at its true value how much such an increase in general soundness and sobriety contributes to the spiritual and physical prosperity of any people. What I constantly observe is remarkable. It is a simple lack of full realism that causes nations, and individuals, to sink down into swamps of indecency and coarseness we would hardly think possible.

Now I do hope you have got me clearly enough. So you won't be tempted to become self-conceited in behalf of your culture and mine. For we are not realistic, that's for sure. I do not for a moment intend to intimate that the general production of present-day imaginative literature is anything to boast of, either in intellectual or moral respect. But we must tremble at the thought of what it might have been like WITHOUT the moderating, regulatory influence on the part of feminine hearts. Most people have no idea of those crude and downright cruel trends a literature entirely in the hands of masculine molders might have developed. Some rudiments of ancient literary art permit us to anticipate what might have happened, and shudder at the bare thought of it.

Tremendously important and favorable things, after all, did happen in the history of Occidental literature. Perhaps most significant of all: an entirely new story grew up, the story written about the child,--and for the child. This is certainly the work of women. The fact that they have succeeded in making men, too, participate fully in the work, does not reduce their merits.

Page 132

I think it will be difficult to estimate fully what the genius of motherliness has really accomplished in this field. Let us quote an authority regarding just those coarse

and cruel tendencies of masculine origin in the literature world even in more recent times, that had to be inhibited and removed. Thorndike says:

"To whatever degree women were responsible for romanticism, they certainly did much to impose a decency, at least outward, upon English letters. The protest against the licentiousness of the Restoration drama came from the middle classes where women were becoming readers and theatre goers. From that time the masculine pen has been more and more restrained by the consciousness that products were to be sold to women, and to women looking to books for refinement and education, as well as entertainment. Since Fielding and Smolett there has been few really robustious and masculine pens. In Victorian literature woman was the censor." (41)

Since I have come to consider alterocentricity as a fundamental motif entirely based on rock-bottom realism, you will understand me when I also regard romanticism as the great bugbear, the disrupter par excellence in our shanky super-civilized lives.

WHAT DECIDES WOMEN'S CHOICE OF READING TODAY?

How can it be explained in a meaningful way that women's emphasis in reading material is on fiction, while that of men is on facts?

The National Opinion Research Center, in an investigation of August, 1945, asked American citizens the following question:

"What do you read most often--fiction, such as novels and short stories--or non-fiction, such as books that deal with facts?"		
Answer	Men	Women
Fiction	24	44
Non-Fiction	58	33
Both about the same	13	19
Undecided	5	4

The sex difference here is pretty clear. And now, why do women thus have such a pronounced tendency of preferring the realms of fiction to the realms of non-fiction, in other words, the more sentimental realms to the more factual ones? Does this testify to any great degree of realism?

In this connection it must be of primary interest to know what KIND of fiction women tend to prefer.

"If you were going to spend this evening reading, which (of the things a story or a book might be based on) would you select, assuming that they were all well written:

- 1) A plain girl, whom no one paid much attention in her home town, goes to Washington, becomes a great social success and marries a brilliant senator.
- 2) An amateur detective solves an unusually puzzling murder."

I have selected those two questions only. In fact, they were the only ones showing a significant sex difference in the answers.

Question 1: Men 7; Women 25

Question 2: Men 29; Women 14

Here obviously everything adds up to the same old tale: Women are anxious to satisfy their peculiar emotional needs. And those needs are concentrated around one great topic, what to them constitutes the focal point in life: love.

We had better spend more time here on Walter Hofman's serious investigations, summarily alluded to above. This is their proper field: sex differences in the choice of literature. He went through the book loans of 13,550 female readers, comparing their choice to that of 25,035 men of the same social level and during the same period of time. The total number of volumes borrowed was 780792. Of these 248647 by women and 532145 by men (37)

THE HUMAN INTEREST STORY MEANS MORE TO WOMEN

Hofman found in women a remarkable preference for what can be immediately contemplated by the senses and what is of real human interest, or anything that may have real connection with one's personal life situation.

Let me state at once how I feel bound to interpret Hofman's findings as a whole, seen in close connection with our other data: There is not necessarily, in women, an antagonism against facts. I am speaking about life's own facts, that is, an existential totality; not facts lamentably torn apart by a disruptive masculine science and philosophy. Whenever facts of that more existential kind, facts of a life-like kind, are presented to women, whether in literature or anywhere else, those women will manifest no greater tendency than men to seek their refuge in fiction. What they are looking for even in fiction today, is not preferably the fantastic, the improbable, the truly fictitious. On the contrary. Have I not already pointed out through what a revolutionary movement they themselves have TRANSFORMED fiction--even the fiction produced by men--enhancing it tremendously with human truthfulness and verisimilitude?

Page 134

But what, then, do the figures for fiction versus facts of the current public opinion research of today actually mean? They can have only one meaning. However deficient our imaginative reading of the present day may have become in sound human realism and existential totality, our women still obviously find more of integrated reality in this literature of an openly admitted fiction, than they are ever able to squeeze out of our present-day literature of alleged facts. Despite all the horrific sentimentality of that popular fiction, by which we are inundated (deluged), they may still find more nourishment in it for their alterocentric urge of turning outward, integrally and humanly, than in the dehydrated accumulation of "facts" that we men pride ourselves in.

What I am now going to disclose about modern research into "women's favorite reading material," may astonish many of you:

THE LOCAL NEWSPAPER'S SOCIAL ANNOUNCEMENT COLUMNS RISE UP AS THE ONLY COMPETITIVE RIVAL TO ROMANTIC FICTION MEDIA OF TODAY

Here I base myself on another serious dissertation. It is written by Josephine Trampler-Steiner. Its topic is female journalist activities in Germany. In that dissertation I find an equally eloquent piece of information. The author was particularly struck by one "little" item, namely women's almost incredible interest in the columns containing the simplest every-day advertisements. She was obliged to establish an indisputable fact. There is just one "branch of literature" that is competent to compete with the novel, when it comes to really deserving the honorable title: "women's favorite reading." That is the current advertisements of the daily press!

Evidently simple feminine curiosity plays an important part in that passion for advertisements as a reading specialty. But women are also eminently able to make advertisements themselves. And they are seen to make newspaper articles just as captivating as any male journalist could ever produce them. The famous newspaper magnate Lord Northcliffe used to consider women as particularly apt to occupy the profession of journalism. According to him, their main assets in this field are:

1) THEIR QUICK OBSERVATION

We have already seen in a previous chapter just WHAT women tend to observe more quickly than men; the details. And, of course, for journalism details play a tremendous part, especially those pertaining to practical life and anything of human interest value.

2) THEIR DEEP COMPASSION

Such compassion, so easily aroused in women, in favor of suffering individuals, means more than many people imagine, to the success of a journalist's enterprise. Lord Northcliffe says: "Much of the attention which has been called to the misery and the general life condition of the poor, is due to the pens of women journalists."

Page 135

And here then, with a fresh emphasis upon the maternal instinct, we come back to one of the greatest things that have happened to modern literature as a whole.

A LITERATURE DEVOTED TO THE CAUSE OF THE CHILD

You recall the great story of how the child managed to come up to the forefront in literature. Thorndike, speaking of our child-centered world, describes the development of the 18th and the 19th centuries as follows:

"In no earlier epoch is literature so devoted to children. The beginning of this tide of imaginative interest, as we have noted, goes back to the 18th century, to the followers of Rousseau, to the infant schools, to the paintings of Reynolds and the poems of Wordsworth and Blake, but it has continued and grows apace. With our changing ideas it is no longer the child as the type of the natural man or the child as the innocent breath of the divine, uncorrupted by the contagion of men, that we worship, but the child as the heir of the ages and as the next step in a progressive humanity. He is our creation and our hope; and, as never before, the emotions of mankind have been engrossed in watching his early years." (44)

Who has given the child this unique place--in literature and in life? It is his mother. Women as writers and readers have shaped literature with invisible hands into trends they favor. The entire scope has become broader. Generic notions have managed to assert themselves. And even right in the midst of an egocentric and hyper-individualistic epoch those notions have, to a large extent, succeeded in conserving their most human aspect. That is the undying song of other-centeredness in the blood of the rising generations. The *élan altérocentrique* has made room for a larger entity. That is, not an abstracted generalization of the "species" as the only triumphant reality, but rather the living FAMILY. It is the clan, the nation, the human race. It is man's uninterrupted progression. Through whom? Through precisely those emotion-stirring heirs of the future, a lively band of chubby-faced, rose-cheeked youngsters. This then is the better thing that has received such a new and encouraging emphasis. And it is above all women's inherent totality and nearness to life that has here decisively molded the views and the ways. No wonder that Thorndike imagined this as the most permanent among all the changes literature has undergone: its intimate appeal to childhood and youth.

Page 136

May not the narrow humanism of a sadly secularized Western world take away the last glory of what is best and truly worth of survival in modern literature. For that is there of course all the time, even in a dechristianized Christendom.

V.

Verbosity versus Terseness (Communication versus Incommunication)

The Art we have now been speaking about for a long, long time, is one delighting in words, words, words. So I may as well go on speaking about words. For there are still tremendously important things we should know about words and also about the happy diffusion with which some people enjoy using them, for instance women.

First, how would it be reasonable to assume that other-centeredness is generally related to the matter of verbosity?

One should be entitled to think that a genuine othercentered person has quite particular reasons for clinging to the word. The word is simply an idea made concrete, so to speak. And the other-centered ones (the woman, the child, whoever it may be) cling to that concreteness. With men and adults this is evidently not such a desperate need. We have constantly found that just the clever egocentric feels this need of

expression in a far more moderate degree, or he possesses a far greater ability of getting along with abstract notions. Accordingly, he should be far less dependent on an oral formulation of his ideas.

With the "simpleminded alterocentric", however, this is bound to be very different. That person must be in the greatest need of words,-- simply in order to have something by means of which he can substantialize or concretize his concepts. EXPRESSING himself is his specialty. So a kind of ex-expression would seem more congenial with his intimate nature than re-expression or inhibition.

And now let us come to the particular facts. Our comparison is one between women and men. We may dive right down into that biopolarity again without too much phrases and circumlocutions.

Page 137

WHO HAS THE "GIFT OF THE GAB;" MEN OR WOMEN?

I seem to be arriving at a rather delicate point of argumentation. Shall I manage to escape this time, as well, with my bones relatively unbroken? What shall I here say about women's position in the great race. Sheer loquacity is probably a quality in which no one is too anxious to excel,-- or be famous for excelling. In fact, I might be well advised to choose my or be famous for excelling. In fact, I might be well advised to choose my terms with special care this time. Otherwise I might run the risk of calling down over my irreverent head just curses and condemnations at quarters from which I never expected that kind of reception. I am not speaking of the thunder clouds of wrath and smoldering ill-will that may have gathered against me on the part of this or that furious amazon belonging to the vanguard phalanx of the feminist movements. For that is a fury I did reckon with all the time. But what would it look like if I now became a cause of offence to the entire feminine sex, in fact, the very beings I have otherwise praisingly qualified as "the more alterocentric ones"! How could I come right out and claim that they are also the "loquacious ones", a bunch of chatter-boxes?

Now, of course there do exist other terms than just loquacity and talkativeness. There is for instance the term eloquence. Why not express oneself in a way as bland as possible? The term eloquence will hardly ever fail to arouse a far more distinguished set of associations in human minds. Even a suffragette of the liveliest spitfire kind would hardly be offended if we just qualified her as eloquent. For that noble epithet rather makes people think of heroes in history such as Demosthenes and Cicero--or of the General Assembly of the United Nations in its fullest splendor. The oratorical genius has always been highly respected among men.

But, as you are fully aware already, my habit so far has rather been to plead the cause of something far removed from the glamour of the formidable elite, something rather modest and "mediocre." It is something more modestly popular and commonplace. In the spirit of that modesty, how would it sound to say something as simple as this: "the desire for conversation,"--or "the ability to take part freely in such conversation." That would sound relatively well-balanced, wouldn't it?

Of course even that might not prove entirely safe. For it might lead someone to think of the exquisite refinement and the elegant "savoirvivre" of old French top society SALONS.

To cut it short, what is the essence of plain human talkativeness? My mood in this business is not a jocular one. For the answer to that question might be of the most serious impact toward a clarification we are looking for with eagerness. So let us embark upon our present research theme with all the solemnity it deserves, and without a deadweight of conventional prejudice which it does not deserve.

Page 138

WHAT DOES MODERN DIFFERENTIAL PSYCHOLOGY REVEAL TO US ABOUT "THE GIFT OF THE GAB"?

First, what are the distinctive traits of the talkative person? And then a particularly weighty question to our inquiry into the Ego-Altero relations: In whom could we expect to find the stronger trend toward alterocentricity? Is it in the talkative or the taciturn person?

The immediate answer I might be tempted to give is this one: Alterocentricity must be more talkative than taciturn. I am then assuming the case of a fairly normal desire to communicate, and a fairly normal ability to do so. I do not by that try to deny the existence of a marked and rather obnoxious egocentricity manifesting itself precisely in persons who talk and talk, for hours on end, persistingly, mercilessly. Some might dash right in and say: Women are just that kind of persons. Wherever two women--or just one for that matter--have started speaking, any man would consider himself lucky if he manages to "get a word in edgewise."

Well, who are the ones carrying away the laurels in this competition then, regarding "conversational skills"?

I think I hear a male voice calling out with apparent generosity: "Let them have the laurels, for goodness' sake. Here we men yield the battle field to women--without a blow, that is absolutely unanimous on our side."

Does this intimate that the man in question has had the practical wisdom to admit, unqualifyingly, the crushing superiority of women as conversationalists? I am not so sure about that. In fact the very readiness with which he makes his unconditional surrender, leaves me with a certain suspicion: That man may not be too seriously depressed at all over the defeat truthful males in all societies have been forced to acknowledge, whenever they dare to compare themselves to women in the arena of practical wordiness. Hardly one day passes without some witty masculine remark on the topic of women's superior skill in the art of that "wordiness." We should only know one thing. In their mind "wordiness" hardly spells "worthiness." If I were to draw any conclusions at all from this, it would have to be the following: The strong sex has accepted the fact of that kind of superiority with unanimity, but not with admiration.

Nevertheless, with you and me this rather deprecative jocularness should not obscure the outstandingly positive side of the story, constituting a quite important part of the factual issue: Women constantly turn out to be the sex more readily disposed to seek contact (even by means of the "gift of the gab") with the society surrounding them. They obviously love to share whatever there is in them with the fellow creatures standing *around* them. Sorrows, as well as joys, are promptly communicated to others through the most natural medium given to man: speech.

Page 139

In March 1950 the AIPO asked a representative cross section of the American people who they thought were the more talkative, men or women. They got the following--not surprising, but still quite interesting answer:

	Men more talkative	Women more talkative	No difference	No opinion
Men's Answer:	7	77	12	4
Women's Answer:	13	62	22	3

This is, no doubt, a fairly reliable information about OPINIONS in a fairly representative part of our civilization. And what then is women's opinion in this case? Obviously it is not at all so much different from that of men. It is at least a quite promising token of feminine self-criticism. Women recognize their own greater talkativeness, and they know that, in this context, it is not a particularly laudable quality. It is not something to boast of.

What we are looking for most eagerly, however, is not opinions but rather facts, even scientifically corroborated facts.

WOMEN'S SUPERIORITY IN LINGUISTIC COMMUNICATION, MEASURED WITH STATISTIC ACCURACY

First some figures from modern differential psychology. I am discussing, in the following, some bodily conditions forming the material basis, as it were, for the readiness of speech.

Physiological defects obstructing the free development of speech are seen to be rare in the female sex. Boys are far more liable to stammer than girls. All modern investigations seem to agree regarding that main tendency. Only the figures of ratio may vary slightly. Schnell, studying the "Sex Differences in Relation to Stuttering" (40), found that this anomaly may be up to ten times as frequent in boys as in girls. And there was no ratio smaller than 2 to 1.

(Here one thing should be admitted: The proving force of this finding, in favor of "feminine superiority concerning speech" is considerably reduced. The fact is: stuttering is only one in a whole series of organic anomalies, for which boys have a greater liability. So I am fully aware of the fact that it would simply have been a curious exception to a general rule if stuttering had NOT occurred more frequently in boys than in girls.)

Page 140

But now comes the decisive question: How do physiologically normal boys and girls compare when we closely study the way they develop that wonderful ability of using speech organs to establish contacts with their environments?

Here the comprehensive investigations of modern psychology are consistent, and even unanimous: Girls--normal as well as feeble-minded--begin to talk earlier than boys of the same groups.

McCarthy, examining the "Language Development of the Pre-school Child" (45), found, for instance, that the average percentage of comprehensible verbal responses was very different for the two sexes:

At the age of 18 months: boys 14%; girls 38%

At the age of 24 months: boys 49%; girls 78%

And what about that verbal superiority of the females over the males at so early an age? Do they KEEP it? Yes, throughout their lives. That applies to women in castles and in cabins, in penitentiaries and in schools. And if you decide to make your observations within the walls of the lunatic asylum, you will find the very same tendency: A far greater obstreperousness and talkativeness is observed in the female than in the male patient.

Particularly in schools numerous tests have been administered. Girls are consistently seen to have a greater vocabulary and a general verbal superiority on all educational levels.

420 boys and 514 girls above the fourth grade were asked to write a composition on a topic of equal interest to both sexes. On an average, the boys reached only 86 percent of the number of words reached by the girls. On the high school level the percentage was even as low as 83 (47).

THE ART OF SPEAKING

But please back to Demosthenes and Cicero, I seem to hear an impatient male voice saying. In what sex do we find the great orators of history?

I have no intention whatever of denying the plain fact: Rhetoric, considered as an exquisite art, is predominantly masculine. But that is just the old phenomenon over again. As soon as speech tends to become a deliberate art, involving a certain inventiveness and high technique, then it suddenly glides out of the hands of women. From the days of antiquity until today oratory has, indeed, been a masculine hobby.

Notice my word "hobby." Hobbies tend to be masculine; did you know that?

Page 141

A CURIOUS EXPERIMENT: MEASURING THE RESPECTIVE "VERBOSITIES" OF VARIOUS LITERARY STYLES

I once thought it most unlikely for any human being to devise a comparatively accurate method for measuring a writer's individual verbosity. But in the JOURNAL OF ENGLISH AND GERMANIC PHILOLOGY, April, 1935, I find an interesting attempt in that direction. James Routh of Oglethorpe University once tried to solve the problem through a rather unusual approach.

We all know some ordinary symbols used in the scansion of verse. Now Routh has undertaken to use the same for the purpose of analyzing prose rhythms. The idea occurred to him that this might be a workable tool for measuring individual differences of style and verbosity in prose writers.

The texts chosen were scanned by careful reading. Only "key words" or "words bearing some unmistakable sentence accent" were marked as accented. For example in the sentence, "The dog bit the leg of the boy," the accented key words are: dog; bit; leg; boy. These words are therefore marked with the macron (a straight line above each

word, like this:??). The rest of the words (the "weak ones") are marked with the breve (a curved line like this).

In a passage from Lamb's "Dream Children" the performed analysis will then give this picture:

"Here the children fell a-crying and asked if their little mourning which they had on, was not for uncle John, and they looked up and prayed me not to go on about their uncle, but to tell them some stories about their pretty dead mother."

So there are 25 syllables marked with the macron (--) and 32 marked with the breve(). The strong words thus become 43 per cent of the total. This is then a sort of index number by which one may identify the style.

In Macauley, in a similar way, Routh finds the figures 20 and 36, giving a percentage of stresses of 35.7.

This method of analysis applied to a great number of writings consistently showed that men recognized as modern in style use a high percentage of strong words. Old-fashioned writers (and such modern writers who are considered to be somewhat old-fashioned in style) were seen to use a small percentage of strong words.

Page 142

This is a finding important enough to you and me. We have already seen the remarkable way in which Schiller in his dissertation on Naive and Sentimental Poetry points out that the ancient classics are "naive" (that is, in his opinion, more natural, candid and harmonious, as well as staunchly realistic. I would say alterocentrically feminine or childlike).

However, still more remarkable in our context is Routh's comparison between women writers and men writers, based on that same method of analysis he has suggested. To me a further comparison between old and modern writers within the female sex is a most interesting experiment.

Routh's general conclusion, on the basis of his special investigations, regarding the fair sex, is very plain: Women of all periods tend to use a small percentage of strong words. The rule may not be universal. But it is convincingly firm in a large number of tried cases.

This, of course, means just a corroboration of a thesis we have established. So it is the trend we would have expected to assert itself. A typically feminine style of speech will tend to produce a great number of "weak" words, whereas a typically masculine style is far more laconic and so-called "vigorous." In what does that "vigor" consist? It will tend to exclude, in a written text, many unaccented connectives. It regards those as "superfluous," and rather runs into heavy stressing.

In this respect we may observe something remarkable in ultra-modern literature. The arche-typical modern writer is seen to be somewhat rough and blunt. He scorns oratory and "unnecessary verbiage." The result will inevitably be a large proportion of stressed words. Here I would like to choose Hemmingway as a plausible illustration. Hemmingway, as we all know, was a famous example of this masculine style, more characteristic of modern writers. Such authors will always be seen to have comparatively few words per idea. Their expression becomes concentrated, rigidly condensed. Only the most indispensable words are used. Every syllable that goes

beyond the strictly necessary is considered as almost a "shame." This is the face of the radically modern, the toughly modern, stylist. To him every superfluity is regarded as something "effeminate." The ideal is to be MONOSYLLABIC:

MONO-SYLLABISM--A STRIKING FEATURE OF HARDCORE MASCULINE SELF-CENTEREDNESS

This mono-syllabic tendency in men--and in modern men especially-- is a phenomenon that does not surprise me at all. On the contrary, it is a feature we should expect in the sombre depths of all taciturn personality, and watch out for it with increased attention.

Page 143

At any epoch of history it would be natural to assume that male authors run into something we might thus call the "one syllable ideal." In that respect they may mark themselves as belonging to the "modern" style elite. And if it has something definite to do with the self-centeredness of a schizoide type of introversion, then there is danger right around the corner. This is my point of view. Routh considers the matter from the rather neutral view-point of an evolution from classicism toward modernism, one might say. And he then makes the discovery that women are more or less "retardatory" in that evolution.

As a far greater percentage of living men than of living women are found to have that style of a certain laconical reticence, Routh concludes that men are changing far more rapidly than women from the old verbose style of the "classics" to the masculine bluntness of the "moderns."

Routh appears to be astonished that only 35% among contemporary women use the "strong style," whereas no less than 61% among contemporary men, similarly examined, use that style. Now you may perhaps ask, "Where does the line of demarcation go between the "strong style" and the "weak style"? Here Routh has decided that 41% should be his standard average. His calculus is simple: The highest average he arrived at was 51%. The lowest was 31. Hence his formula: Above the medium figure 41: a more "modern" style. Below that figure a more "classical" style.

What conclusion shall we abide with then? How shall WE interpret the fact that women have comparatively many, but rather weak words? Does this mean feminine "conservatism," or does it mean feminine "talkativeness"?

In my opinion it means both. There is no need of putting one interpretation up against the other. The two go harmoniously together. And so do masculine radicalism and masculine mono-syllabicism. These are two aspects of one and the same fundamental motif.

Of course the terms here introduced by me may need some further definition, and a much closer specification. It must be clearly realized, not only what "feminine CONSERVATISM" really signifies. That latter term ("conservatism"), so heavily encumbered with rather "political" connotations, has to be very carefully qualified. This will be done in due course. It will then be seen that, under certain conditions, women do distinguish themselves as truly conservative. But this is far from saying that conservatism is the general rule in the female sex. Whether women are to reveal themselves as conservative OR radical, this depends, as I have come to look upon it, on closely determined circumstances. Here I shall once more demonstrate the forceful

role played by other-centeredness as a basic motif. Alterocentricity once more intervenes spectacularly, as it makes up its mind to enter discriminatingly upon the scene.

Page 144

In the case under our present consideration we are confronted with a "radical modernism." It is our society as a whole that is seen to evolve toward that phenomenon. And here something most remarkable is in the process of taking place. What you and I are hurrying toward with an ever accelerating speed, in our very capacity of modern men, is an extreme degree of terseness and taciturnity of our very life style. And notice: That taciturn trend is something consciously sought. Urgently needed then, is a heroic defiance *against* a general drift into that tough modernism, the very spirit of the new age. This is where women assert a wholesome trend. Let modernists call that a reactionary spirit, as much as they like. I am not impressed.

Now make a little experiment of theoretical thought right here: Let us assume, for the pure fun of it, that we had in front of us a society in which a development in the inverse order was taking place. Imagine an ever increasing status and prestige, from year to year, for just some kind of ingenuous talkativeness! Do you think women would then, as well, be wave-breakers, just fighting the contemporary current, demonstrating the stubbornness of their reactionary spirit? Would they still show themselves from their "conservative" side? I doubt it. Women may turn out to be radical enough, I warn you. But this is my topic for another chapter.

Conclusion: I am, of course, fully aware of the deficiencies of any such "objectively measuring experiments" for the evaluation of literary styles. There is for instance the obvious arbitrariness coming in at the very moment you choose your labels. What authorizes you to point out one word as "stressed," another one as "unstressed," or one as "strong," the other as "weak"? This choice could easily be subject to criticism. It might also be objected that Routh's investigations here extend over a comparatively limited area,--too limited indeed to be conclusive and truly significant.

In similar experiments of my own I have endeavored to reduce the arbitrariness by increasing the number of specimens chose, as well as choosing from various languages. Another improvement may have resulted from a more careful method of distinction. For instance names consisting of numerous syllables have not been given the overweight in "weak stresses" actually due to them in strict accordance with the general rule.

A random selection of modern authors from recent English literature still did show me some definite sex differences of the very kind that Routh has registered, but not so much that the evidence becomes scientifically conclusive in the strict sense of the term, so far.

Page 145

THE COMPARATIVE "VERBOSITIES" OF SOME MODERN LANGUAGES

I know another method of similar investigation which might prove quite as dependable. It consists in simply measuring the lengths of free translations from one foreign language into one's mother tongue, and then comparing the respective "verbosities" of male and female students as translators. My own experience as a

philologist and linguist (this once used to be my main field of study), comprising classes in a number of countries with different mother tongues over a number of years, seems to indicate with fair accuracy that girl students consistently tend to use more words to render the same idea than boy students do. Now, the interpretation of these findings may of course vary, depending on the angle adopted: Do those "loquacious" female translators find it IMPOSSIBLE to express the ideas at hand with some greater concentration? Or do they simply enjoy so much that alterocentric gambol which consists in CHATTING rather than SPEAKING (in the more dry and sober sense of the word)? Personally I tend to lean toward the latter interpretation.

In this order of ideas, it may be interesting to note some remarkable facts forcing themselves upon a linguist's attention: Languages themselves appear to possess their individual "verboisities." A comparative study in this field might claim to be instructive enough, I should think. For behind those languages there are--if not individual persons--at least peoples. And a people is unquestionably a living organism. It will necessarily have an "individuality" of its own, and its peculiar personality features, so to speak.

Among modern world languages German seems to be a match for almost any other well-known foreign tongue, as far as the "average number of syllables per idea" is concerned. The English language shows a rather opposite trend. It is remarkably mono-syllabic, quite literally speaking. So the same story told in those two languages, placed side by side, will--under otherwise fairly equal conditions--reveal a tendency which I have found to be strikingly consistent: Considerably more space is required on the German than on the English side. The result does depend, it is true, to some extent, on which text is the original one. For even with two languages of "equal verbosity" the translation will tend to be more lengthy than the original.

Page 146

THE CHARACTEROLOGY OF ENTIRE NATIONS

These reflections may naturally lead us into a more or less speculative experiment of considering whole national population groups from my special point of view. True, I do have a considerable fear of generalizations. Nevertheless, a rather irrefutable tendency seems to force itself upon my attention. The outward-oriented type of character is far more prevailing in Southern and Middle European population groups than in the Northern European ones, for instance. As compared to an Austrian-- or even a Dane--a Norwegian is a rather reserved introvert. Now, there is no more infallible sign of that introversion than precisely the isolating habit of taciturnity. A comparative reticence is the feature we can safely use as a sort of measuring standard for the purpose of evaluating the relative degree of self-centeredness versus other-centeredness in a whole population group, as well as in the case of individuals.

Here, however, no competent characterologist would fail to realize that the British people, for instance, are most likely to come out as definitely less other-centered than, say, the Italian. On the other hand, I have to repeat emphatically: a whole series of other qualities must be taken into consideration to obtain the complete picture. And some of these qualities may not be immediately thought of as decisive for the sanguine versus the phlegmatic temperament. In fact alterocentricity has ways of its own. And one must know this fundamental motif in its totality. We shall get at a capital point in our

study of these more problematic relationships when, finally, we discuss feminine LOVE, a preparatory subject to that of the Christian Agape, the fundamental motif par excellence of all historical tradition.

One thing, nevertheless, may already be pointed out in favor of the "natural alterocentricity" of the Mediterranean population groups, by and large. Their openness of mind is definitely greater, on an average, than that of more Northern groups. They are incontestably more childlike in their attitudes. With their more vivid gesticulations, eloquent mimicry and abundant flow of words, the genuine Southerners are usually observed to expose their entire personality, as it were, outwards.

It is a generally valid fact that the more open, extrovert type of people tend to be prevailing in rather warm and sunny regions of the earth. In the northern hemisphere that means, of course, the south. What could be the underlying causes for this? Ethnographical anthropology has a poor stock of dependable data, so far, it seems, upon which to build a tenable theory. It would seem, however, that light and warmth generally do cause a certain intensification in both corporeal and mental processes. At any rate, much seems to indicate that the farther we come toward cold and dark regions, the more reserved the people tend to be. In some regions, it is true, this rule may be difficult to harmonize with the factually prevailing conditions. Perhaps its dependability has been disturbed by other more forceful factors. But in other regions the mentioned north-- south difference is believed by many to be clearly perceptible, even within the boundaries of quite limited territorial units. For instance, there appears to be quite observable differences between the population groups of Southern France compared to Northern France, between northern and southern parts of Great Britain, and so on.

Page 147

One thing is certain: It takes the smiling sunniness of alterocentricity to thaw up and express oneself.

THE CHARACTEROLOGY OF HISTORICAL ERAS AND WORLD MOVEMENTS

My study as a whole is not psychological in a limited differential sense. Nor is it anthropological in a limited ethnographical sense. It is first and foremost historical. And the history it is concerned with is that of varying degrees of human totality, as that totality has developed -- or failed to develop -- in our present Occidental world culture. So it is nothing less than entire ages, and "time spirits" I have endeavored to investigate from my particular angle. And now, as the result of my investigation, what is it I am having the boldness to state? Comparing one period of history to the other, I contend that one age manifests a "more alterocentric" spirit; another age a "less alterocentric" spirit. Which age has what trend? How could I dare to pronounce myself with absolute conviction, downrating one age, compared to the other? Here is my answer: I have never dared to make any statements without digging deeply and conscientiously for my relevant material, carefully weighing its proving value. And moreover, the difference in cultures and historical epochs has not been my first step, my first choice. It had to be preceded by a far more scientifically graspable field of investigation. I had to have reliable clues regarding the various ways in which women differ from men. This happens to be, not only a fascinating study, but from a human interest angle, a story of downright dramatic significance. Apart from the final section dedicated to the amazing

story about feminine LOVE, this second--last chapter, preparing our way into the mysteries of Agape, is perhaps the most surprise-loaded part of my introduction into secrets of "WOMAN the UNKNOWN."

Page 148

VI

Sensitivity versus Insensitivity

An indispensable quality to study in human beings is that of their comparative suggestibility. Other related terms are: affectability, susceptibility, and -- most common of them all perhaps -- simply SENSITIVENESS. One thing constitutes the quality under debate, namely a QUICK RESPONSE TO STIMULI, physically as well as mentally.

I imagine that no one will seriously doubt which of the two -- suggestibility or impassibility -- is more closely related to the alterocentric élan vital. It would seem self-evident, to practical experience, as well as theoretical reason, that suggestibility, or sensitiveness, must be a great quality, helping a living individual to adapt himself to his environment. It must be the very foundation for his ability to turn outwards.

In fact, the very system of sensory nerves is a primary condition for making any living creature conscious of having any environment at all. How could we relate to anything in our surrounding world, either good or bad, without the sense of feeling? This is the invaluable instrumentality in the service of warning us against evils, and even informing us that we are really alive. The conclusion is evident: A vivid affectability must be basically alterocentric and basically good.

Nevertheless, I shall not deny that just the present topic throws up particularly troublesome problems. Here is one: We have just spoken about art. And there we came to a rather unpleasant conclusion: Art, in its most pointed forms, is not necessarily alterocentric. Now, about art we do know one thing for sure. It just could not exist in any degree or in any form without a fair amount of feelings. The intense activity of outstanding artistic genius demands a particularly high amount of sensibility. Certainly you never heard about any great artist who distinguished himself as a particularly insensitive person, did you?

In this respect we shall have to face the fact: That fascinating quality called sensitiveness shows a somewhat ambiguous nature, to express it mildly. How can it promote alterocentric and egocentric trends at the same time? The answer can only be this one: There must be profoundly different qualities bearing the same name: "sensitiveness." The sensitiveness of the typical artist is not necessarily always the sensitiveness of the typical alterocentric. (48)

Take the case of an extreme artistic genius like Leonardo da Vinci. In this connection our thoughts also naturally go to the case, once more, of the outstanding Scandinavian dramatist August Strindberg. The dissimilarities between these two artists may have been multiple and profound. But they also had something essential in common. . . The internal splitness of the Swedish dramatist was so great that one might almost present him as the prototype of the schizothym personality; that is, the personality type I most closely associate with egocentricity, as I

understand it. It is not I, but rather Strindberg himself who has given that strikingly significant image of the Strindbergian genius, the genius of the schizoide, the genius of ultra-artistic disruption, the genius of supertitanic self-centeredness. He says about himself:

"I am as cold as ice, and yet a mind with a sensitivity bordering on sentimentality."

LEONARDO DA VINCI -- EPITOME OF SENSITIVITY AS A SCHIZO PHENOMENON

Was there, in Leonardo da Vinci's deepest nature, an internal splitness similar to that of Strindberg? Various phases of his life clearly testify that there was. He certainly has the abysmal dimensions that seem to predispose the exceptional genius for a certain disruption. In Leonardo a prodigious multiplicity of different arts seemed to be fighting for the hegemony and to secure for themselves--each one in its turn--a sort of raging triumph. At least we may perceive, in that overdimensioned artistic personality, as only a sort of magnifying glass will reveal it, not only the disturbance of man's mental equilibrium, whenever he abandons himself to the trance of his artistic intoxication, but also an equally mind-disrupting glacial chill and emotional impassionateness (deadness), which unexpectedly may take the intoxication's place. Leonardo, we know, was not only an ingenious artist, but at the same time an equally ingenious scientist. Some might here be misled to assume that nothing but a wholesome and truly whole-making balance would be the natural outcome. But here we must keep in mind the extreme dimensions reached by both endowments in Leonardo's case. This could just as well suggest the special danger of an additional splitness, the splitness between extreme feeling and extreme intellect, between radical art and radical science. Let us have a look at either side. On the one hand, that man gives evidence of a supersensibility, driving him sometimes to the act of buying birds from the fowlers on the market place, not in order to keep them in captivity himself, but simply in order to restore to those poor creatures their lost freedom. He just could not bear the pain of seeing them suffering the hardship of incarceration. On the other hand, he had an impassivity allowing him to register the last convulsive movements of a hanged person, without, as he informs us himself, the least vibration of his own sentiments.

Now the history of our culture may certainly present cases, also, of a certain harmony, resulting from a sound combination of the scientist's objectivity and the artist's sensibility. Just that coupling together of science and art has produced brilliant master-pieces of artistic renown.

But, in any case, it may hardly achieve any outstanding level of alterocentricity in my conception of the term. Is there at all any truly alterocentric form of human sensibility? This, I think, is a question for which differential psychology may provide a remarkable answer. First one question, which some may think foolishly superfluous: Are women typically sensitive? And then: If so, in what way?

THE UNBALANCED SEX

Who has not heard about woman, that "hysterical creature, howling and sobbing, and having nervous breakdowns on the slightest provocations"!

To be sure, women are notorious for their feelings, their actual floods of emotions. And what do scholarly investigators say? Even the most sober laboratory tests have verified the rumor: Women do have a definitely greater sensitiveness than men, both *physically* and *mentally*.

But then, suddenly, here too, a rather enigmatic phenomenon takes you by surprise. Just that super-emotional, otherwise so apt to start up in panic, and squeal like a stuck pig, as soon as the tiniest mouse happens to run across her kitchen floor, she -- the very same woman -- may suddenly be seen to bear a world of pain and hardship. This happens, for instance, when, one day, she is laid on the sick-bed; or even right upon the surgeon's dreadful operation table.

Most informative in this connection are some questionnaires sent to a large number of physicians and dentists in many parts of the world years ago. The results were the same everywhere. The FEMALE patients were consistently registered as superior to the males in the ABILITY TO BEAR PAIN.

In the United States 11 groups were ranked on the basis of from 9 to 35 "judgments" each. Seventy percent of the judges thought that women were superior to men when it came to enduring pain. It was found, by the way, in the same investigations, that the LABORING class appeared to be superior to the well-to-do class in this same respect (50).

Who would deny the fact of a certain ambiguity here? On the other hand, can we afford to let that ambiguity remain ambiguous? No, we must do what we can to make the ambiguous, even in the case of women, the mystery creature, become unambiguous. Too long already has that mysterious character of feminine sensibility been allowed to remain just mysterious. It has always astonished psychologists. It even caused Lombroso, the prominent Italian criminologist of a past generation, to deny the existence of any such thing as a greater sensibility in women. He thought the common notion of "women's greater sensibility" must simply be due to a misunderstanding:

Page 151

"Manifestations of pain have been mistaken for pain itself; women react more expansively." This is how he tries to explain the enigma.

Another Italian anthropologist, Sergi, speaks of greater female IRRITABILITY, rather than greater SENSIBILITY. This "irritability", as used in Sergi's nomenclature, is regarded as the "lowest degree of sensibility." It will either "be transformed into real sensibility" or "remain at its initial stage."

One thing appears particularly interesting to me in Sergi's theory: He considers this "irritability" in women as the most DIRECT AND ENERGETIC CAUSE OF MOVEMENTS AND OUTWARD MANIFESTATIONS. Let us try to get somewhat closer to a demystification of the mystery.

WHAT DECIDES WOMEN'S SENSITIVENESS TO PAIN?

My most curious question in this order of ideas would be: WHAT decides whether that "initial element" of potential feeling -- whatever it may be -- is to develop

into definite sensations and finally burst into open action instead of being kept at the more calm and more docile stage of "irritability"?

I could not think of any more natural solution of the enigma, in any case, than the special view-point I have adopted in this study from the beginning:

Women's biological assignment as mothers naturally includes an "assignment to bear pain"! That is, the pain itself need not necessarily be reduced, but the ability to bear it is teleologically increased. In what particular cases? Well, teleology means purposefulness. Now, *when*, in particular, does it become meaningful in a woman's life to bear pain? Once more the answer to that question is bound to have a lot to do with what we have called a woman's principal biological function. We know, some of us just theoretically, it is true, that females are destined to go through pains which males know little about, except from the cries coming from the maternity wards sometimes, when men-folks may happen to be sufficiently near to hear anything at all. Should we think it so strange then, if something definite happens at the moment when pains are of such a kind that they can be reached and controlled by those incredibly long arms I have called feminine alterocentricity? At that moment there is simply a surging up of unknown forces enabling women to endure the pains.

Page 152

As an immediate result of that "marvel", it may of course look as if the pains of the women concerned have been magically alleviated. In fact, they have been alleviated. Not magically though. Oh no, realistically, and in strict accordance with the basic law of simple alterocentricity. And that realism, as we shall once see, is nothing but the capital and all-pervading principle of Agape, nothing less. And of course we must feel perfectly free, after all, to express what has happened as MYSTERIOUS. That woman's pains have been MARVELOUSLY relieved. But this of course does not mean without any basis in the dependability of known or unknown realistic and even scientifically verifiable natural laws.

The first experience of a mother in connection with her baby is one of pain. At least that is the prevailing impression given by obstetrics everywhere in OUR civilization. And from that moment on, pain and sacrifice seem to be her natural lot. How could women ever carry out the task nature has imposed upon them, if that same nature had not also made some provision for a reasonable help to carry it out.

"THE HYSTERICAL SEX"

You may take almost any case in which something really great or fateful is at stake: Who are the ones showing the greater endurance and equanimity when facing the horrors of war, for instance? Strange enough, women. I have already made reference to this strange fact in my introduction. But now to the details contained in the relevant documents. Certainly not many investigators would have expected such a score at the time when the terrors of heavy bombardments in World War II began to strike down upon the civilian population in a way they had never done before in human history.

The official report from the British Library of Information gives us the facts in black and white. In his survey, bearing the title "Women Less Prone to Bomb Shock," Frank D. Long says,

"It may be true that women are more emotional than men in romance, but they are less so in air raids. Their protective instinct for those they love, is actually a shield against the nerve-shattering effects of warfare noises. They perform the job at hand with calmer deliberation than men. Men get through the job all right, but they work in a state of mental excitement -- often unconsciously suppressed -- which, in time, takes its toll" (51). Long found that women recover more rapidly than men under psychological treatment. Why? Are not women the sex of constant and incurable hysteria and neurosis?

Page 153

Here, as well, Long gives an answer which seems closely connected with the facts we have noted a long time ago, calling them "female extroversion" and "female alterocentricity." The leader of the rehabilitation team, Mr. Long, reminds us what an essential part of the treatment of those war-shock-ravaged patients consisted in. The psychiatrists did their utmost to induce them to TELL their exciting experiences. For the healing process it is so important that the patient should "open up" and "get things out." In order to be able to really "settle one's account" with those disturbing matters of the deep interior, and victoriously cope with them, it seems indispensable that THE facts about them should be faced unflinchingly. And now what difference have the experts found between male and female patients in this respect? It has been consistently found that women can recall details, here also, with greater ease than men are able to do. And, most important of all: they are more willing to TALK ABOUT THEM.

Maybe the surest truth ever reached by modern psychoanalysis: TURNING OUTWARD HAS HEALING IN ITS WINGS It is practical women, not philosophical theorists like Sigmund Freud, who have been most efficient in proving the truth of that rule in the world of the human mind.

And the historical document that most realistically informs man about the simple functioning of this marvelous principle is not the all too famous book "Die Traumdeutung" of a fairly recent date. No, it is the Bible. It was greater authorities in the field of psychiatry than Freud and his followers today who first initiated mankind into the secrets about the importance of sick minds (I am including sin-sick minds) being exposed to the frank searchlight of conscious knowledge. This permits the repressed truths to come out, thus passing from the dark regions of the "unconscious" (man's own system of self-deception) into the regions of an active control. The person is finally led by the fantastic power of a free will, granted by God to every human being, making him a responsible creature. That is a passage from the gloomy dungeon of not-life into the opening splendors of life. The triumphant result is restored health, which means restored wholeness. The etymological connection is evident. There is inherent soundness and salvation for human lives in the outward-launching movement. Conversely, in the closed-up chambers of the EGO there is only perdition. Man is bound to find his rescue, and his only true Center, OUTSIDE HIMSELF. This is the old lesson taught by religion for millennia: "The truth shall make you free." That means open admission, frank confession, breaking down the bars of seclusion and egocentricity, finally learning to depend implicitly on something -- or Someone -- outside oneself, something greater than self. This was always the only avenue back to life.

Opening the floodgates of divine grace, that was always the only cure for disrupted souls, the unique means of getting WHOLE again: OTHERCENTEREDNESS.

Page 154

But now what is the summary of our findings, as far as our differential research is concerned? Are women MORE sensitive or LESS sensitive than men? Our tentative conclusion so far may sound rather ambiguous. The best I can say is this: They are both more and less. It all depends the degree of other-centeredness that is permitted to enter in any given case. The principle itself is unambiguous enough. Human emotionality, in its general, unmodified form, is NOT NECESSARILY othercentered. Everybody will have to admit, on the contrary, that there is a markedly self-centered side to emotionality or sensitiveness as such. This quality, so intimately connected with being alive, does NOT NECESSARILY engage itself in the service of a preservation of the human race. It is NOT ALWAYS positive in its effects. By the way, how do we naturally -- and most reasonably -- look upon people who are mainly, or exclusively, preoccupied with matters pertaining to their own various sensations, in their bodies or in their minds? We characterize them as egocentric without any hesitation, don't we?

Our main concern, in the first instance, is of course the position of the female sex in a new field. Do women have anything to brag about or to be ashamed of? So far certainly no reason to brag. In fact, how could any reasonable person start boasting of a quality about which he does not yet know whether it is actually good or evil?

But we OUGHT to know. Yes, but how do we GET to know -- for sure -- whether an abundance of emotions is good or evil? Now, the question of good and evil, as far as I can judge, is the most important one in human life. You may have guessed that an old professor of Ethics would say that. Anyway, my question is precisely this: How in the world do we get to know? -- for sure!

The approach I suggest is the following: We might first ask the question, What MAKES feelings good or evil? Do we have any somewhat reliable principles to go by? In our upcoming new chapter you shall see how different and helplessly groping the ideas may be about an ethical question as capital as that.

Page 155

HUMAN EMOTIONS IN THE DEFENDANT'S DOCK -- AN ATTEMPT TO ESTABLISH A TENABLE THEORY

I shall take my point of departure in Hebb's serious endeavor to delineate the phenomenon of emotion, in his work THE ORGANIZATION OF BEHAVIOR (52).

First he rejects the idea that emotion is an "awareness", an "event in consciousness." Traditional opinion, you see, holds that afferent excitation produces a feeling of awareness. That feeling then acts on the nervous system. It makes the subject sweat or tremble or run away. (I discuss this common conception more closely in my book MAN, THE INDIVISIBLE, Olso University Press, 1971)

For the time being I may just stress one item: Hebb prefers to speak about "emotional disturbance" rather than simply "emotion." For he realizes the multiple (I would say at least DUAL) character of the latter term. As you easily realize, the word "emotion" might be nothing but a synonym to "feeling," without any specification as to whether that feeling is a positive or a negative matter. But in my opinion, what the serious researcher of human characterology must insist on finding out is precisely this:

What can there here be in that emotion, causing it to become a phenomenon of interior splitness? I am speaking about a disruption even tearing asunder the person's very life. This is of course exactly what you and I are most curious to know something positive about.

So, to me, in that work, one thing appears particularly interesting namely the great insistence on the "DISRUPTIVE nature" of emotion. Exactly WHEN do feelings turn out to "tear people asunder" in their deepest lives? In our context this question must take the form of a critical either or: Does *any* kind of emotion turn out to be negative under this or that unfortunate circumstance? Or is there a definite distinction between certain emotions that are, in themselves, conducive to peace and harmony, and others that are inherently conducive to interior war and mental disharmony?

Another scholar, Leeper, also discusses the "disorganizing influence" of emotion. And he, like myself, feels a strong ambiguity in current notions on the matter at hand, and therefore the need of a clearer distinction (53). Also in another respect he may remind somewhat more of my personal attitude, and my personal approach: He expressly mentions MATERNAL LOVE as a significant instance. But Leeper does not seem to draw the full conclusion from this instance that I feel I must draw.

Page 156

A MOTHER'S LOVE -- A TREMENDOUS LESSON ABOUT EMOTIONS

Let us agree as far as ever possible without any luke-warm compromise: Maternal love IS a remarkable case of human emotion. And it is perfectly constructive in nature. Some other emotions, you know, will strike us as rather opposite in their character. Isn't that your experience? They may impress us as downright destructive. Take one example: the emotion of STAGE FEAR. You have no difficulty in realizing how terribly destructive that may be. (The literal meaning of the term "de-struction" is: "tearing down"). Stage fear is a most threatening form of fear. On some occasions it may totally ruin an orator's or an artist's performance. Take also the case of another disruptive emotion, namely ANGER. I am speaking about an absolutely uncontrolled rage, the sad act of "losing one's temper." A boxer in the ring who permits that passionate heat to get the better of him, may make rash and uncontrolled movements that simply ruin his chances to win his match. Take, also, special specimens of mental depression. They may seriously reduce a breadwinner's ability to provide for himself and his family. All such examples should force the intelligent psychologist to modify his statements with great circumspection. Here it really appears indispensable to CLASSIFY man's emotions in some intelligently ordered way. But according to what principle then? What is to decide whether a definite emotion should be qualified as constructive or destructive, good or bad? Leeper for his part has chosen this formula for his suggestion of a marked differentiation:

"Only when it becomes really EXTREME, will emotion tend to disorganize." (Emphasis mine).

In other words "disorganization" is NOT characteristic of emotions AS SUCH. It is only the exaggeration or "excess" of a given emotion that makes it bad. This is evidently the idea Leeper is trying to get across to us. The mental disturbance, the negative element of "tearing assunder" a person's sound balance, according to this, is

not part and parcel of the emotion itself. No, it is only the "exaggeration" of that emotional trend that brings about the disruptive effects.

Here I can not at all accept the full implications of Leepers formulation. I fear it is too dangerous indeed. It opens the way to a relativism that scares me. Just on this point of our thinking I would be far more inclined to agree with Hebb. The differentiation should be formulated in a more adequate way. For it must be directly misleading to limit oneself to establishing a difference as far as the DEGREE of the emotion is concerned. On the contrary, the emotions here making their appearance must be essentially different in KIND. One set must be entirely good, the other entirely bad. That is a radical distinction in quality, isn't it? It does not distinguish merely according to the principle of quantity. Inherent QUALITY is the criterion. At the moment that you happen to have, in front of you, an emotion of the constructive mold, you may stay assured that it does not--magically--change into a destructive mold. It will not metamorphose itself into a basically disruptive emotion, no matter how intensive it may grow.

Page 157

Let us return to the instance we have already chosen for a clarification: maternal love. That specimen of human emotion is an unequivocal one, solid one. Would it be reasonable to assume that it could suddenly transform itself into a disorganizing, disintegrating force at the moment it gained a certain level of magnitude? Our experience so far, both practical and theoretical, shows nothing that would present evidence in favor of such a hypothesis. Maternal love remains maternal love, with all this positively stands for, irrespective of what dimensions it may adopt. Certain things just cannot be overdone. The more an emotion identifies itself with other-centeredness, the more it seems bound to be registered in that category of immaculate goodness. There is no "overdoing" of alterocentricity in its purest forms. And in the humanity we know today there seems to be nothing coming closer to that pureness than maternal love. That must be the reason why motherliness knows no borderline with a sign-board posted at the road-side, bearing this inscription: "No TRESPASSING. So far, but no farther please?"

How can this be explained? It can most reasonably be accounted for by something fundamental in all other-centeredness. Per definition alterocentricity means one thing: It means reaching out, farther and ever farther, beyond all border-lands. And if this is so, then how could it ever be possible at all that TRANSCENDENCE (the simple act of PASSING BEYOND) would deteriorate into becoming THE great danger in man's life? In certain fields exaggeration is bound to remain an impossible notion. Can true love be carried too far? The triumphant cry of alterocentricity is: Pass on!

We shall soon arrive at a chapter on Women and Criminality. Then we are going to get acquainted with a strange immunity inherent in typical womanhood: Maternal love is just basically immune against criminal deviations. This is an enigmatic phenomenon criminologists have been amazed to observe. A mother's love for her child is hardly ever seen to drive any normal woman into the abyss of criminality,--or, any other abnormality. To be sure, maternal love does inspire fight, even the fight of a formidable lioness; that is, a pretty violent fight sometimes; but please notice: not the violence of typical criminality. One thing is practically non-existent in that "maternal category" of fight, you see, namely the HARDENING that constitutes the essence of a deeply criminal mood. Here you should know about two things that just cannot find

room in one and the same heart at one and the same time. That is, on the one hand, the arche-typical, stubborn enclosure in one's own self, which is a never-failing characteristic of the hardened criminal; on the other hand, the equally arche-typical transcendence of one's own self, that constitutes the alterocentric élan vital. I am speaking about the outstretched arms toward the ones needing the compassionate mother's affection desperately. Those two tendencies here mentioned exclude each other radically. You can grasp that simple fact, can't you? (See a later headline: "Why are Women More Inclined to Obey the Laws?" p.).

Page 158

Now let us pass on, and this time to some emotions that are not at all favorable to the sound integration of a human mind. Hebb mentions SELF-CONSCIOUSNESS. In English this term has a definitely negative connotation. And we all know how painful the disrupting effect may be of that constant awareness of one's own person (in the sense of a typical introversion)

Hebb's argument is undoubtedly logical. Even just a TOUCH of self-consciousness may ruin a person's conversational skills. It may considerably reduce an orator's performance. Who does not have some personal experience of what here happens to a poor human being. Again we may ask, Why does this awkward helplessness happen to us? Again my answer is the same: *Egocentricity* (that is, the tendency of turning morbidly inward) implies a potent danger, whatever its degree may be (Once more the "degree" argument fails completely).

FEAR AS A DEFINITE LIFE SAVER

Now, what about the emotion of fear in its wider non-qualified sense? Is it necessarily negative in its effects? By no means. Fear may be a creature's way to safety, or why not use the big word: SALVATION!

We may very well take the classical case of a little mouse, suddenly discovering her abominable enemy, the cat. Immediately she has the well known reaction of running into her little hole. Is this fear a positive or a negative kind of emotion? Here, we must admit, we have to do with a rather sound type of fear. It actually saves that animal's life. And of course that sound case of a life-saving fear in an animal's existence, may, in essence, be quite comparable to the cases of fear in the existence of human beings, too: For instance take the case of a man, perhaps even man of irreproachable courage in his daily life. But then, on his way one day, he happens to meet a savage lion. All of a sudden he, too, is seized by that strange emotion of fear. And that natural reaction of his mind causes him to move. Just like the mouse, he finds his shortest and most expedient way of escape. Was there anything fundamentally disruptive, or biologically unsound, in this case of human fear? Of course not. One further question: Was it a fear of such a "small degree" (Leeper)? I should say not: To that man it was the "fear of his life." And he realistically saved his life by following its urgent suggestions.

Page 159

At the same time, I do admit that fear may reveal itself as a killer, just as well as a saver. What makes the difference? Sometimes fear--like so many other emotions--may unveil itself as a mental OBSESSION. There again that unfortunate phenomenon of a

stubborn occlusion asserts itself. It happens to human minds ever so often that they close themselves up convulsively.

Notice: the same thing hardly ever happens to animals. It is what I would call the typically egocentric human predicament, a virtual mental occlusion, a self-made imprisonment. But that self-inflicted kind of incarceration obviously presupposes a fairly high level of mental ingeniousness. It takes a *man*, one might say ironically, to fall into such depths of misfortune. By the way, does the Bible ever speak about creatures on a lower level than that of man, falling into the mysterious pit called "sin"? Not to my knowledge. The fall of man obviously could only happen on a comparatively high level of creaturely intelligence and volitional freedom. It was men, on this earth, who sank down into that abyss of abnormality and disruption. You never say about a bear, however savagely he has behaved: "He has committed sin." Fatal disruption evidently demands a certain process of preparatory false moves. A dumb beast never abases itself to the abysmal levels of downright egocentricity in that "self-trapping" sense I have suggested.

We were discussing the sound type of fear of the man who met a lion. Let us pass from this primitive case of "pure nature" to one of more dubious quality. I am thinking of the case of "human civilization."

In that connection I want to consider, from my particular view-point the case of *another* man who experiences an emotion, not necessarily all that positive, but still described by the same word: fear. We are now on the level where self-consciousness (a foe more terrible than lions) may enter upon the scene.

STAGE FEAR -- IS IT POSITIVE (SALVATION-BRINGING) OR NEGATIVE (PERDITION-BRINGING)?

The new man I am introducing, may not look all that different from the previous one. He too may enjoy, among the people who know him (or who do NOT know him perhaps, as well as they think), an immaculate reputation. His true courage has not yet been put to the test in any public way. But then one day he is invited to take part in an important party. He is even asked, in a most obliging manner, to make a short address in public, in honor of some person or some worthy cause that is here being celebrated.

Page 160

His inward torture is indescribable. Very much like the man in front of the savage lion, precipitously and with all signs of panic, he seeks the little opening through which he may slink away,--into "safety." In short, he reveals himself to his host as a man with no courage to speak of.

What is it that has suddenly scared that man stiff? Materially speaking, some simple construction of wood, called a pulpit. The proper name of his inward disruption is *stage fright*. That is the special edition of a man's "self-made occlusion" and "mental disorganization" this time. The demon of stage fear may shed considerable light over our present principal topic, namely "egocentricity as emotional disruption."

Hebb asks the tempting question if one may not say that emotion is a disrupter of behavior, even at times when it is notoriously useful. May it not be disorganizing and still have its "survival value"?

Personally I would feel wretched if I had to dilute the term of "disruption" as much as that. In my philosophy of alterocentric realism "disruptive" has a definitely negative connotation. And into the concept field of true survival nothing negative can enter. It just could not get a toehold there. Take the case again of that man suddenly facing his wild lion. HIS emotion of fear, I fully agree, was an entirely sound reaction. The very survival of that man depended on his ability (thanks to his sound fear) to cut short one action and to channel his energy into another action, his peaceful walk changing into a head-over-heels flight.

A religious person might cite a fairly corresponding case on the highest spiritual plane: A human being gets aware of the fearful reality of sin. He feels like fleeing for his life--away from the terrifying enemy. Now, who would dare to characterize such flight as a reaction of "disruptive" or "disorganizing" behavior? Nobody in his sound senses.

Generally speaking, I would here rather lean toward Leeper's way of classifying the case I have brought up for discussion. At least I do agree with Leeper that

IN SOME CASES FLIGHT MAY BE AN ENTIRELY WELL- ORGANIZED PATTERN OF BEHAVIOR

And when I say "some cases", my distinctive criterion is still that of alterocentricity versus egocentricity. Of course it must at the same time be admitted: There is not, necessarily, so much difference between two persons, both of them rather pitiable. I am thinking of, on the one hand, that artist or orator who trembles before his audience, and, on the other hand, the man who anticipates the possibility of a fit of stage fear, and "calmly" decides to keep away from the stage entirely; that is, the invited person who may not come to the party at all because he foresees that he

Page 161

might be called upon to do some public witnessing. The latter is not better, not one bit. His courage too has failed miserably. But what is it then, that makes the two of them fairly similar? In fact, both the trembling ON the stage and the flight FROM it have their origin in one and the same attitude. That attitude is egocentric fear. On some other occasion flight might be entirely compatible with a faultlessly alterocentric attitude in the flier's basic character. In other words, the conflict resulting from one case of emotion, and the one inherent in the other case, may be two fairly different conflicts. Some of our conflicts are quite respectable, simply because alterocentricity is allowed to remain a basic attitude in them. Other conflicts are basically egocentric. Accordingly Leeper is quite right in one thing he says: Conflict is not, ipso facto, disorganization.

Two distinctive alternatives always seem possible then. And this is just when I think the more outward-oriented person really stands on vantage ground. He definitely tends to remain "harmonious with some function that is being served" (Leeper), whereas the more egocentric person's attitude tends to be rather "chaotic and haphazard." (I find Leeper's adjectives here most striking. They perfectly describe the anti-realism to which egocentricity, as I see it, falls a victim.)

Quite generally speaking, I think this ability to remain "harmonious with some main function that is being served" is a tremendously important element in the whole alterocentric attitude. Here is the secret of the apparent magic, the virtue inherent in other-centeredness, helping it to exert a truly harmonizing influence on the emotional

lives of human beings. To understand this process better, let us discuss a little further from our personal point of view - just that fascinating topic of

STAGE FEAR-AS A DISORGANIZING PHENOMENON

What is stage fear actually? Mostly it is not at all a sound, natural sort of fear. It is rather that spooky specter appearing when you rely entirely on self for salvation and fullness of life. Here is the best evidence of its ever deceptive self-centeredness: It is not the fear of some naturally observable object. Oh no, its structure is far more complicated than that. In fact, what is here being feared is fear itself. The strangest whim of inveterate non-realism has got hold of the person suffering from stage fear. I may realize perfectly, in my moments of sound intelligence, that my fear has no objective reality whatsoever to base itself on. But the very possibility that I may start fearing, this is a fact scaring me stiff. And in practice that is of course bad enough.

Page 162

Tell me, my stage-fear-disrupted friend: What did you really have to be afraid of that memorable evening when you were to recite your little poem in front of a large audience? You knew your things perfectly. You had every logical possibility of playing your part without a hitch. I mean --PROVIDED THAT you were not overtaken, at the decisive moment, by that impish little intruder, that miserable "fear of fear itself." And how did things really proceed? Did Mr. Stage-Fright, the old villain, break his appointment with you? Certainly not. He turned up right in time, perfectly on schedule. And he spoiled everything. He made a mess of what should have been a beautiful night.

But why then, do we invite such phantoms of the imagination and permit them to terrorize us so dreadfully? What is it, exactly, that gives this fighting with "windmills" such a paralyzing power over our lives? It is, once more, our own egocentric attitude, nothing else. Of course, in his calmer moments of objective retrospect, any man may admit the entirely illusory essence of the foe he has been grappling with at the time that he made a fool of himself up there on the rostrum, a limelight experience of the rather dismal kind. The very illusoriness of that enemy is the reason why it becomes so incredibly hard to back him down. He has the strategic advantage over you of existing only in your own excited mind, playing at hide-and-seek with you far up in the ethereal regions of irrealities. But at the same time he is certainly real enough. Or is not self-centeredness real enough? Jesus of Nazareth compared the reality of these "invisible things" to that of the wind. The effects are visible enough, real enough.

IN CASE YOU SHOULD STILL BE IGNORANT ABOUT HOW SELF-CENTERED YOUR OWN MIND REALLY IS

Let us ask the question more thoroughly and more personally still: What was it that seemed to matter most to you on that evening when you were to make your great debut as a public orator, or whatever it was, - and then all of a sudden, the catastrophe of stage fear happened to you? Was it the good you here finally had a chance to do for a group of listeners needing your help desperately for some reason or other? Was it the success of the *others* that burdened your mind most of all? I am afraid not. It was - to be recklessly honest - rather your personal appearance and prestige, wasn't it? I imagine you saying to yourself that night, "For goodness sake, old chap, now you must

see to it that you do not cut a poor figure. This is your chance to score a personal victory, perhaps even build up your future greatness in the world."

Well, that is just the way we are. We are all so awfully self-conscious, always bent on showing off, appearing to our best advantage, being successful FOR OUR OWN SAKES!

Page 163

"What will my public think of me?" That is my one great anxious question, isn't it? And this is just the moment when everything begins to go wrong - with me, the poor publicly featured debutante. Immediately I have fallen into the hopeless dilemma of fear, - fear as a disruptive, a fatefully disorganizing emotion.

THE AMAZING FORMULA OF INSTANT SALVATION: "LOVE CASTS OUT FEAR"

And now I know I cannot avoid the moral and religious point of view, and still remain faithful to the great Totality which is the self-evident harbor of the alterocentric launching out on the open sea. So it would be strange indeed, and a token of utter cowardliness, if I failed to spell out the word that gives us some definite information, after all, about the way the old wonder takes place in practice:

The Christian gospel has a grand formula for the "expulsion of fear". The Bible puts it unceremoniously: "Love casts out fear." (1 John 4:18) Does that formula apply to our predicament?

I should say it does! Love always applies. Love and truth! Without these two siamese twins there is no cure for any disruption in human hearts.

First, IS it true, in any context, that it is MY PERSON and nothing else, that really counts? It is NOT true. That unfortunate night, for instance, when I was to act as the featured speaker of our great meeting, what was the thing really counting, after all? It was the MATTER I had to present that counted, wasn't it? And, of course, this is precisely where the secret of love also comes in, - and its wonder-making faculty of "casting out fear."

With a true alterocentric attitude on that occasion, what would my prevailing concern have been? Simply this: Tonight I have something really valuable for those dear people in front of me, a word to cheer them in their despondency, a sacred truth to help them in their need. I must be eager to serve them to the best of my ability.

Then, what happens to my own self? It becomes insignificant. It can so easily be left out of account, entirely forgotten. The disrupter is dead and buried. The ego can lose itself in the outside world. I can rest peacefully in the great "altero" reality, in God.

This is the bare truth applying unflinchingly to so many occasions. There is the most excellent foundation for the great psychological catch-word of the Gospel: "The truth shall make you free." (John 8:32). It is illusions that keep human minds in gloomy bondage.

Page 164

Do you know, the simple philosophy of othercenteredness has a new and attention-arousing formula for happiness in human lives? And it is not a cheap phrase of modern pragmatic intervention in a superficial world culture. It rather provides the profoundest informations to modern man about exactly how he can be sure to transcend the unhappiness constantly lying in wait for him to disrupt him hopelessly: The great rule runs:

YOU WILL BE HAPPY IN THE DEGREE YOU CONTRIVE TO FIND YOUR CENTER OUTSIDE YOURSELF

Fear has become the besetting emotion of this generation. We are afraid of cancer, afraid of radio-active fall-out, afraid of the ultimate disaster of a Third World War with its hydrogen and cobalt bombs. And the worst of it all is this: Humanly speaking, our fears, in so many cases, seem to be only too well founded on realistic facts. Nevertheless man's one really dangerous enemy may be found just inside himself. On the other hand, his true peace of mind, as well as his prosperity in material goods, will always realistically be measured by one reality only: the degree in which he is able to FIND VALUES OUTSIDE HIMSELF. And I would not dare to omit mentioning the greatest of those values: God. God is our Value par excellence. And if we become so engrossed in humanistic self-idolization that we fail to realize that the super-value just mentioned is something man finds outside himself exclusively, then there is every indication that we have fallen victims to a most egocentric type of mysticism. Our Christian spirituality has changed into pagan spiritualism. That philosophy is the present religion of the Western world. In philosophical spiritualism man's ideas about man have gone entirely wild. Humanistic self-deification is the ultimate limit of self-centeredness in both the Orient and the Occident.

IS THE ABSENCE OF STAGE FEAR IN YOU AND ME TODAY NECESSARILY A SIGN OF A VICTORIOUSLY OTHERCENTERED ATTITUDE?

Sometimes I have rather lively discussions with certain daring fellows, old colleagues of mine. One thing they seem inclined to speak rather daringly about-and my term "daring" here borders on the territory of what some would call "overbold" -is a certain WOMAN. It so happens that this peace-loving woman, posthumously, has become the center of a historic battle in the religious denomination to which she belonged, and in the foundation of which she has played a very great role.

Page 165

During her life time, Ellen White, for her part, definitely did not distinguish herself as one who speaks daringly, in that dubious sense of overbold. This is not to say that she lacked the necessary courage to speak up in favor of what she thought to be just and true.

In our present context, one thing has struck me particularly from the moment that I happened to compare that woman and *her* encounter with "stage fear" to myself and my colleagues, and *our* experience with that same curious thing.

I gently remind those daring ones today of what used to happen-to me and to them-at the time when we were novices in the art of oratory, and still had no experience in facing an august public. Today most of us just laugh as we recall the frantic way we trembled on the rostrum, delivering our maiden speeches. We were glad that the pulpit was high enough and opaque enough to hide the convulsive way our knees kept knocking against each other. However, even so, our respective audiences could hardly fail to detect how literally shaky the position of our pastoral ministry was. And they certainly knew exactly the nature of our predicament: If ever any one suffered from stage fright, we certainly must be counted among that number.

Today we do not shiver any longer for "as little as that"! Oh no, sir You should only know how tough we have grown. That is why we can speak so openly and humorously-even braggingly-today about our weaknesses of the past.

But this is where certain misgivings of mine seem to be sneaking in. Are we, bragging ministers of today, necessarily so much better off than we used to be in the days of yore? Does our present daringness-in the pulpit and outside-necessarily indicate that we have now grown all that triumphantly other-centered? Are we bold maybe rather in the sense of hardboiled titans? In those distant days when our legs still tended to tremble under us, as we faced a fold of lambs we were supposed to feed, the reason for our trembling-at least partially-may, after all, have been that we still had an awareness of being small in ourselves, entirely dependent on the Great Other One, the only One who could rescue us and help us to get through with tasks He had asked us to perform.

This is the point at which, in my serious talks with my colleagues- practically all of them just men, men, men-I come back to the topic of a certain woman, and this time looking at her from a rather novel angle. How was that woman pretty different from you and me? Did that girl, in her early teens, around the culmination of the Millerite movement, have a childlike type of daringness that made her enjoy standing in front of multitudes of grown-up people, presenting the message of witnessing that God had entrusted her with? Was she-unlike you and me-perfectly immune against everything inherent in the stage fright syndrome? Far from it. Let us quote some passages from her own pen:

Page 166

"...The Lord gave me a view of the trials through which I must pass, and told me that I must go and relate to others what He had revealed to me. It was shown me that my labors would meet with great opposition, and that my heart would be rent with anguish, but that the grace of God would be sufficient to sustain me through all. After I came out of this vision, I was exceedingly troubled, for it pointed out my duty to go out among the people and present the truth. My health was so poor that I was in constant bodily suffering, and to all appearance I had but a short time to live. I was only seventeen years of age, small and frail, unused to society, and naturally so timid and retiring that it was painful for me to meet strangers." Life Sketches of Ellen G. White, p. 69.

In the same book she refers to precisely the stage fear she had suffered from for some time:

"Up to this time I had never prayed in public and had only spoken a few words in prayer meeting. It was now impressed upon me that I should seek God in prayer at our small social meetings. This I dared not do, fearful of becoming confused and failing to express my thoughts. But the duty was impressed upon my mind so forcibly that when I attempted to pray in secret, I seemed to be mocking God, because I had failed to obey His will. Despair overwhelmed me, and for three long weeks no ray of light pierced the gloom that encompassed me." (Ibid. p. 33.)

The reactions of that girl were genuinely human, you say. And the way you say it, might intimate that you rejoice at the perfect naturalness, the deep humanity of her reactions. Good to see, in a way, that she had "exactly the same weaknesses to overcome that used to get the better of you and me."

Well, did she overcome those weaknesses? Did she overcome them exactly the way you and I have overcome them? By no means. Her case is as different from yours and mine as it could possibly be. And now, whether that differentness gives credit to you and me, or to her, this is a matter we shall have to decide after a season of due consideration.

Let me, so far, just present the bare historical facts. Follow the mental development of that lady, as she gets thirty years old, or fifty years, seventy years, eighty-or even eighty-six.

The psychologist would say, "What a strange case! That woman, in spite of the fact that she had speaking appointments from day to day, through a long life, never got over the 'stage fear syndrome.' Why not?"

Page 167

Let us first consult her own writings for a moment, about the historical fact of that "weakness" staying with her throughout her life. I mean the feeling of being doomed to a total collapse in front of a public she tried to face in her human power. The explanation to this extraordinary case of lifelong weakness is given under the title: *Fear of Self-exaltation* (a pretty realistic category of fear indeed, I should say):

"One great fear that oppressed me was that if I obeyed the call of duty, and went out declaring myself to be one favored by the Most High with visions and revelations for the people I might yield to sinful exaltation and be lifted above the station that was right for me to occupy, bring upon myself the displeasure of God and lose my own soul." (Ibid. pp. 71-2)

The Lord's favorable reply to Ellen's wise request can be simply summed up: "I shall see to it that you are kept properly humble ("other-dependent, GOD-dependent") my dear child."

This is an impressive revelation of what I call Christian realism, the divine philosophy given permission to assert itself triumphantly in the life and doctrine of a "handmaid of God" even as late at night as this, and even as far west in pagan territory. Nowhere in this endtime culture, apart from *her* writings, have I come across one single piece of literature reflecting so perfectly the great light of the Bible's *rock-bottom* realism, standing out in its monolithic grandeur, and therefore constantly referring back to that unique light. I am speaking about a monolithy whose basic principle is nothing but the alterocentricity I have been trying to describe. It is precisely that harmoniously well-balanced philosophy of totality and outward-directedness puny men have attempted in vain to tear down with their unreasonable criticism. The result of their foolish attempt will be what Ellen White foretold as the dubious fate of one of her most self-centered critics during her own lifetime. "If you go on pursuing this course, your sun will set in obscurity."

The egocentric dream of worldly fame has always been a deceptive and bitterly disappointing mirage.

I have inserted this more personal experience of mine with some of my fellow believers, just in order to give something of a more "ring-side" illustration of how ambiguous the term "fear" may be. Ellen White was one of those women whom a non-understanding world might suspect of suffering from a self-centered type of stage fear in terms of a regular stage fear syndrome. But her life as a whole testifies to a fact far removed from that. Her fear was what the Bible calls the fear of God. That is an immaculate quality of fear. It is simply impossible to carry an inherently good thing like that too far.

Page 168

ARE WOMEN MORALLY UNBALANCED?

This question inevitably forces us back to the same well-known contention, namely that "women have no control over their emotional system." that is no negligible accusation. Now, what about the proven facts in this field? Is there, in women, such a preponderance in favor of emotional instability? If so, then we would have to go on asking with fearful anticipation: "since women suffer from such a general lack of emotional control over their lives, then where would this moral--or rather immoral--trend be likely to stop? Would it include some kind of brake system, enabling it to stop before it reached the fatal point where emotional disruptions turn to be outright *criminal*?"

All people need inhibitive forces helping them to curb their inclinations toward excessive emotionalism. Suppose now that women lack the element of such inhibition, then frankly, what guarantee do we have that their wild race downhill would stop short of seriously *delinquent* actions?

Does practical every-day life show that women are more exposed to such hazards than men?

Ashley Montague must have shocked the conventionally reasoning world by bluntly stating that MAN is the emotionally unbalanced sex par excellence. In all important fields of every-day life men show far more signs of a deficient self-control than women do. It is NOT women who lose their temper. They do not fight, and they do not swear as often as men. They seldom get drunk. And exceedingly seldom do they commit acts of violence against other people. Oh no, it is MEN who drink excessively. And that excessive drinking is precisely an infallible sign of their emotional instability, their deficient control over themselves.

Now as far as the alcohol consumption is concerned, it is hardly necessary to produce any exact statistical documentation in that respect. Everybody knows which sex outstrips the other when it comes to lying helplessly in the gutter. Men are too famous indeed already, as far as both public carousing and private wine-bibbing at home are concerned. Still we may need the testimony of a certain regular testing in order to establish something more dependable in statistical terms regarding the general trend of men and women respectively, toward emotional inhibition and moral self-control. So what do the standard works of modern psychological and anthropological investigations on human character tell us about.

Page 169

SEX DIFFERENCES IN INHIBITION AND SELF-CONTROL

A Columbia University team of scholars have, in fact, devised reliable tests for these traits of human character, too. And comprehensive studies have been conducted. The conclusions with regard to sex differences in inhibition are not the least remarkable ones. There was no doubt at all that girls are generally better inhibited than boys are, in all the types of conduct included in the tests. For in all tests administered to each population tested, the differences were seen to favor the girls:

"Not only are the total inhibition scores of the girls larger, but in the three tests where there is a clear demarcation between those who inhibit and those who do not, the percent of girls who succeed in resisting the distractions presented, is greater than that of the boys. (55).

Now, theoretically speaking, that superiority of the girls might, of course, to some extent, be due to differences in interests. Girls do care less than boys for mechanical puzzles for instance. Hence they may be assumed to find it somewhat easier to let alone the puzzles of safes, which are important in these tests. But we must also take into account other circumstances that would more than weigh up such advantages in the girls' favor. Take just the question of GREATER EMOTIONALITY. Here the girls indisputably have a handicap. We may be very correct in saying: "Character means strong urges kept in tight reins." Evidently then, a strongly emotional mind demands a force particularly great--sometimes admirably great--to be held in check. By the way, just those investigations here mentioned gave special evidence of that intimate connection existing between, on the one hand, the degree of emotional stability, and, on the other hand, the degree of self-control, and the persistence with which that self-control is maintained.

STUDIES IN SEX DIFFERENCES IN MORAL KNOWLEDGE

We should also refer to some further studies conducted by the University of Columbia, this time in close cooperation with the Institute of Social and Religious Research (56).

Here we find thorough investigations comprising adequate test batteries, and carried out to measure moral knowledge, among other things. Are there, then, any consistent sex differences to be registered in regard to the general knowledge of right and wrong?

Yes, in fact, the average score of the girls exceeded that of the boys on each one of the moral knowledge batteries, in each one of the populations tested. The test included four batteries.

Page 170

TESTS	SCORES:	BOYS	GIRLS
1. Good citizenship		51.9	54.0
2. Information		347	359
3. Opinion A		433	452
Opinion B		505	545
4. Burdick culture scores		354	182

Battery number 4 is here one used to measure "cultural level." It indicates to what extent the subject has assimilated such cultural factors as etiquette, acquaintance

with books and music, proper relations between parents and children, and the like. Here the difference between boys and girls was about 7 times its standard difference. So there is an enormous difference in favor of girls at this point of the test. Superiority on this Burdick test of culture is considered to be a reflection of conventional standards. It is interesting to note, however. Girls are superior, not only here, but on the entire moral knowledge test battery, reflecting a person's ideal standards.

"These differences between boys and girls in moral knowledge is highly correlated with intelligence, and yet there is no sex difference in intelligence. There is evidently something other than intelligence that determines the scores on these tests of knowledge of "Right" and "Wrong," and one's way of feeling toward the moral demands of life situations." (57)

Here one more fact might have been mentioned: Generally a stronger suggestibility is seen to cause lower scores on the moral knowledge tests. And women do have a higher degree of suggestibility, or emotionality, than men. In view of these facts combined, the clearly superior moral knowledge scores of the female sex become still more impressive.

WHY ARE WOMEN MORE INCLINED TO OBEY THE LAWS?

Delinquency may with good reason be regarded as a sort of mental disturbance, caused by some sort of "emotional instability." So the enigma presents itself: Since women do have a significantly greater tendency toward emotional instability, for instance in the form of "neuroticism",--why, then, are they not also more inclined to break the laws of their respective community?

Let us not skip the apparently rather negative side of women's minds, as psychologists commonly rate them. No one can deny the consistent findings of modern research: There is a greater frequency of "nervous habits" in girls, such as nail-biting, thumb-sucking, etc. What have been the factors most decisive in bringing these conditions about? Is it biological or subsequent environmental factors? This is an issue we may leave as unsettled. But the facts are there. That is all we need to know for the time being.

Page 171

And something else is also there, namely the greater frequency of behavior problems, NOT in girls, but in BOYS! This is a fact on the masculine side it is equally important to know,--and wonder about. All modern psychological investigations show that boys are problem children far more often than girls. For instance, Anestasy and Foley remind us that just the boys are the ones filling the institutions for maladjusted children. In a later chapter on order versus disorder, I have this headline: "All Kinds of Order Characterize the Alterocentric Mind."

Does a strong emotionality, of necessity, lead to a lack of self-control? Evidently there is no valid proof of such a contention. Saying offhand that women's stronger emotionality is convincing proof of their "lack of self-control" must be a rather poor form of logic.

Those great Italian criminologists whose research I have previously referred to, have also examined the sensibility of INVETERATE FEMALE CRIMINALS. The fact is:

they found these women still more dull than the prostitutes. So it can hardly be their particular degree of sensibility that turns some women into criminals, can it?

Female criminals are characterized as doubly exceptional: First they are exceptional as criminals, namely in a community of ordinary decent citizens. Secondly they are exceptions as women among ordinary criminals. For only an exceedingly small percentage of inveterate criminals are women.

The natural, or conventional, form of retrogression among women is prostitution, not crime. Notice how one investigator expresses himself:

THE BORN FEMALE CRIMINAL IS NOT A WOMAN SHE IS RATHER A MONSTER!

Wickedness must have grown enormous before it could force such natural obstacles as: maternity, piety, corporeal weakness,--and I must add--last but not least: feminine alterocentricity.

Interestingly, criminologists underline just the lack of maternal affection registered in the hardened female criminal. This is typical symptom of her particular degeneration. There is, in her, a strange union of masculine qualities, preventing her from being more than partially a woman. For instance, there is a typically masculine trend in all her interests.

A remarkable INTEREST-ATTITUDE ANALYSIS by Terman and Miles, "Sex and Personality: Studies in Masculinity and Femininity" (58), shows a striking masculinity of interests in delinquent girls.

Page 172

In the hardened female criminals there is, for instance, a love of dissipation which must, necessarily, be antagonistic to the constant sacrifices demanded of a mother.

Says Lombroso:

"Her exaggerated sexuality, so opposed to maternity, would alone suffice to make her a bad mother. Psychologically and anthropologically she belongs more to the male than to the female sex." (Quoted by Ellis. See Note 3.)

THE REMARKABLE "SIX MONTHS OF GOODNESS" IN THE LIFE OF ONE OF THOSE HYBRID MONSTERS

On the opposite side, I have some equally unquestionable testimonies: The function of motherhood exerts an almost miraculously transforming influence on a woman. That is seen even in the case of hardened criminals. On them the childbearing function is observed to act, for a time at least, as a sort of antidote. Miss Thomas, a woman vicious from her childhood, according to the judgment of criminologists, had six months of goodness in her life. During those months her childbirth and child rearing function seemed to have transformed her nature. Unfortunately the little one died, however, and from that moment she relapsed into the gutter. Her case history certainly is not an isolated phenomenon.

It cannot be disputed: Maternity effectively introduces an element of soundness and life. Even against crime, and the gloomiest wickedness, it forms a wonder-making prophylactic. By the way, do we not also see a sort of illness-defeating mechanism at work in a female organism during the strainful period of pregnancy?

Maternal love is a woman's strongest "passion." But why does that "passion" so rarely lead her to infringements and crimes? What we actually observe taking place, is, in a certain sense, the very opposite: Far from blindfolding a woman, maternity has the effect of making her more seeing than ever. Motherliness becomes a sort of eye-opener. It makes that mother only better prepared to consider things in a pertinent and unbiased manner, morally as well as practically. Motherhood is conducive to a philosophy, not of sentimental romanticism, as people tend to think, but rather of sober-minded realism; that is the philosophy culminating in the true Agape, the great fundamental motif, prepared from eternity by the God of Rock-bottom Christianity. This is what I am trying to make crystal clear in a later work: THE PART OF THE STORY YOU WERE NEVER TOLD ABOUT AGAPE AND EROS and now also in an important sequel to this present book: *In Jeopardy: The Natural Mystery of MOTHERLINESS, The Last Hope of Survival for a Dying World.*

Page 173

Lombroso attempts to explain the mystery of maternity's fantastic effects in the following way: Maternity is preeminently a physiological function, whereas criminality -- even when induced by passion -- is pathological. Maternity is an intense NORMAL feeling. Therefore it just cannot become a perturbing element.

Well, evidently there must be a tremendously strong reason why despairing mothers so very rarely seek their escape in crime or similar violent derailments? Anyway, the historical facts are clear enough: The natural extremity to which maternal love will resort under critical conditions, is not what men might have expected. I am speaking about a crisis in a parent's life as serious as, for instance, the loss of an only child. It might be an apparently meaningless accident that has suddenly taken away that child. It might also be the manifest wickedness of other people. What then is the "normal reaction" of that mother, left childless and comfortless, with total loneliness as her only "companion"? The extremity to which she takes her "refuge" is not crime. It is MADNESS. I do not know to what extent it may be justifiable to regard even mental illness as some sort of "security valve," applied by nature herself in cases of extreme interior crisis. As for the matter here at issue, I can only keep to the plain registered facts of our statistics. Some plain figures gathered from different European countries show quite noteworthy facts: From one-and-a-half to three times as many women as men go mad from the loss of children.

BUT WHAT THEN CAN DRIVE EVEN GIRLS INTO THAT NASTY POOL OF ACTUAL CRIME?

The Norwegian investigator Sverre Brun-Guldbrandsen gives the following juvenile delinquency figures for the percentage of girls involved in cases treated by the Children Welfare Councils (Vergeradene) in Norway during the years 1934-1953 (54):

Years:	Girls involved due to conditions in the HOME:	Girls involved due to the child's own conduct:
1934-39	44.4% of total group	9.0% of total number were girls
1940-45	43.9%	19.4%
1946-53	42.6%	12.5%

1934-53

43.6%

13.9%

Subtract this from 100, and you have the percentage of *boys*.

The last column shows that a comparatively small percentage of girls were involved in cases of juvenile delinquency or asocial behavior. Admittedly, the percentage does rise to a high of 19.4 for the years 1940-45, the years of a terrible World War, when even Norway was an unhappy country occupied by German troops. Here, by the way, we are facing a

Page 174

common tendency of most statistics of criminality. But notice also: even in times of war the figures of women, in the statistics for participation in criminal acts, rarely pass beyond 20 percent. In spite of various incongruities in them, such statistics must be said to reflect a very real sex difference in criminality. Among criminologists there is little disagreement on this point. Of course some dissidents do turn up occasionally. Brun-Gulbrandson cites the case of Polak (60), who claims that differences in male and female criminality may be almost entirely explained by three different factors:

1. Women's participation in crime is more in fields in which they are not detected.
2. Even when detected, they are not so frequently reported.
3. Even when reported, they are not so severely punished.

Pollak's assertions, however, have been seriously challenged by other criminologists (61). And his views will certainly never be accepted by the majority of scholars in this field.

"THE MENDACIOUS SEX"

We have already given due study to women's peculiar way of perceiving reality. So we do know something about their "intellectual" attitude toward truth. What is, now, their moral attitude toward truth?

Firs this question: What has been the common opinion, down through the ages, about female truthfulness? Not always too flattering, it seems. I shall limit myself to citing cases from our modern era.

Diderot characterizes women, in their attitude to the need of truthfulness, as "toutes machiavelliques du plus au moins." (Entirely Machiavellian from one end to the other).

Fenelon describes them as "artificieuses, pleines de dissimulation et de finesse" (Full of artifice, dissimulation and fine tricks).

Labruyere expresses himself in a still more depreciative way: "Il coute peu aux femmes de dire ce qu'elles ne sentent point" (To a woman it costs little to tell something which is not at all her true feeling).

In fact, it seems to be one of the favorite forms of the "esprit francais" to devise some highly seasoned aphorisms on feminine mystification, and dissimulation, or absurd relationship toward reality.

I have already informed you that Schopenhauer, the old woman-hater, does not lag so far behind his French brothers. Dilating on "Der Frauen Natur und Recht" (Women's Nature and Rights) he does not refrain from speaking about women's

"instinktartige Verschlagenheit und ihr unvertilgbarer Hang zum Lügen (Women's instinct-like shrewdness and ineradicable proneness to tell lies).

Page 175

I have taken time out to go through some of the standard works of modern personality research in this field. And what is the general impression resulting from that? It is simple. Our comprehensive investigations of psychology today do not reveal any such "instinctful female artfulness," and still less any "ineradicable female propensity toward lying".

According to the elaborate test batteries of Hartshorne and May, described in their work *STUDIES ON DECEIT* (52), girls were found to cheat more than boys in one single case only: One of the numerous, ingeniously devised tests was to be taken home by the girls and boys tested. Here, it is true, there was a uniform tendency for the girls to cheat more than the boys. The investigators, however, interpret that one incongruous case in what is evidently the only logical way. They find its explanation, not in the greater susceptibility of the girls to the temptation of getting away with something that would prosper their interests, but rather in their greater desire to *MAKE GOOD IN SCHOOL*. The conclusion sounds understandable and to the point:

"The relative indifference of boys to the formal requirements of the school, has often been commented upon. And as it takes considerable effort to look up words in a dictionary in order to find their meanings, the lack of motive would be a sufficient explanation of the failure to do even as well on the tests taken home as on the ones done in school. In schools F and Q (two of the institutions tested), where motive is probably more evenly distributed between the sexes, it is the boys who take the greater advantage of the situation to deceive, rather than the girls" (63).

SOME PLAUSIBLE EXPLANATIONS OF THE BAD REPUTATION ENTAILED BY WOMEN, - THOSE "BORN LIARS"!

Researchers have tried to analyze the reasons why women more frequently "dissimulate," thus provoking the misleading impression of being "less truthful" than men. One of them describes the tendency as "almost physiological":

1. **WEAKNESS:** The physically weak ones cannot so easily afford to be frank. That reason for falling into the use of ruses is also found in the animal world. Birds who think their offspring is in danger because you happen to be too close indeed to their nest, will for instance feign the failure of a wing, fooling you into pursuing the mother, just in order to get you away from the helpless little ones in the nest or near the nest.

2. **MENSTRUATION:** Here conventional views seem to force

Page 176

women to exercise some kind of dissimulation for several days every month.

3. **MODESTY:** A woman is not supposed to show her love, or her need of love, unless she is challenged by her partner.

4. **NECESSITY OF CONCEALING ANY DEFECT,** real or imaginary, that might cause the strong sex not to choose her.

5. **DESIRE TO APPEAR INTERESTING,** even through weakness. I may mention the classical trick of *fainting* "at just the right moment." Of course the "strong

ones" may sometimes in their self-conceit be too inclined to think that this or that "weak one" has arranged a scene of pretending fainting just for their sake. On the other hand, all such cases of "female fainting" are not necessarily a fiction of some masculine imagination. It goes without saying that there is ever so often a realistic need, on the part of the fair sex, to arouse the attention of the maybe "not so fair one." You know as well as I the fact of those already mentioned social conventions: The MAN is supposed to take certain initiatives. So it may be urgent enough to remind him of the appropriate moment to intervene.

6. SUGGESTIBILITY AND FANCY: Feminine imagination may grow a bit too strong at times, causing imaginary matters and real matters to be fused together in a somewhat misleading way. But something of that kind happens to other categories of human beings as well. I am thinking of the "category" we set apart under the name of *children*. Children are often accused of dishonesty without being really to blame. Many cases of gross exaggeration, or even actual distortions of the facts, may be accounted for by sheer imagination. Women are strikingly close to children in this respect, as well as in so many others. With women, too, a simple super-abundance of feelings may be the main reason why they render something they have heard, or even an experience they themselves have gone through, in an inaccurate way.

7. PRACTICAL DIFFICULTIES,--especially in that really problem-studded task of bringing up children: It is often so temptingly easy to resort to "white lies" as an expedient way out. Whether this is the only way out, and the correct one, even pedagogically speaking, that is of course another question and a rather dubious one indeed. (See my book GOD THE SITUATION ETHICIST).

8. Women sometimes seek their refuge in "white lies" simply for the purpose of not hurting or shocking other people unnecessarily. Sensitiveness of heart and delicacy of mental disposition may account for a multitude of less than ideal things.

I might enlarge this list indefinitely. But this should suffice to demonstrate what another student of human character, Klage (64), would probably call "external mendacity." That would tacitly imply also the existence of an opposite concept, that of "internal veracity." The idea is of course that you may outwardly appear to be a liar, whereas, inwardly you may be truth itself. I have already, in the case of inward faithfulness and outward unfaithfulness pointed out how delusive--or at least enormously difficult--it may be to separate that "inwardness" from its corresponding "outwardness."

Page 177

I seriously fear the insidious danger of falsehoods, even when they may seem limited to the "outward" form. On the other hand, I must say: How much better--infinitely better--our interhuman relations would be, if we happened to be more eagerly looking for a more or less "hidden" truthfulness still to be found in many people around us whom condemnatory and superficial observers may rashly label as just "ineradically prone to tell lies." At bottom those discredited ones may still have a far greater amount of inner truthfulness in their lives than many others who seem to enjoy a quite enviable reputation for "meticulous accuracy." For it has always been possible for any pedant to appear irreproachably perfect and truthloving, and still not have sufficient moral courage even to acknowledge the fundamental impulses of his own heart.

WHOM DO OUR TRAGEDY WRITERS TRADITIONALLY PICK OUT AS VICTIM'S OF "THE LIE OF ONE'S LIFE" ("LIVSLÖGNEN"--I B S E N)

Is it man or woman? I am referring to a character vividly and most dramatically portrayed by the Norwegian master of problem dramas. He describes, again and again, a type of persons who have managed to build their entire lives on the failing basis of some ingeniously constructed falsehood. One day that cherished "lie of your life" is suddenly and mercilessly taken away from you. And what happens to you? A total collapse of your whole life structure. That "vital falsehood" of yours had been the only prop keeping you apparently upright.

But notice something strange about that ever returning motif: Prevailing--if not exclusively--those characters are presented as MEN. And this is not just a whim conceived by Henrik Ibsen. It is manifestly the way the vast majority of perspicacious dramatists have viewed the distribution of character roles between the sexes in life's gigantic drama. "The lie of man's very life", you see, is not a properly feminine construction.

It has never been necessary to be a profound philosopher in order to make jocular comments on the "craft" and the "cunning", characterizing the female sex. But it obviously takes more than just popular jocularly or traditional opinion to perceive that the "instinktartige Verschlagenheit" Schopenhauer manages to find in women, does not prevent them from possessing a remarkable degree of "inner truthfulness", an actual devotion to truth, in their deepest heart.

Page 178

HONESTY, ACCORDING TO NATIONS AND SEXES

The national group investigations by Anastasi and Foley (30), previously referred to, also comprised an honesty test. The result here as well is in favor of women, as compared to men. True, the critical ratio in this case does not exceed the standard error in a way quite as significant as, for instance, in the esthetic value test of the same series of investigations. Nevertheless, it is almost certain that the true female scores in honesty must have been pulled down considerably, owing to special circumstances particularly unfavorable to a just evaluation of the female accomplishments in that test. I am referring to an evident advantage on the boys side, which did not have any equivalent, on the girls side, to match it. Some institutional groups participating, you see, included a Catholic college for men. That group was seen to give exceptionally high scores for "the appreciation of religious values." There was not any corresponding institution among the female students examined that might be assumed to possess a similar positive impetus, thus making up for the influence on the final scores, on the part of that idealistic ecclesiastical group of young people on the male side. And now, notice: in spite of this incongruity the scores for honesty turned out to be, for male students: 96.36; for female students: 99.0. (here too, in changing the test from national difference test into a sex difference test, I have made the necessary computations as accurately as the available information rendered this possible).

One thing then comes clearly out. That applies to this section of the test exactly as much as to the others: The SEX differences are considerably higher than the NATIONAL GROUP differences.

4 BOYS TO 1 GIRL REGISTERED AS "BEHAVIOR PROBLEMS"

Nothing is more consistently revealed by the modern tests of differential psychology than the fact of female discipline versus male indiscipline. Among boys there is a much greater tendency of aggressiveness and dominant behavior than among girls. We have not been able to hide the fact that it is preponderantly boys who are sent to the child guidance clinics for the treatment of behavior problems.

Numerous surveys, such as Ackerson's: CHILDREN'S BEHAVIOR PROBLEMS (University of Chicago publication. See my note 65) show the uniform trend. One survey of predelinquent children in the Middle Western cities (66) actually shows a proportion of FOUR boys to ONE girl as behavior problems.

Page 179

The result of an investigation of 579 children of nursery school age shows an early tendency of more aggressive behavior in boys. They are reported to "grab toys," "attack others," "rush into danger," "refuse to comply," "ignore requests," "laugh," "squeal," etc., far more frequently than girls (64).

Of course, objections may freely be made against the conclusive force of such reports. They may be blamed for reflecting a certain bias in the evaluations, stemming from reporters belonging to a society that has simply "made up its mind in advance to see greater mischief-makers, or scoundrels, in boys than in girls." It would hardly be wrong to sum up the suspicion in such a way.

My question is only: Why should there not also be SOME very good point of explanation in the simple fact we cannot fail to observe: There is, in women, from their earliest age, and throughout their lives, a greater inward harmony, a moral sense of order. And that interior order, also called discipline, constitutes an original prophylactic against delinquency and against all kinds and degrees of objectionable conduct.

I do NOT, by this, deny the possibility of subjective evaluations in contemporary testing. Of course, one should be careful to avoid considering exclusively from a positive angle that feminine tendency of a "better behavior." This might be, to some extent, a tendency to depend, more or less slavishly, upon the praise of one's superiors. For girls do submit--maybe more or less uncritically--to authorities. They do show a greater weakness for becoming despondent if they are not able to secure that fatherly recognition and praise they are so anxiously yearning for.

But why should it immediately be interpreted as "introverted" behavior when girls get discouraged because that need of approval and acceptance is not satisfied? What should prevent us from looking at the same phenomenon from another viewpoint as well?

There is something here reminding me of the relation Joseph had to his father Jacob, the Old Testament patriarch. How did his brothers look upon it? Rather negatively. And we can fairly well understand their viewpoint. I do not pretend that everything was perfect in Joseph's case. Nor in his father's case for that matter. But some critics seem to go to the extreme of blaming Joseph for dreaming certain dreams that obviously antagonized his brothers very much. After all, does the Bible ever suggest that those dreams about Joseph's position of superiority over his brothers were the boy's own invention (or an invention of his "subconscious mind")? I would say only theologians of an extremely humanistic mold, or any other observer, seriously doubting the intervention of divine providence in the history of this world, could openly infer that Joseph himself was responsible for his dreams. In fact even that boy's good behavior

and his sonly relationship to his father seems to be interpreted by some as mainly a dubious thing, an exclusive sign of dishonesty and poor comradship. The award for true manliness and respectable comradship rather seems to go to Josephs brothers, those notoriously wicked ones.

Page 180

Is this intelligent reasoning? Does it possess the fulness of Biblical realism?

In our own case story, the idea of many seems to be that girls suffer from a similar weakness. That is the "unmanly" behavior of "being good." If they do not manage to solicit from their superiors the praise and approval they covet, then they just become despondent. And despondency is just another token of *feminine* introversion, just like pouting and weeping.

Is there an alternative to this trend of logic? I do think so. Why should not that candid eagerness in a girl, on a given occasion, to "do well" and win her superiors' praises, be just another sign that she is coming closer and closer to managing the supreme feat of perfect *submission*. She has acquired the ultimate willingness, the sincere desire, to incorporate herself into the larger entity of her proper milieu. As far as I can see, there is no surer indication of sound EXTROVERSION than that. For is it not, on the contrary, the attitude of in-subordination that is definitely introvert in a negative sense?

THE PHENOMENAL ART OF ADAPTATION

The individual who has his center outside himself (in the external world, the world of the other-ones, the Other One), will, as a matter of course, adapt himself to that world. High suggestibility gives high adaptability. Expressionability is just another term for that tremendous aliveness of the other-centered person. Take the expressionability of a woman's face. Her smile, her laughter, her blushes, her tears--even her pouting--all these phenomena, so readily called into action, are as many eloquent signs of feminine alterocentricity. What it all means is women's greater awareness of their environment.

Now I would like you to weigh in your mind how much truth there may be in the following contention:

Page 181

ANY WOMAN IN FRONT OF ANY MAN BECOMES, AT ONCE, SHYER AND MORE EXISTENTIALLY ALIVE!

Is it just the fantastic mobility of the female face that has inspired men to launch the above contention? Havelock Ellis, for one, states something very close to that. He says: A woman, especially if her nervous control is somewhat defective, involuntarily changes, when, for instance, an individual of the opposite sex approaches. He adds: However indifferent that man may be to her personally, she cannot prevent certain instinctive responses of her vaso-motor and muscular system: She becomes at once shy and more alive.

If he had not made that addition, we might have been tempted to suspect that the male creature's traditional self-importance and self-conceit could have caused him to exaggerate immeasurably the attention imagined to be aroused in a helplessly excitable female whenever the master of creation (man) happens to be in the offing.

On the other hand, I have already pointed out what great importance in a woman's life is attached to, above all, what is biologically most intensively meaningful to her. Now, if the child is the center of meaningfulness par excellence, then of course the potential father of that child can hardly remain a totally unimportant (or meaningless) matter.

I should here mention what some prominent biologists believe about precisely that greater aliveness in women, in terms of a particularly quick response to stimuli, both external and internal. Even the great mobility of the female face, just mentioned, and the entire greater aliveness of a woman's expression is found to be deeply rooted in her biological functions. The special way her endocrine glands perform their secretions has an intimate connection with the mental reactions happening to her as a woman. Biochemists consider an excessive excretion of calcium compounds as necessary for female reproductive functions. That excess, however, has been found, in its turn, to reduce equanimity. It may seem to you that such excitements causing a certain unbalance must be a rather dubious inconvenience that has to be accepted. It is part of the bargain, as it were. For it has to be conceded: in our world today conditions are no longer perfect. For the time being, a "second rate deal" has to be accepted; that applies to so many instances. The way of sacrifice and temporary suffering seems to be the only one practicable here and now. Human females certainly have not been exempted from the reverse sides of the "great deal."

The extreme excitability and liability to convulsions in frogs during their breeding period has been studied and compared with related phenomena in the human female at beginning puberty, during the period of ovulation and gestation, and most of all at the culminating moments of labor. These studies, so far, suggest a TELEOLOGICAL side to female nervous excitability, considered from a functional point of view. This affords a glimpse of great meaningfulness, after all. Just those fundamental physiological peculiarities in women have been assumed to provide a certain accumulation of nerve force, most useful to the periodically returning functions. They might then also be the explanation--or one of the explanations--for many seemingly inexplicable outbursts in the fair sex (71).

Page 182

One thing is certain: it does cost something to be a potential mother, but most women obviously find that it is worth the price.

ARE WOMEN "A BUNCH OF CHAMELEONS?"

We now have something like a fairly meaningful background. With this in view, we may feel justified in assuming a certain reflex-like ability in women to adapt themselves, even mentally, to their environment. That may particularly apply to the part of their environment of most vital importance to them as women. But precisely that adaptability is undoubtedly responsible for a good number of misinterpreted facts. Who has not heard of the chameleon-like changeability, even "insincerity", so frequently presumed almost as a sort of standard equipment of the feminine mind.

It has often been stated that a woman will mold herself on the ideal of the man with whom she is associating at the moment,--provided that she does at all have any admiration for him, that is.

This may look like a case of opportunism that it would be pretty hard to qualify as entirely praiseworthy. Quite understandably, in most readers' minds, the above formulation of the statement might call forth a rather unfortunate impression. It might cause them to doubt that any typical woman possesses the elementary moral force to assert her individual human integrity. The ability to develop a personal backbone and form a character that will stand unshakeable, is considered by serious people to be an absolute must. But in this case every quality of that kind seems to be a blank failure. The temptations are, allegedly, too overwhelming.

By whom is that woman so irresistibly tempted? Supposedly by her social environment in general, just pressing in upon her; and by one part of that environment in particular,--namely the "biologically meaningful part."

You probably know WHO is meant, don't you? Well, who would it be, if not MAN, the father of her prospective children? When that fellow comes into the woman's life, the rumor goes, he immediately "winds her around his little finger."

Is this the true story about the main characteristics of feminine morals? Oh, "frailty thy name is woman!" Don't you feel you can hear Hamlet's tragic voice ringing through the air? So what is it then that characterizes the typical human female's attitude toward her environment? It must be weakness, despicable "feminine softness."

Page 183

And this is assumed to be particularly true of her attitude toward the part of her environment that is supposed to be outstandingly significant to her in terms of her profoundest biological assignment! What a shocking disclosure.

WHAT ARE THE DOCUMENTED FACTS ABOUT THAT CHAMALEON-LIKE FEMALE MALLEABILITY?

Is this what the records of the past reveal about women? By no means. Both secular and religious history give abundant evidence that women may perfectly well stand on their own two feet with remarkable moral firmness. They are not at all bound to "mold themselves on the ideal of this or that man whom they happen to be associating with." No-no, not even when it happens to be a man for whom they have a considerable admiration.

On the contrary, women have access to a moral force that would help them at any time to stand upright, with a personal independence which most men might have to envy, -- if they knew its character. For alterocentricity, on its highest level, includes the unique glory of a FREE WILL. It is rather EGO-centricity--on its lowest level--that leads to will-lessness. Oh yes, egocentricity consistently lands in the drear wilderness of automatism, the ultimate moral deadlock. Egoism is the blank inertia, a negative force causing a person, by and by, to feel helplessly entangled in "the meshes of fate." That fatalism is the barren idea with which man's environment--all he finds outside himself--turns into a wilderness. Simple non-meaning takes the lead of your life entirely, reducing you to a mere automation. You are finally having your great encounter with the meanest "other one" you ever dreamt of. A tragic thing has happened: Your environment--or all that is left to you in it--has turned into a stale emptiness, a chaotic nothingness, over which materialism reigns as sovereign king. It is the drab no-man's-land spiritualists babble about, calling it by their most meaningless term: "pure matter."

You have reached the stage of ultimate depersonalization. You are a nondescript citizen of the so called Nirvana "heaven."

Tragedy of tragedies! A human person, originally endowed with a personal conscience, granted him by a personal God, could not possibly get any farther away than that from the golden goal of genuine other-centeredness.

Conclusion: It would be a strange thing indeed, if women were doomed to be as soft as dish-rags, devoid of all personal backbone,--and this simply BECAUSE they are other-centered. That is a wicked lie. It is monstrous absurdity.

Page 184

On the other hand, this does not exclude the eventuality that women's inherently good and sound personal adaptation, may degenerate into a veritable moral looseness. It would serve no useful purpose to obscure the fact. There is danger ahead. It is too well known how able women are to adjust. That includes the ability to place undue confidence in others. Their will may be adjusted to other people's wills, even the wills of unworthy partners. Some men, we know, do suffer from an almost total absence of sound moral principles. To refrain from adjusting to the words and the ways of such men, demands a particularly great amount of moral stamina. It means that a woman must fight against heavy odds in order NOT to develop an undue admiration for that unworthy man.

It would seem appropriate here to address one word of admonition to any man whom it might concern: Do you happen to be that "other one" in this seriously tempted woman's life? If so, then why not accept the full moral implications of your position. In that case it would seem imperative for you to take due cognizance of something, she herself would NOT be so well advised to dwell upon. I am referring to woman's undeniable "attenuating circumstances." You must realize, as her partner in life, to what extent her desire to lean upon THE OTHER ONES, materially and spiritually, has its natural foundation in her very instincts as a woman, her very functions as a woman.

In this profoundly biological context, a husband, more than any other equal life partner in her entire life situation, is bound to occupy a unique place in that familiar environment that becomes truly significant to her as the garden of life. For, after all, he is nothing less than the actual--or prospective--father of that woman's children. At the moment when a fellow man acquires such a position in a mother's--or prospective mother's--life, HIS share in the moral responsibilities implied, suddenly grows beyond all accurate calculation, and all human predictability. Accordingly, the question of respective guilt, if that becomes the issue, is bound to be an equally incalculable, and an equally unpredictable one, humanly speaking.

Page 185

REMARKABLE EVIDENCE OF FEMININE ADAPTABILITY IN SOCIAL LIFE

It goes without saying that sociability must become just another one of those synonyms whose capital concept is alterocentricity. So if women reveal themselves as eminently sociable, this certainly ought not to cause any great surprise. And we should not be surprised either, of course, if we have to establish other qualities that would follow directly from the greater soundness enjoyed by a more sociable (that is, a more alterocentric) person. What about a woman's life expectancy, compared to that of a man? This means nothing less than the "ability to survive." And what could be more

dependent on general biological soundness than that? An increase in alterocentricity, with all it stands for, ought to favor definitely a corresponding increase in survival value by and large.

I am speaking in literal physical terms. For that increased viability, biologically speaking, must of course express itself in the very number of years a person can live. So what do the statistics of modern medical science have to say in this respect? They are emphatic and unflinching. Women do live longer than men. They do recover more easily from illnesses. They do bear pain and material disasters with greater endurance. In short, they are definitely stronger, in all essential biological respects, than the "strong" sex.

However, this alone would never be enough. There can be no question, of course, of any human existence worthy of the name, unless precisely that well-adjusted happy relationship has been established between the human individual and the other intelligent creatures among whom a person is intended to lead his life in a truly meaningful way. Sociability is the great thing. Even on the highest religious level its value is priceless.

Now, all the research material I have been able to lay my hands upon in this order of ideas, does show a consistent trend of clear female superiority. I am speaking frankly about the art of making life a success in this extended--social--sense. I shall limit myself to a few references I deem strictly necessary.

The evidence is abundant and conclusive, all the way from preschool age. In fact, we have already paid all due attention to the trend during those youngest years. But what then about the more mature years of women's lives? Well, the superior scores for female sociability in childhood show no sign of decreasing with old age.

Johnson and Terman, in one piece of investigation, focused their attention just on the ages between 70 and 90. The result of that research constituted no exception to the general rule: For what do women mainly depend on, even in those advanced years of their lives, in order to feel fairly happy? On sociability! Men's case was again found to be clearly divergent. It was established with equal significance that THEIR happiness was far more highly correlated with quite other things during that same period of life (72). But women--NO! Without togetherness no life for them.

Page 186

FLORENCE NIGHTINGALE IS STILL ALIVE

Let us turn to special points of evidence. Take medicine as a field of professional occupation: What specialties are women doctors seen to favor? Among other things, particularly PEDIATRICS, PSYCHIATRY, OBSTETRICS, and ANESTHESIA.

Ashley Montague (73), for one, has no doubts as to why women choose precisely fields of specialization of this kind within the medical profession: They simply are happier whenever they are enabled to give the support of their very personalities, their sympathy and understanding, as well as their wisdom and their skill, to their patients. The male physician is interested in the performance of a task, the solving of a scientific problem. The female physician, however, is more concerned with the human meaning of those tasks and problems. Her intuition obviously reminds her more readily of the fact that "the care of the patient begins with CARING FOR THE PATIENT." In her, we might say, the old spirit of Florence Nightingale is kept intensely alive.

I cannot either in this serious matter skip the BERNREUTER PERSONALITY INVENTORY, so famous for its measurements of human personality traits. It gives the following significant figures for SOCIABILITY: Male average: 25.9; Female average: 31.9.

In almost every test in this area women afford evidence of being more socially dependent, and more socially interested. Moreover, you should notice one thing here: There is no reason to fear that those nice scores obtained for feminine sociability should have been exaggerated. On the contrary, they represent a definite understatement. For all evidence tends to suggest that women are even more social-minded still, in reality, than they appear in the tests. That too is pretty well demonstrated, in an indirect way, by the investigations conducted by Johnson and Terman. In fact, something very important, as a due corrective, should here be taken into account by all experts in differential psychology: Women's overt EXPRESSION of their social interests (their interest in being social) is considerably inhibited by their natural TIMIDITY. I have given some discussion to that latter feminine tendency already. Some thorough psychological statistics register this timidity under the name of a "lack of self-confidence."

That "poor" display of self-confidence (self-reliance) in women's lives, as we shall see later, is a tremendously important ASSET for the development of their deeper religiousness. But such modesty in female behavior is definitely no asset in terms of an impressive demonstration of how tremendously great women's deepest desire is, of mingling socially with their fellow creatures. It is only the deeper insight of some

Page 187

statisticians that has permitted them to draw a farther-reaching conclusion in this direction. It has forced them to assume that women must possess, in the depths of their hearts, a more ardent ideal of being social, even when they do actually BEHAVE in a less social way. They simply fail to command that masculine self-assurance it takes (the "nerve" it takes) to manifest an exterior conduct that would correspond to their actual interior sociability. This circumstance should be duly heeded by all judges who strive to interpret with maximum fairness the feminine scores of the sociability tests.

THE SIGNIFICANCE AND DOCUMENTATION OF THAT LOWER SELF-CONFIDENCE IN WOMEN

What it actually means is so great a subject, that most of it must wait for another contest. It has to do with a capital question, not only for the theory of human spirituality, but also for a captivating practical inquiry: "Who is the more religious, man or woman?" On the other hand the reader must already be perfectly entitled to demand an answer to the basic question: Does the writer have any valid proof that this lower degree of female self-confidence is a documented fact? Perhaps some women's lib strategists would be the first ones to challenge this piece of information.

Well there is all the scientific evidence needed. Researchers show perfect agreement on this point. I shall here only mention the conclusions drawn from facts carefully collected to find out the social orientation of 3,000 college students (74). The Bernreuter Inventory actually proves, with the overwhelming critical ratio of 9.62 (the highest ever reported in the entire inventory) that men are more self-confident than women.

In other words, as test subjects, MEN, in the present contest regarding sociability, would seem to have a definite advantage, in one sense. For whatever rudiments of social trends there may still be left in those husky fellows, one factor is bound to work out in their favor at least: They will always have a fairer chance, thanks to their masculine boldness, to show themselves in their very best light. In this impressive respect it has to be admitted: Women seem to have a far less favorable position. But that is only a temporary inconvenience. Nothing you see, would be able to hide, in the long run, the explosive superiority of the female sex, wherever social adaptation is the great issue.

Page 188

We have barely touched a tremendously challenging topic: the role of self-confidence (self-reliance, self-dependence) in human lives. For the time being I have to limit myself to asking just a few rather disturbing questions. In itself the term "confidence" sounds quite reassuring, doesn't it? Its closest synonym would be "faith". And now what about self-confidence? Is that basically good or basically evil. Is it akin to alterocentricity or to egocentricity? This has seemed destined to become one of the most fascinating objects of my entire research in the history of ideas. Of course the somewhat dubious thing is that prefix "self", introducing the word. "Confidence" equals "faith" all right. But "faith in one's own self" how does that sound? Religiously speaking, not necessarily too good, some might say. In this present little volume I do not find the space--perhaps not the proper forum either--for an in-depth analysis of concepts and trends belonging more specifically to the history of religions. And still it must be conceded: There is one large-looming quality I have found overshadowing all others in the lives of "Ultra-Occidental" men. I have deemed it worthy of being launched as this culture's fundamental motif. That is SELF-SUFFICIENCY,--in Plato's language AUTARKEIA, a fateful representative of all secular humanism in our Western world.

For the time being, however, we have more than we can handle with the simple facts of every-day life in an average human society. You may be surprised to see how much there is to captivate and illuminate our minds in the topic: sex differences in the ability to adapt:

PECULIAR TRAITS OF WOMEN'S SOCIAL ELASTICITY

We know, both from literature and from life, that women have an almost unbelievable elasticity in front of changing social levels.

Once in a while, by sudden wealth, a family may be raised to a far higher circle of society. Well, you say, it should not take such an admirable degree of elasticity to adjust to that. You may be wrong about that. But I understand your point. What you would praise as admirable is the ability to adapt oneself when one's family is suddenly compelled to descend to a far lower social level. Well, our great question applies to both cases: Which sex is found more equal to the new situation. The evidence is unanimous. As a great general rule, the "weak" sex adapts far more easily to either one of those unexpected changes.

To be elastic means, of course, to have some material in you that helps you to bend rather than break. The introvert, self-centered person seems to lack this element. So he tends to break rather than bend. In the case of some men that breaking will take the tragic form of simple suicide.

SUICIDE--A "MASCULINE" TYPE OF REACTION

What do we know about suicides caused by financial failures and social breakdowns? They are far more frequent in men than in women. Statistical figures for Germany, for instance, over a period of 9 years, showed this proportion: Men 7.5; Women 18.46. Corresponding figures for Italy over a period of 11 years: 7 as against 4.6. The same table of "suicides from want" gives for Norway: Men 10.30; Women 4.50.

Such proportions are not exceptional phenomena. It is common knowledge that suicides by and large show much higher rates for men than for women. Edward von Mayer's suicide table for Europe (75) registers between and 4 male suicides for every 1 among women.

Louis Dublin and Bessie Bunzel have published the results of their comprehensive studies on suicide in the modern world. It is to be found in their well-known work: TO BE OR NOT TO BE (76). As for the United States they found that only women commit suicide for every 10 men. It is these authors who go to the length of calling suicide a "masculine type of reaction."

And let us now return to our specific topic of financial reverses and social degradation as causes of family tragedy.

FINANCIAL FAILURES HIT THE WIFE HARDER. STILL SHE BEARS THEM BETTER THAN THE HUSBAND

Some will say, as a bankruptcy is announced and they think they have hit the nail on the head as far as the essential part of that news is concerned--"Mr. So-and-So has suffered total bankruptcy." But now this little question: Whom would it be reasonable to regard as the "main sufferer" in a case like that. Is it likely that a financial reverse of this crushing kind would affect the daily life of a wife less strongly than that of her husband? The logical answer must be: It would hit her life MORE strongly. We must, for all practical purposes, take into account the literal corporeal strokes immediately resulting to the wife in that household, from that financial failure. And do not imagine that the pain of that unexpected blow is one she feels in her skin only. It goes down to the depths of her flesh and bones. More than that, it overwhelms her very soul. Have we not made it clear that she is the more sensitive one, mentally as well as physically? Would it be reasonable to assume that she is the one who would react with dull indifference to those sudden changes in social prestige, "family honor", and what have you? Do you forget the role of the MOTHER, the very heart of that normally pulsating family. I am speaking about a pulsation that used to be normal right up the present moment. But what has happened to the normalcy all of a sudden? It has collapsed.

Page 190

And now comes the question, the most curious one of the whole series: Why does that woman play, from this moment on, the incredible role she really does? Why is just SHE the remarkable member of that family, the only one of the whole bunch, who bears all the reverse effects of that sudden financial disaster with a minimum of violent reactions?

Would it be illogical to answer: She does all this simply because she is the fabulous one, miraculously strengthened to play the role of the life saver. Her hidden

forces include that precious gift of adapting fairly well to the unexpected. Any variations in social conditions must eventually yield to her masterful control. Whether it is a matter of economical skyrocketing or a precipitous downfall, makes no essential difference. The acuteness of feminine sensibility registers every detail of the abrupt change with accuracy. And still that same femininity bears every aspect, every effect of the sudden change with an unbelievable degree of equanimity.

How come? The answer is a remarkable:

As Max Nordau has strikingly stated, the difference in nature between a duchess and a washerwoman is only superficial. So a duchess can adapt herself to new surroundings and become a washerwoman much more easily than a duke would be able to transform himself under analogous circumstances. I already mentioned the core of the secret: If you do not bend, you are bound to break. The duchess bends where the duke breaks. I am sorry for the duke, if this is the masculine misfortune that happens to him. But as long as there is still some fine duchess around, there is still hope for him. His life may be saved.

Some researchers have tried to explain the heroic stand of that family-rescuing mother by looking upon it from the viewpoint of a "lower female differentiation." That is a theory which has not proved so easy to verify. But why not consider it from the simple viewpoint of a "higher female elasticity"? That greater elasticity is a natural part of greater adaptability, and, accordingly, just another obvious link in the alterocentric chain.

One thing is indisputable: Men do distinguish themselves by a considerably greater rigidity. So how could they hope to bear a really taxing strain, without breaking, rather than bending? That breaking may be tragic. But it is not inexplicable or unpredictable. It is a well-known pattern development in the life of a prevalingly schizothym person. The internal split type of mind will tend to push its conflicts to a tragic extreme from which there seems to be no return. The opposite human type the cyclothym, will rather tend to "round off" the conflict. The sharpest edges are cut off, as it were. There is a provision made for some kind of compromise. And that may be a rather wholesome, redeeming type of compromise.

Page 191

The woman who has been crushingly hit, may have an ever so loud cry of despair. But in that cry itself there may be an element of other-centeredness, an intensive search for a possible way OUT. How shall we explain the survival value of that element? Here is a perspective from which it can be viewed, still within the scope of a valiant alterocentricity: A woman may manage to look at even financial ruin in her own sound matter-of-fact way. So her vision is not blind-folded by just staring frantically at her own "inner disaster." I should not use a term as introvertedly philosophical and masculine as that. But you have certainly heard and experienced what so many of us have come to fear as the ultimate disaster. It is often called "a personal downfall in prestige." Some would even label it a "tragic loss of honor." Men have so many solemn ways of describing even purely outward and rather superficial mishaps.

But now, in contrast to this ridiculous superficiality, what is it our good heroine of the motherly genius gets sight of, right in the midst of that sudden "calamity" befalling her family? What should it be if not the practical difficulty that has to be solved first and foremost: We may sum it up as follows: How is she going to save her children (Her husband is one of them) from dying of hunger during the next few days? Here some

down-to-earth solution has to be found right away. Now what time do you think that kind of realistic thinking leaves for melancholic moods or sentimental acts? (Even suicide is often a result of soft romanticism taking the place of hard realism). Do you see the sound trend of things growing out of this type of alterocentric thinking? Even entire months and maybe years are filled with sober-minded and activity-creating projects. Her great question is: How am I going to build up a new future for "my kids", right here on the very ruins of a lamentable present? These urgent--and I must be permitted to add: most alterocentric--questions, quite understandably constitute as many items of sound distraction. Each one of them leads that anxious mother OUTWARDS. That means far, far away from the most egocentric of all solutions: Suicide!

THE SADDEST FEMININE ALTERNATIVE IN ALL HUMAN HISTORY TO SUICIDE AND CRIME:-- PROSTITUTION

It should probably be our next candid step to bow our heads in shame and sorrow and admit something in which we all, as a human race, have a dreadful share. Our history testifies from times immemorial that "another solution" remains wide open to women, driven to the ultimate extreme of social misery. It is a solution of abject compromise. I feel as if the uncertain word of MEDIOCRITY is written straight across it. And here we have the clearest evidence that mediocre solutions are NOT NECESSARILY good. I am speaking about a really sad occurrence in the history of feminine destinies. I am speaking about prostitution.

Page 192

The records of criminology are there to verify an extremely disheartening story: Prostitution constitutes nothing less than THE traditional alternative of a negative reaction among women, reduced to social wretchedness. Suicide is just the rare exception. We have to dwell upon something else than both suicide and crime as women's negative historical choice. Self-inflicted death must have appeared to them such a bottomless tragedy, and crime such a violent extreme, they just couldn't get along with the thought of it. Neither of those alternatives could meet even the unhappiest woman's approval. So the drab compromise had to take their place.

But frankly is that alternative necessarily a better choice? Prostitution is virtually a spiritual death. Now, tell me candidly: Is there such a gain in "only having to die spiritually"? It must mean living death. Prostitution is suicide of another kind. Not necessarily a "better" kind. The ordinary kind, suicide proper, is what you might call an "acute" phenomenon. Prostitution is just a chronic form of the same ailment. So we are simply facing the old question: Is a chronic condition necessarily any better than the corresponding acute one? At the moment when a woman goes into prostitution, she gives up everything that provides her life with true meaning. How could the death of your soul be an event less tragic than the death of your body?

We are here standing face to face with a misery which seems to be kept in reserve for women only. Now that statement may be a superficial one, a rather incorrect one. For men too can prostitute themselves. I am not here speaking about male prostitutes in homosexual circles. Even today those are comparatively rare. I am speaking about some far more common cases of male prostitution,--some far more serious cases also. Too often indeed it is our very lives that become prostituted. We

are selling ourselves, our very souls, for a pot of stew. There could be nothing more tragic anywhere than men abandoning themselves to a prostitution of their very lives.

Still don't let us wiggle away from the sad thing happening to WOMEN. Don't let us lose ourselves by going into cases of "prostitution in the figurative sense." Prostitution proper is a disgrace. It is an abomination. And it is a female feature,--no mistake.

Since we are at it, let us also admit another point of indisputable feminine weakness. It is a perversion of what we have recently been praising as "social adaptability."

Page 193

One word would be enough to remind anybody that here we have to do with a social phenomenon that may turn out quite negative. And it is then a negativity ten times more female than male. The word is "fashion."

ENSLAVED BY A STRANGE SLAVEDRIVER: FASHION

WHEN and WHY do women yield more willingly than men to the social pressure exerted upon them on the part of certain conventional patterns of group behavior?

The very word "fashion" leads our thoughts very naturally to the idea of CLOTHES. Here it should always be kept in mind what an enormous part the question of dress really plays in a woman's life. Of course it means a lot to persons of either sex. Clothes have come to be counted among the things we look upon as almost part and parcel of our very selves. To a large extent we actually identify ourselves with our clothes. Our personal honor, or dishonor, seems intimately involved in the concept of our apparel.

For women this may be true in a particular way. To them clothes tend to become their "social signboard", to say the least. A woman who has the feeling of being ill-dressed, does, to a remarkable extent, associate this with personal disgrace. Small wonder, then, that fashion in this special field tends to get a particularly firm hold on the minds of women.

However, there seems to be a very general hesitation in women to break away from almost anything that social conventions have consecrated. This prevailing tendency to opt for the STATUS QUO may of course seem to take the character of a general principle of conservatism among women. And in a number of fields--including politics--that would impress many observers as being a rather unfavorable tendency in a progressive world,--sometimes even an actual danger of stagnation and death.

Now, what about women's general trend here? Are they more conservative than men?

Let us first limit our inquiry to the question of a certain "clanmindedness." We all have an idea as to what that stands for. Now it can hardly be denied, that wherever the matter of clan or kindred is heavily involved, there definitely appears to be a greater trend toward conservatism in women than in men. Some have interpreted this as a greater inclination toward "introversion" in the female sex. But if a particularly close attachment to relatives and friends has to be labeled in that way, then I shall have to revise the notion I have had, so far, of the term "introversion." On the other hand, we are all familiar with the fact that a narrow clan spirit is bound to mean a trend toward

isolation, and hence toward self-centeredness. That isolated group may be a family, a tribe, even an entire fatherland. Chauvinism has many forms and degrees.

Page 194

I would like to cite one example of a certain group-"conservatism" in recent history, and women's attitude toward the issues involved. I select the results of a poll undertaken by the Dutch Institute of National Investigation (68). It was conducted at the time when the Indonesian question was most burning. The nation was asked: How are the relations between the Netherlands and the Indies now to be fixed?" It is interesting to note: Twice as many women as men desired the STATUS QUO. What was it here that a significantly greater percentage of MEN opted for? It was simply the more liberal idea of an independent Indonesia. Some will say, whenever things of that kind happen: "Men are more idealistic than women. And they are refreshingly radical in their idealism." Do you remember the result of a "generosity test" arranged for boys and girls? The girls proved consistently more willing to share, and to give away things. But the boys, in that case as well, distinguished themselves as the ones going to radical extremes. Their inclination was to "give everything or nothing."

What kind of "idealism" is that? Is it the well-balanced alterocentric kind? Please do not imagine that idealism is one solid absolutely unambiguous concept. Here a differentiation is more important than ever. Let us keep that urgency fresh in our minds now as we ask your topical question:

ARE WOMEN NATURALLY CONSERVATIVE?

I do not deny that there may be many a true idealist even right in the midst of this terribly messed-up thing we call international politics. And I perfectly well understand them when, in our particular case, they will throw up their arms and cry: "Where is the social justice or the elementary human decency of those Dutch women who so clearly voted against the simple liberation of a people in bondage?"

As the responsible author of a book on alterocentricity, I probably ought to tremble at the thought of a possible uproar: Suppose those critical judges might have heard about my special thesis of Feminine Othercenteredness. Would I not then run the risk of suddenly hearing them burst out with redoubled indignation: "What a pitiable quality that 'Other-centeredness' must be."

I anticipate the bitter irony of their bombarding questions, and prefer to ask them quite seriously myself: How could a typical alterocentrist be naturally opposed to the elementary rights of human beings? Would that person really go straight against the liberation of oppressed minorities, against the intransigent idealism that is bent on saving the world?

Page 195

AN IDEALISM BENT ON "SAVING THE WORLD"

Let us stop for a moment at those very words: "idealism" and "liberation (salvation) of THE WORLD."

In the first place, permit me to make one fundamental statement: True alterocentricity is not at all on the side of any "idealism" in that general or whole-sale sense of the term. By no means. As far as that is concerned, you would look in vain for alterocentricity both in the realms of philosophy and in the realms of international

politics. To the genuinely alterocentric person there just does not exist any such thing as "saving the world." There is no "salvation of the SOLID BLOC TYPE." I am speaking about the more or less THEORETICAL TYPE, the BUREAUCRATIC TYPE, No-no. That belongs to the world of political propaganda, not to the world of human alterocentricity. Not for one moment would the truly alterocentric person abandon himself to any such vain scheme as that of going out to "save HUMANITY." Another bombastic term for such goals of "liberations en masse" is the HUMAN RACE. Those are all theoretical concepts making no sense whatsoever to a down-to-earth alterocentrist. He just does not know any such thing as "HUMANITY", or "the human race." To him this is devoid of practical meaning. The only thing he knows in his world is individual human beings. The true alterocentric spirit deals with men, not with categories. What the alterocentrist plans to save is the OTHER PERSON.--not populations EN BLOQUE. That other person is the only reality he really knows. And please tell me: How could you ever save, or think of saving, what you do not know at all?

A typical woman then, as I think of her, has considerable difficulty in getting enthusiastic about ideologies, about "noble causes," more or less abstract in nature. She reserves her enthusiasm for the tangible case, the concrete person. It is against the visible injustice practiced against Mr. So-and-So that she rises up in furious indignation. It is on Mrs. So-and-So, and the specific pains suffered by her, she takes real pity.

The usual agitation on a more or less political level may be ever so overflowing with ingenious idealistic phrases. But how does it affect the average woman? It leaves her astonishingly cool and impassive. She just does not feel too much at home in a circle of true politicians,-- pathetic, over-excited, ultra-radical men.

Does all this mean that the feminine spirit is necessarily, and in general principle, conservative? I would insist on underlining the following:

Page 196

CONSERVATISM DOES NOT, BY ANY MEANS, APPEAR TO CONSTITUTE ANY ABSOLUTE RULE OF CONDUCT IN WOMEN, SEEN AS A GROUP

In fact, you may come across a most marked radicalism in women. That applies to the political arena, as well as any other domains of social life. To tell the truth, such feminine liberality and radicalism impresses me as the most natural thing of the world. Just think of women's strong emotionality, their inflammable enthusiasm and their vivid suggestibility, -- let alone their passion for completeness and totality.

Maybe they do lack something in the power of analysis. That capacity is sometimes assumed to be necessary for laying bare the rottenness of old social structures. But once a woman has become convinced of that rottenness, she may go in for a reformation and a new order of things with a wholeheartedness and a radicalness which has the explosiveness of revolution in it.

Just think of the French Revolution. What an important number of women we see acting a significant part in that shaking event in modern world history.

Sometimes, it is true, what we have to do with, in such political dramas, is not women properly speaking, but rather a rare sort of hybrid creatures whom we might call "MEN-WOMEN"; that is, women sadly lacking in truly feminine attributes. In other

cases, however, we may, right in the hottest flames of political drama, have to do with women of the most total type. They are women whose totality has managed to ripen and realize itself precisely in the heat of such unique world crises. Let no one underrate the tremendous dynamics inherent in genuine alterocentricity, and the amazing heroism potentially present in that otherwise so unobtrusive fundamental motif.

FACTORS MORE CONDUCTIVE TO THE STATUS QUO

Realism forces us to return to precisely that unobtrusiveness; that is the prosaic reality of the every-day bourgeoisie. Perhaps the most significant phase of women's social orientation is their intense family feeling. An investigation administered by Baumgarten-Tramer to Swiss children gives interesting clues in this respect: Whereas the boys were seen to be mainly interested in adventure stories, the principal interest of the girls was registered as "family history" and "biography". Words connected with kindred and family relationships of all kinds are constantly found to be more abundant among females than among males.

Page 197

One questionnaire item is formulated as, "Do you happen to recalloffhand the names of your grandparents on both your mother's and your father's side before they were married?" -- This question gave a significantly superior scoring for women (70).

Let us now go to a real "status quo question." The American Institution of Student Opinion had the interesting idea of asking students in the United States whether they intended to stay in their present town or community after having completed their education. Among those who answered in the affirmative it is curious to see how many boys and girls, respectively, gave as their reasons for staying, the following:

"Although I don't particularly like it here, family ties, friendships, or other reasons for staying outweigh my lack of interest."

The result was: Boys 16; Girls 25.

One may interpret such differences in various ways under varying circumstances. But one fact remains fairly firm: Women do have a much stronger sense of attachment to a family, to a clan, to a country, or whatever name the natural group may have. They have a far stronger feeling of fellowship, generally speaking. Some biologists may call that a gregarious instinct. A religious person may call it sacred bonds of brotherhood. Names mean so little sometimes. I happen to call it alterocentricity. I think that is a significant name, by the way. It has a whole program in it, a program for life in its totality. Women have always played a prominent role in favor of the permanence of social traditions.

Of course it would be foolish to contend that all manifestations of that strong feminine sociability are necessarily constructive in the best sense of the term. One example: did you ever hear any person say with a certain consternation in his voice: "What will people say?" Do you think that phrase drops more frequently from a man's lips or from a woman's lips? And then the most important question: What does the phrase imply?

You don't have to be either a classical Boheme or a modern hippie in order to realize the dangers and the disadvantages involved in too strict an adherence to

conventional views and ways. At least some quite outspoken representatives of a more liberal-minded spirit will remind you of the atrocious conditions--sometimes even crimes--following in the wake of that frantic urge of the super-sociable ones to be "like the others", -- at any cost; that is, just as good as the Smiths and the Joneses in family status, in cars and housing, and all possible matters of prestige. Of course this will also include a desperate desire to avoid public shame at almost any price. From times immemorial that desire has caused unwed mothers to commit infanticides.

Page 198

Of course, even a minimum of sound judgment ought to be sufficient to repudiate such trends--whether in men or women who seem prepared to go almost to any lengths of floating with the tide, just in order to avoid town-talk. What we have to do with, is simply a perversion of sound sociability. And alterocentricity is contrary to all kinds of perversion.

That is the obvious reason why that fundamental motif keeps aloof from the ditches on both sides. My main worry--you know it already--is all the time "the other ditch", that of the "esprit boheme."

You will understand me when, in this book, I warn particularly against the position of those who "do not care one brass farthing" what other people think or say about them. What I fear is that an attitude of this kind will turn out to be more fateful to the survival and proper functioning of a sound community than the attitude of those who ask in an over-anxious tone: "What will people say?"

Page 199

TEMPORARY CONCLUSION

With the topic of a wholesale moral prostitution of human lives, we have come to a point where all meaningfulness seems to come to an abrupt end. It is a full-scale meaninglessness that has begun its historical sway.

Is there nothing positive enough and strong enough to save a human being from prostitution? There is one thing: LOVE. I am speaking about the love that is "without a wrinkle or any such thing."

Already a human female's peculiar pattern of love is an amazing reality, let alone the matchless Agape of Biblical realism. The marvels manifesting themselves in a typical woman's unique pattern of love, is something so stupendous that most of us have no adequate idea about it. I had looked forward to including this as a sort of a corner stone in the volume of my work. For that is where we definitely come to "the part of the story you were hardly ever told about women." Nevertheless I have decided that both you and I will be far better off, permitting that grand topic to have its unhampered gambols in a volume all by itself. It is not a small thing to prepare a true understanding of the greatest thing in the world. I am referring to the fundamental motif par excellence: AGAPE.

To me, not only as a linguist, but above all as a philosopher (a convinced adherent of a philosophy I call Christian realism), it has seemed a detail of immense significance even to observe that, whereas the word "Eros" in Greek is of masculine gender, the word "Agape" is entirely feminine.

This book, so strongly concerned about the fundamental motif called Love, a motif demanding totality and completeness, was bound to have a sequel, an indispensable follow-up.

In fact, it has three sequels. One of them is almost a direct continuation. Its title is THE PHENOMENON OF MOTHERLINESS: That is, the Part of the Story You were Never Told about a Mother and Her Child. The second is an epilogue of historic specificity: *The Writing in the Sand*. There I had to take the case of a specific Woman, of a specific culture, at a specific time in history. It is the Part of the Story You Were Never Told about Mary Magdalene.

Finally I had to draw most important conclusions of all this for the general stupendous facts of the fundamental motif par excellence, carrying an entire universe on its majestic loving arms: AGAPE. This is *the Part of the Story you Were Never Told about Agape and Eros*.

NOTES

1. H. A. Witkin: *Personality Through Perception*, 1954.
2. David Riesman: *The Lonely Crowd*, 1956.
3. Havelock Ellis: *Man And Woman. A Study of the Secondary and Tertiary Sexual Characters*, 1927.
4. *Journ. Abn. Soc. Psychol.*, 1927, 22, pp. 52-61, - quoted by Anastasi and Foley: *Differential Psychology*, 1949, pp. 674-675.
5. E. Wiersma et G. Heymans: *Bietrage zur besonderen Psychologie, auf Grund einer Massenuntersuchung, Zeithschrift fur die Psychologie der Sinnesorgane, Band 51*, 1919.
6. Anastasi and Foley: *Differential Psychology*, 1949, Table 37.
7. See also Livesay: *Sex Differences in Performance on the American Council, Psychol. Examin., Journ. of Educ. Psychol.*, 1937, 28, 694-702.
8. Q. McNemar: *The Revision of the Standfor-Binet Scale*, Boston, 1942.
9. Leontine Zanta: *Psychologie du feminisme*, 1922, p. 21.
10. D. G. Paterson: *Manual f. Min. voc. Tests For Cler. Workers*, 1946.
11. Leontine Zanta: *op. cit.*, p. 21.
12. Lotze: *Microcosmos*, II, 1858.

13. Erich Fromm: *Psychiatry, Sex and Character*, 1943.
14. Cited by Witkin: *Personality Through Perception*, p. 488.
- 15.
16. H. E. Jones: *Sex Diff. and Physic. Abilities*, *Hum. Biol.*, 19, 1947.
17. Terman and Miles: *Sex and Personality*, 1939.
18. Ashley Montague: *The Natural Superiority of Women*, 1956.
19. Zasso and Julien: *Contribution a la psychologie differentielle des sexes au niveau prescolaire*, *Enfance*, 1954, 7, pp. 12-23.
20. Terman and Miles: *Studies in Masculinity and Feminity (Sex and Pers.)* p. 447.
21. Public Opinion Agency "Fortune", 1946.
22. Public Opinion Agency "Fortune", 1946.
23. Brun Gulbrandsen: *Kjønnsrolle og ungdomskriminalitet*, 1958, p. 142.
24. Wiersma and Heymans, *op. cit.*
25. See our vol. on Totality.
26. Havelock Ellis: *op. cit.*
27. Margaret Mead: *Sex and Temperament in Three Primitive Societies*, 1935.
28. Rubenstein: *Music and Masters*, 1960.
29. See P. R. Fernsworth, *Gen. Psych. Monog.*, 9, 1931, No. 5, pp. 291 ff.
30. Anastasi and Foley: *op. cit.*, Table 58, p. 773.
31. G. M. Gilbert: *Sex Differences in Musical Aptitude and Training*, *Journ. of Gen. Psychol.*, 1942, 27.
32. Feydeau: *Théophile Gautier*, p. 127.
33. *Nouvelles Littéraires*, 5 jan., 1929.

34. Schiller: Über Naive und Sentimentalische Dichtung, Samtliche Schriften, edition R. Kohler, 1871, vol. X.
35. Ughetti: L'Umoreismo e la Donna (La Defizienzza dell' umorismo et del senso comico nel sesso femminile), Torino 1926.
36. "Fortune", mars, 1949.
37. Schuking: Die Soziologie der litterarischen Gesshmackbildung, 1931.
38. R. B. Johnson: Novelists and Novels, 1928.
39. Ellen Key: Missbrauchte Frauenschaft, p. 13.
40. See "Tom Jones", 1749, préface au livre IX.
41. Ashley H. Thorndike: Literature in a Changing Age, 1920.
42. W. Hofman: Die Lektüre der Frau, 1931.
43. J. Trampler-Steiner: Die Frau als Publizistin and Leserin, Inauguraldissertation, Rotaprint, Dr. Berger, Freib./Breisgau, 1938.
44. Thorndike: op. cit. p. 219.
45. Journal of Speech Disorders, 11, 1946, p. 277.
46. University of Minnesota, Institute of Child Welfare, 1940, 4, p. 174.
47. La Brant: Genet. Psych. Monog., No. 14, 1933, pp. 387-491, quoted by Anastasi and Foley: op. cit., p. 652.
48. The words by Strindberg are: "Jag er kall som is, ock dock en kanslig anda til sentimentalitet.
49. Johan Torgensen: Mennesket, vidunder-og problembarn i livets historie, 1956, p. 347 ff.
50. Journal of Social Psychology, 1932, pp. 347-376.
51. Quoted by Ashley Montague: op. cit.
52. Hebb: The Organization of Behaviour, edit. 1957, pp. 236 ff.

53. Leeper: A Motivational Theory of Emotion to Replace: "Emotion as a Disorganized Response", J. Genet. Psych., 55, 1948.
54. Carsten Johnsen: Livet venter utenfor, 1959, p. 136 ff.
55. Hartshorne, May and Maller: Studies in Service and Self-control, 1929, p. 382.
56. Hartshorne, May and Shuttleworth: Studies in the Organization of Character, 1930, pp. 117-121.
57. Hartshorne, May and Shuttleworth, op. cit., p. 119.
58. Terman and Miles: op. cit.
59. Brun-Gulbrandsen: op. cit., p. 12.
60. Pollak: The Criminality among Women, 1950.
61. Brun-Gulbrandsen: op. cit., pp. 18-21.
62. Hartshorne and May: Studies in Deceit, 1930.
63. Hartshorne and May: Studies in Deceit, 1930, pp. 177-178.
64. In his work: Handschrift and Character.
65. Ackerson: Children's Behaviour Problems, Univ. of Chicago, 1931.
66. H. D. Williams: Art. in Journ. of Juvenile Research, 1933, 15, p. 269.
67. Harrwick: Sex Differences in the Behavior of Nursery School Children, Child Development, 1937, 8.
68. The Netherlands Foundation Statistics, January, 1946.
69. Baumgarten-Tramer: Zur Frage der psychischen Geschlechtsunterschiede bei Schulkindern, 1945.
70. Public Opinion Quarterly, 1950.
71. Havelock Ellis: Man and Woman, 1929.

72. W. B. Johnson and L. W. Terman: Some Highlights in the Literature of Psychological Sex Differences since 1820, *Journal of Psychology*, vol. 19, 0.327, 1940.
73. Montague: *The Natural Superiority of Women*, 1956.
74. Bernreuter: *Personality Inventory*, 1938.
75. Mayer: *Suicide Table for Europe*, 1913.
76. Bessie Bunzel and Louis Dublin: *To Be or Not to Be*, 1933.
77. Ragnar Rommetveit: *Social Norms and Roles*, 1953.
78. Ragnar Rommetveit: *Social Norms and Roles*, 1953, pp. 59-60.
79. Hartshorne, May and Maller: *Studies in Service and Self-control*, 1929.
80. Spranger: *Lebensformen*, 1929.
81. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 20, 1936.
82. CIPO, May, 1945; AIPO, May, 1947; and April, 1950. (The details are to be found in the issues of "Public Opinion Quarterly" for those dates).
83. CIPO, 1945.
84. Ibid.
85. Cited by Montague: op. cit.
86. Ragnar Rommetveit: *Ungdom og religiös tru*, 1951, and *Social Norms*, 1953, p. 110.
87. Rommetveit: *Social Norms*, Ibid.
88. Spranger: op. cit., p. 287.
89. Spranger: op. cit., p. 286.
90. Spranger: op. cit., p. 286.
91. Spranger: op. cit., p. 288.
92. Gina Ferrero: *L'Anima della Donna*, 1925, p. 123.

93. Hans Friedenthal: Beiträge zur Naturgeschichte des Menschen.
94. University of Iowa Studies in Psychology, vol. II.
95. Ellis: Man and Woman, a Study in the Secondary and Tertiary Sexual Characters, 1929, pp. 32-34.
96. Ibid.
97. Johan Torgensen: Mennesket, vidunder - og problembarn i livets historie, 1956: (Man - Prodigy and Problem Child in the History of Life).

This ebook was downloaded from Carstenjohnsen.org --a site for visionary books on Christian Philosophy.