

Confessions of a Matriarchist

**Rebuilding
Society
on Feminine
Principles**

B I L L L O N G S T A F F

Confessions of a Matriarchist

by Bill Longstaff

Published by:
Ballot Publishing
308, 1506-9 Street SW
Calgary AB T2R 1H8
403-245-9587
ballot@shaw.ca

Distributed by **Draft2Digital**

This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License. To view a copy of this license, visit <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>.

ISBN 978-0-9689029-4-3

By the same author

Democracy Undone: The Practice and the Promise of Self-governance in Canada

No Free Lunch and Other Myths

Notes on Democracy

Table of Contents

One: An Incident on the Coppermine River
Two: From Molecules to Monkeys
Three: Replication Ethos
Four: Toward Matriarchy
Five: Patriarchal Politics
Six: ... and Matriarchal Possibilities
Seven: Markets Free, Capitalist and Feminine
Eight: A Woman's Place
Nine: Science Fictions
Ten: The Golden Rule
Eleven: Kinder, Gentler Religion
Twelve: Crime and Punishment
Thirteen: Macho Triumphant
Fourteen: Sporting Blood
Fifteen: The Mating Game
Sixteen: The Next Generation
Seventeen: Forming the Feminine Citizen
Eighteen: Making a Matriarchal Future
Epilogue
<i>Sources</i>
<i>About the Author</i>

One: An Incident on the Coppermine River

A Meeting of Minds

LATE IN THE year 1770, Samuel Hearne, faithful servant of the Hudson's Bay Company, faced a difficult challenge. For years, Indians coming into the company's Prince of Wales Fort at Churchill on Hudson's Bay had been in possession of pure copper. When asked about the source of the copper, they spoke of mines near the mouth of a river that emptied into the Arctic Ocean. The company had instructed Hearne to chart the route to the mines.

The effort had been initiated by the governor of Prince of Wales Fort, Moses Norton, who had paid two Chipewyan Indians named Idotliazee and Matonabee to "trace to ye mouth of ye Largest Rivers to ye Northward."¹ Years later they had returned with samples of free copper and a rough map drawn on deerskin. With these in hand, Norton travelled to England to persuade the company to send a white man, in particular Hearne, to accurately map the way to the mines. Land could not be claimed unless it was properly identified. Hearne's experience in the north was largely as a seaman, sailing out of Churchill in the summer to trade or whale up the west coast of the bay; however, he also had experience in overland travel in the northern winter. He was young—in his mid-twenties—but tough and intelligent.

By late 1770, he had already mounted two expeditions, both of which had ended disastrously. They had been organized by Moses Norton and organized very badly. Norton exercised especially bad judgement in his choice of leaders. For the first expedition, he chose a conjurer named Chawchinahaw who lost interest once he had been paid and then used his shamanic influence to lure the other Chipewyan away from the enterprise. Deserted by their guides, Hearne's party of three whites and two Cree hunters struggled back two hundred miles in the dead of winter to Prince of Wales Fort. In all fairness, Hearne had contributed to his own problems by pushing the Indians, something they would not tolerate. Quick to learn from his mistakes, he never tried that again.

For the second expedition, Norton chose a Chipewyan named Connequesse who boasted that he had travelled close to the Coppermine River. Connequesse turned out to be less than his word; by the time they reached latitude 63°10', they were lost and had to return. Eight months after starting out, Hearne was back at the fort. His prospects looked bleak.

But only briefly. On the way back to Churchill, he had a stroke of luck. He met an extraordinary man, probably the only man alive who could guide him to the Coppermine—Matonabee. (Idotliazee had died during an epidemic.) Matonabee was a dark, handsome man, born to a Chipewyan father and "a slave woman, who was formerly bought from some Southern Indians who came to Prince of Wales's Fort with furs." He was, in a sense, a child of the Hudson's Bay Company. His parents' marriage was arranged by a governor of Prince of Wales Fort, who later adopted him when his father died. As a young man, he was employed by the company as a hunter. He was a legend in the north, a hunter and trapper of such ability he kept up to eight wives.

He and Hearne hit it off immediately, and he agreed to guide a new expedition. He instructed his new partner that the choice of leaders for the previous attempts had indeed been bad, but they had also made the serious mistake of not taking women who, he informed Hearne, could carry as much as two men, pitch camp, make clothing and "keep us warm at night."

An Old Quarrel

They set off in December of 1770. By May of the following year they were well into their journey, camped at a place called Clowey Lake, where they repaired their canoes before departing the woods for the tundra. Here they were joined by large numbers of other Indians, sixty of which indicated their intention to join the expedition. Hearne soon learned why. They intended to kill Inuit.

Hearne had inadvertently become a member of a war party. He remonstrated with them; he didn't want to kill anyone, and in any case he was a Hudson's Bay man, a trader, and you can't trade with dead people, or with hostile people. Indeed he had been instructed in writing by Governor Norton, "You are to dispose of [light trading goods] by way of presents ... to such far-off Indians as you may meet with, and to smoke your Calimut of Peace with their leaders, in order to establish a friendship with them. You are also to persuade them as much as possible from going to war with each other, to encourage them to exert themselves in procuring furs and other articles for trade, and to assure them of good payment for them at the Company's Factory."

His protests were to no avail. He was accused of cowardice, reporting in his journal, "They told me, with great marks of derision, that I was afraid of the Esquimaux." Hearne, totally dependent on his companions, exercised discretion and assured them that he saw no necessity for attacking without reason but was, nonetheless, not afraid of Eskimos and would protect without regard to his own safety any of his party in danger. The Indians were satisfied; he did not again interfere with their design for their ancient enemy.

The men left their women and children and many of their possessions behind as befit what was now a military venture. By mid-July, they were on the Coppermine River. Soon after their arrival, their scouts spotted the camp of a small band of Inuit, only five tents, exactly what they had been looking for. Keeping to low areas so as not to be spotted by their quarry, they approached the camp and waited until the band had bedded down for the night. The long Arctic day gave them plenty of light for their work.

Hearne describes their morale: "My crew, though an undisciplined rabble, and by no means accustomed to war or command, seemingly acted on this horrid occasion with the utmost uniformity of sentiment. There was not among them the least altercation or separate opinion; all were united in the general cause ... Never was reciprocity of interest more generally regarded among a number of people, than it was on the present occasion by my crew, for not one was a moment in want of any thing that another could spare; and if ever the spirit of disinterested friendship expanded the heart of a Northern Indian, it was here exhibited in the most extensive meaning of the word."

The warriors painted their shields and their faces, tied their hair back or cut it short, and stripped down, some to their breech-cloths and moccasins. Then they descended upon the Inuit. Twenty men, women and children ran naked from the tents but, surrounded by dozens of their murderers, had no place to hide or escape. All were butchered. One young woman, pursued by two men, fell wounded at Hearne's feet. He begged for her life but, in his words, "The murderers made no reply till they had stuck both their spears through her body, and transfixed her to the ground. They then looked me sternly in the face, and began to ridicule me, by asking if I wanted an Esquimaux wife; and paid not the smallest regard to the shrieks and agony of the poor wretch, who was twining round their spears like an eel!" After the killing, the men toyed with the bodies, making rude comparisons of the women's genitals to those of their own women.

After the massacre, they carefully observed certain formalities. They abstained from their favourite foods. Nor would they prepare food. (Fortunately, two men had not engaged in the killing, so they could cook for the others until the party rejoined the women.) When they ate, they smeared red ochre above their mouths and across their cheeks. When they returned to their women and children, they refrained from kissing them. After a period of time, they left the camp and made a fire into which they threw all their "ornaments, pipe stems and dishes." Then they held a great feast and ate that which they had been forbidden and "when all was over, each man was at liberty to eat, drink,

and smoke as he pleased; and also to kiss his wives and children at discretion, which they seemed to do with more raptures than I had ever known them do it either before or since.”

Vice and Virtue

Behaviour like that of the Chipewyan haunts us. If this is the way these simple hunter-gatherer people, essentially the creatures we evolved to be, behaved towards the Other, then we suspect that there is something natural about it, that it is deep-rooted, that it is the way we are.

Examining the bloody-mindedness of civilizations, particularly those of the twentieth century, we like to imagine a time when we were a peaceful species, nomadic hunter-gatherers living a simple life in harmony with our fellow humans and with nature. But, as much as we might prefer to think otherwise, the Chipewyan were behaving toward the Other in a way typical of *Homo sapiens*, be they hunter-gatherers or modern humans. Particularly disturbing is the fact that Hearne’s companions were not a collection of evil men, of bad guys. On the contrary, they were a rather average group of men of their time and place. Among them was even an extraordinary man—Matonabee himself.

Earlier in his life, Matonabee, at huge risk to himself and with astonishing courage, single-handedly made peace between his people and their ancient enemies and neighbours to the west, the Athapascans. The governor of Prince of Wales Fort had engaged him as ambassador to the Athapascans in the hope of increasing trade. (His attachment to the Hudson’s Bay Company, particularly to Prince of Wales Fort, was profound. When he heard in the year 1783 that the French had destroyed the fort and carried off all the company’s servants including Hearne, he hanged himself, occasioning also the death of six wives and four children who died of starvation.) According to Hearne, “Notwithstanding all these discouragements and great dangers, Matonabee persevered with courage and resolution to visit the Athapascow Indians for several years successively; and at length, by an uniform display of his pacific disposition, and by rendering a long train of good offices to those Indians, in return for their treachery and perfidy, he was so happy as to be the sole instrument of not only bringing about a lasting peace, but also of establishing a trade and reciprocal interest between the two nations.”

Matonabee’s Dilemma

Matonabee, like all of us, was complex. Hearne, a perceptive observer, describes him as a man of good sense and liberal sentiment: “His scrupulous adherence to truth and honesty would have done honour to the most enlightened and devout Christian, while his benevolent and universal humanity to all the human race, according to his abilities and manner of life, could not be exceeded by the most illustrious person now on record.” Hearne also insists that the raid on the Coppermine was not instigated by Matonabee. And indeed when Matonabee and Idotliazee had visited the river earlier they had befriended the Inuit and offered them gifts.

And yet he involved himself in this dark thing. We can speculate about why such a man would offer savagery one day and tolerance the next, but dealing with motivation does not quite get at the heart of the matter. What is fundamentally important is that he, like most of us, had the capacity for both and that these capacities are still expressed. In a recent history that has seen the Nazi genocide of the Jews and the Hutu massacre of the Tutsis, two of the worst atrocities among many, we are quite aware that our capacity to hate and destroy the Other continues unabated. And yet we have also seen in fairly recent history the end of slavery, the emancipation of women, and real efforts toward creating a peaceful world. Making peace, too, still captures our imaginations. We are Matonabee writ large.

Did Matonabee, we wonder, see a conflict, an ugly inconsistency, between his behaviours? Did he find himself caught in a dilemma? Or to him was all this merely the rhythm of life?

He had the luxury, if that's what it was, of having room to accommodate both sides of his being—aggression, dominance and exploitation on the one hand and harmony, flexibility and co-operation on the other. We no longer do. Unlike the old world of the Chipewyan, the Inuit and the Athapascans, our world cannot afford our capacity for violence. Today, the annihilation of a camp of five tents becomes the annihilation of six million people. The horror has become too great. Our potential for destruction threatens us and threatens even the environment we live in—our planet is experiencing the greatest extinction of species since the disappearance of the dinosaurs 65 million years ago, and we are causing it. Our dilemma is immense. If we are to resolve it and avoid an Armageddon of our own making, if we are to make peace with our fellows and the planet we inhabit, we must understand our capacities, particularly the capacity for male misbehaviour, and act out of that understanding. We must look into the roots of our capacities and track their genesis to our own era.

Let us begin at the beginning.

Two: From Molecules to Monkeys

In the Beginning Were the Replicators

FOR THE FIRST few billion years after the planet Earth spun itself out of space debris, it was an inhospitable place. Great meteors slammed into it, huge volcanoes erupted massive clouds of chemicals into the atmosphere, no seas existed to cool and refresh it. But eventually it calmed down; water vapour from the volcanoes condensed and formed oceans, vast tureens of thin chemical soup. Out of the soup, complex molecules formed. Then, roughly four billion years ago, some of these molecules developed something quite wonderful—life.

Certain carbon-based molecules, organic molecules, “learned” how to copy themselves, to replicate. Today we call these “clever” molecules genes. These information-carrying bits of deoxyribonucleic acid (DNA) had one purpose in life, if we might generously be allowed to ascribe purpose to long-chained molecules: they existed to replicate.

But simple replication wasn’t enough for survival. The oceans were precarious places for little bits of molecules floating about, so the genes began to design vehicles for themselves, vehicles that enclosed their designers in membranes, functioned symbiotically with other complexes, and evolved to meet changing circumstances. Genes co-operating with each other could create structures that served replication much more effectively than simple clumps of molecules. They could make replication machines.

The first machines were elemental, things rather like the blue-green algae of today. Every species ever to inhabit the earth, from the humblest to the grandest, has a lineage going back to these minute ancestors. The mightiest emperor along with the germ that kills him, just like us and every other creature extant or extinct, arose from pond scum.

The machines were mere single-celled organisms for billions of years, but eventually the cells began to cluster and then around 600 million years ago the clustering accelerated into a spectacular array of increasingly complex creatures—replication machines of very great sophistication. Beginning in the water, they eventually moved onto the land to populate the earth in its entirety.

Created as they were to fulfill one great purpose, their designers, still contained in every cell of their being packed tightly into chromosomes, instilled in each and every one of them one overarching imperative: reproduce themselves, and thus facilitate replication of those who had designed them. All organisms, including us, are nothing more than transient vehicles designed by genes to make copies of themselves.

Then Came Sex

The earliest organisms reproduced asexually, by cloning, as many species still do, including the ubiquitous bacteria, still very much with us, the oldest and one of the most successful life forms on earth. Virgin birth remains commonplace in nature. But eventually, as somehow seems inevitable to our lascivious sensibility, genes discovered sex, the pairing of male and female.

Asexual reproduction has the great advantage of number—each organism can reproduce freely and independently of other organisms. Sexual reproduction, on the other hand, reduces the potential number of reproducers and demands an expenditure of energy in finding a mate, or mates, and mating. So why then did most species turn to this seemingly inefficient approach?

The answer is variety. Mingling two sets of genes, as opposed to relying on only one, produces a much greater variety of offspring. Organisms constantly face environmental threats of one kind or

another. The greater the variety in a species, the better the chances that some members of that species will survive any particular threat, say a bacterial or viral enemy. They will accomplish their purpose of carrying their genes on to succeeding generations. In other words, evolution selects for variety and therefore, other things being equal, for sex. Sexual reproduction's constant shuffling of genes may also mean that bad mutations have less chance of accumulating. Sex now dominates reproduction.

Sex probably began with two simple cells getting together, two fusing into one. Initially, the two fusers may have been very much the same, but eventually they became specialized. To maximize their reproductive capacity, these cells needed two characteristics: they had to be mobile, in order to find a mate, and they had to be rich in nutrients, in order to feed their offspring. The two characteristics are, however, in conflict. It is difficult to be highly mobile while carrying around a supermarket. The answer was to design one cell to be an aggressively mobile mate finder—we might call him a sperm—and a complimentary one to be a much larger, well-stocked but immobile, nurturer—we might call her an egg. Thus was begat male and female. This early division of roles has remained, as we shall see, influential in gender relationships ever since.

Visiting with Relatives

In 1972, a touching obituary appeared in London's *Sunday Times*. An "enduring matriarch" had died and the *Times* was paying its respects. It referred to her life, which had run the gamut from wild promiscuity to wonderfully warm mothering, as "rich and full of vigour and love" and declared it "had a meaning and a significance in the pattern of things." The honoured personage's name was Flo. She wasn't one of those people who affect only one name, like Cher or Madonna; in fact, she wasn't a person at all. She was a chimpanzee, a delightful character made famous by Jane Goodall as one of the chimpanzees that the renowned ethologist studied in Tanzania's Gombe National Park.

Throughout most of life's intriguing history, Flo's class of animals, and ours, the mammals, were little more than a gleam in a replicator's eye, but about 65 million years ago they came into their own. For ages they had kept to furtive ways, humbled by the greatest beasts ever to make a footprint, the dinosaurs. The dynasty of these latter unfortunates, however, collapsed utterly, offering the mammals their opportunity. Evolving from timorous shrew-like creatures, the mammals exploded upon the earth with profligate variety, replacing the dinosaurs with a dynasty of their own.

Before we visit our own people, our own dynasty, we can profit from looking at an ancient echo of ourselves, an echo primitive yet still among us, representing what we might have been immediately before we became hominids, a very early version of what we now are. We can look at Flo and her kind. Flo's obituary was fitting, even if chimpanzees get rather few. They are, after all, with the exception of the bonobos, our closest relatives. They are also, fortunately for us, closely studied, particularly by Goodall in the wild and by primatologist Frans de Waal in captivity.

They are not our ancestors. They are not the apes of yesterday anymore than we are the hominids of yesterday—they too have evolved—but we came down most of the evolutionary road together, so we should not go too far wrong if we consider them an approximation of our pre-hominid selves. By examining them, we get a snapshot of what we were just before we were human, a grainy and somewhat out of focus snapshot perhaps, but a useful one, nonetheless. If we find similarities between their behaviour and hunter-gatherer behaviour we can reasonably assume we are looking at authentic pieces of the human puzzle.

Mating Rituals

A hint of gender similarity between our two species arises from size, or more specifically relative size. Male chimps, like male humans, are about fifteen to twenty per cent larger than females.

This tells us a lot about mating behaviour. In species in which males fight for exclusive access to females, they tend to be much larger than the females. Gorillas, for example, live in harem groups, a male consorting with a few females. The males, who must constantly fight off rivals seeking to take over their harems, are twice the size of females. In species where males and females tend to pair off, or where competition for females is minimal, the sexes tend to be similar in size. Species with size ratios in between tend to have relationships in-between, competition between males but a generally relaxed attitude towards commitment, neither harems nor long-term pairings.

Something close to this expected pattern is seen in chimpanzees. Females in estrous mate promiscuously; nonetheless, sexual bullying occurs. Although females retain considerable freedom of choice in their mating, males may exploit their size and ferocity to intimidate females into copulation. Much mating takes place in groups, but a male will also persuade a female to join him in a consortship, in which the two will wander off *ménage à deux* for days or weeks on end. The advantage is all to the male; while consortship improves his chances that the female's progeny will be his, the female loses the security of proximity to others and gains little in return.

Of great importance to males is dominance among themselves. Males, like females, mate promiscuously, but tend to submit to rank. Higher-ranked males aren't necessarily larger but are more confident and more aggressive. Lower-ranked males may get their chance in a group mating, but the dominant male will be at the head of the line which means his sperm will have an advantage in fertilizing the female's egg. Evolution will, therefore, select for the traits carried by his sperm's DNA, including aggressiveness.

Copulation is pretty much the beginning and the end of the males' interest in matters sexual. They provide no assistance in raising the young. They are, however, indulgent towards youngsters and will protect all members of the group against external threats.

Status-seekers

Mature males form the core of a chimpanzee troop. They engage in furious struggles among themselves for dominance. Success depends partly on size and fighting ability but also on determination, intelligence and particularly on the ability to form coalitions. A male can rarely win and never hold top rank for long without support. As de Waal observes, "The roots of politics are older than humanity."

A male who achieves dominance achieves also an aura of authority, an aura he quickly loses when he is deposed from his position, which he inevitably is. The aura increases his testosterone levels and therefore his virility.

Despite their struggles for hierarchy, however, the males remain buddies, hanging out together, mating females together, grooming each other, hunting together and patrolling their territory together. The competition for dominance does not in itself usually result in violence, tending mostly to involve display: hair on end, swaggering, charging, throwing objects, foot stomping, screaming and other macho devilry. If contact occurs it will more often be slapping, kicking and grappling. Only a small minority of altercations are sufficiently savage to cause serious injury.

The situation is very different, however, when males are patrolling or expanding their territory. If they encounter a strange male, or even a strange female not in oestrus, their attack may very well be lethal. Although to say chimps wage war might be excessive, Jane Goodall observes that if they had firearms they would almost certainly use them on their neighbours. And possibly with pleasure. Male chimps apparently enjoy the thrill of the raid and the attack on the "enemy" no less than Matonabee's Chipewyan warriors on the Coppermine.

Male chimps occasionally even hunt together. Although primarily vegetarian, chimps will kill for meat when an opportunity arises, the only primate other than humans known to hunt co-operatively. The males will share their prey with females and youngsters. Meat is the only food chimps share; otherwise, they forage as individuals.

Females are not inclined to violence and will even mediate hostility between males. They do, however, pursue hierarchy among their gender. Here, advantage is won less by intimidation and more by inheriting status from a mother, and by age and personality, and the status a female achieves is generally more stable and long-lasting than is the case with males. The strongest bond for females is with family, that is to say with their children and grandchildren. The strongest bond of all in chimpanzee society is between mothers and their adult daughters.

Emotional bonding is important to all chimps. They kiss, hug, pat each other on the back and hold hands for affection and reassurance. Grooming, participated in by all ages and sexes, is of particular importance in maintaining social solidarity. It reduces stress and tension; restores harmony after aggressive incidents; strengthens bonds of family, friendship and political alliance; facilitates sexual relations; and affords many hours of quiet pleasure. It is the chimpanzee group's social cement.

The chimpanzee troop is a fairly loose organization. Individuals and small groups range around the troop's territory in no apparent pattern, separating and coming together again, males ranging further than females. No chimp, not even the dominant male, can be said to be the leader of the troop. He cannot lead it where it doesn't want to go. A rough equality coexists within the dominance hierarchy, with even the male hierarchy constantly open to challenge, change and new coalitions.

Of Monkeys and Men

Even in this brief glimpse at our approximate ancestor, we experience shivers of recognition, of familiarity. We see a particularly powerful similarity in the arena of male behaviour. If we return to our example of Stone Age men, the Chipewyan of the far north, we do not find the same promiscuity but we do find polygamy; we do not find the same intense struggles for dominance, but Hearne does relate the common practice of men wrestling over the possession of women, even over each other's wives.

He writes about how, on one occasion, even the very capable Matonabee was humiliated when another man who "far excelled him in strength" threatened to take one of his wives by force, and Matonabee was obliged to provide gifts in her stead. His humiliation was doubled by the fact that he had bought the woman from this same man just over a year earlier. We wonder if the man was motivated by his desire for the gifts or by the status achieved, to say nothing of the testosterone rush, from humbling a respected competitor. In any case, the loss of control greatly distressed and embarrassed Matonabee; only urgent entreaties from Hearne kept him from abandoning the expedition on the spot.

Chipewyan males could also be sexual bullies. Women were treated as property. Men, including the usually even-tempered Matonabee, beat their wives for perceived insult or insolence. And Hearne observed, too, the ultimate humiliation of women—rape—when the men in his large, well-armed party took advantage of a small, poorly armed band they encountered by stealing from them and assaulting their women.

Like chimpanzee males, human males compete as individuals and as coalitions, bonding to multiply their power. Reciprocity, in the form of male bonding, as an aid in establishing hierarchy or status is a very male phenomenon. Males exploit the strength of a group to gain an advantage and then compete within the group to enhance their advantage even further.

As with the chimps, human males expand coalitions into alliances that include all the males to protect or enlarge a group's territory, i.e. its resources. By expanding the territory of all, they expand the resources of each. We see also a parallel violence. As chimpanzee males patrol the borders of their realm, attacking, even killing strangers, the Chipewyan slaughtered their Inuit neighbours. The tribe-like behaviour of the chimpanzee males is uncannily similar to that of Matonabee and his Chipewyan and it continues to this day, in ever increasing and ever escalating circles of violence.

Female chimps have little interest in which troop controls a territory; indeed the females, particularly young ones in heat, often leave the troop they were born into and join another. Human females pay rather more attention to tribal pursuits, but their interest pales by comparison to that of men.

In both species, male status, important in sexual affairs, surrenders to an impressive equality in other matters. Goodall's comments regarding the fraternal nature of chimpanzees echo Hearne's about the Chipewyan, "They live in a state of perfect freedom; no one apparently claiming the superiority over, or acknowledging the least subordination to another." Matters of violence, whether in hunting or defending territory, served to consolidate the brotherhood. Again, quoting Hearne as the warriors were about to annihilate the Inuit camp, "Never was reciprocity of interest more generally regarded among a number of people, than it was on the present occasion by my crew."

Chimpanzee behaviour suggests that we inherited much from our ape ancestors—yet we are not them. What their genes demanded from them is not quite what our genes demand from us. We have a replication ethos of our own.

Three: Replication Ethos

From Lucy to Homo Sapiens

OUT OF THE great variety of species that genes have created emerged the animals called Hominini—our tribe.

In 1974, in a place called Hadar in Ethiopia, paleoanthropologist Donald Johanson discovered the remains of Lucy, the foremost celebrity among our ancient ancestors. Lucy's remains, a partially complete skeleton about 3.2 million years old, revealed a diminutive ape-like creature about a metre tall. Lucy and her kin are formally referred to as *Australopithecus afarensis*, the southern ape, a species long extinct.

And what do these long-dead animals mean to us? A great deal, actually. They are important, poignant almost, because they were our first step—literally—away from the apes, our first step on our own. The first step not because *Australopithecines* were particularly bright—Lucy's brain case was about the size of a chimpanzee's—but because they walked upright. Lucy's hip and thigh bones tell us this, as do fossilized footprints of a similar age found by Mary Leakey in northern Tanzania. Recent evidence indicates that even before *Australopithecus* came *Sahelanthropus tchadensis*, 7-6 million years ago, also bipedal, the oldest known hominin. All this tells us that humans, of a sort, were on the earth.

Our triumphs and travails along our branch of the family tree remain far from clear, the subject of vigorous debate. The story takes us through an intriguing cast of characters, including *Homo habilis*, *Homo erectus*, *Homo heidelbergensis* and many others. Whatever convolutions we underwent, whatever cul-de-sacs some of our species entered, the end result was a bipedal creature with an expansion in brain size to three times that of Lucy's, and a revolutionary change in communication from barks, hoots and grunts to complex speech.

As to the sexual relationships, or politics, or economics, of our hominin ancestors we know little. They and their societies are long gone. We know that about 2.5 million years ago, the first of our genus, *Homo*, appear, along with the first stone tools. A change in sexual dimorphism (the relative size of males and females) also occurs. Up until this time, males were about twice the size of females, suggesting a harem arrangement, family groups with a male defending a number of females against competitors. After this time, males are only about 15 per cent larger than females, suggesting more sexual sharing and possibly pairing. Accompanying this was the beginning of a decline in the size of male canine teeth relative to the size of female canine teeth—prominent canine teeth are an important part of male ape dominance displays. We know also that about this time an increase in brain size coincided in a shift from a mainly vegetarian diet to an increase in meat eating. Meat is more efficient nutrition and the brain is a high-energy user.

We know that 30-40,000 years ago in Europe and probably earlier in Africa, an explosion in culture occurred. From simple stone tools that had scarcely changed in 200,000 years, we now see fine tools of bone and ivory, painting, sculpture, musical instruments and jewellery, signifying not only the accoutrements of modern humans but their inventiveness and their sensibilities as well. Culture was well established. These people had art, music, abstract thought, symbolism and most certainly, speech. And they were systematic hunters. They were us.

Homo sapiens first showed up about 300,000 years ago. We originated in Africa, the font of humanity, and from there trekked out into the rest of the world. By 30,000 years ago, *Homo neanderthalensis*, the beetle-browed Neanderthals, had disappeared and we were the only remaining hominids, the last and ultimate species of humans. All that was left was to take over the earth. This we did—not a patch of the planet's land mass has escaped our attention. Advantaged by our unique intelligence, we have proved to be masters of adaptation and conformed ourselves to lands bone dry

and soaking wet, brutally cold and burning hot. We have occupied jungles, forests, savannahs and deserts—whatever we've encountered.

Examining most of our hominid history, including that of *Homo sapiens*, is a matter of sorting through dusty bones and long-disused artifacts, a matter of much guesswork; nonetheless, much knowledge about our early selves, our “natural” selves, is available through the study of human societies that have only recently encountered the modern world, societies like the Chipewyan. Those peoples who are only now emerging from the stone age present the best picture of what we evolved to be. Since the times they represent, we have added layer upon layer of culture to our behaviour, concealing our biology in the process. They are closest to what our genes intended us to be, closest to the end product of biological evolution working its way with us. They, you might say, are the genuine article.

Their story, combined with knowledge of our earlier incarnations from sexy molecules to ape ancestors, and reinforced by our history since, tells us that our tale is about aggressively competitive males and about nurturally selective females, a tale of dichotomy.

A Tale of Two Ethos

Why evolution selects for dominance in males is now obvious. The dominant male has better access to females, thereby ensuring his DNA greater success in the gene pool. Sperm is plentiful and cheap, allowing males to broadcast their seed as widely as opportunity offers.

Competition for dominance leads to individualism in males, but it does not preclude co-operation. If teamwork advantages individual males by bringing more females into the group, by expanding the group's territory and therefore the resources of all, or by enhancing the status of certain males and by association those allied with them, males are quite capable of close, even brotherly, co-operation.

Domination, or status, among men is a much more varied affair than among chimps, however. It can be achieved by other means than brute force and the manipulation of coalitions. Matonabee, for example, was widely respected for his prowess as a hunter, trapper and trader.

Culture offered up a whole new realm for men. Status, or success, could be achieved by skills in the arts or tool-making or magic; by the exercise of intelligence and wisdom; even by moral rectitude, by being an exemplar in the moral code. It could be achieved without the use of violence, although the skills of the warrior have generally been among the most valued and the most prestigious, and often essential in seeking the highest status.

Status-seeking among men changed in large part because of women's need to be much choosier than their ape ancestors. The parental investment of a male chimp is minimal. He mates as promiscuously as he can, and that's all there is to it. Fortunately for him, females need no help from him in raising the progeny that carry his genes. Indeed, once safely in the egg, his genes have little further use for him. (Genes' contempt for their replication vehicles is well-illustrated by the male honey bee. When he mates, his genitals explode inside the queen and he is dead before he hits the ground.)

Such is not the case with men. The price paid for getting a big-brained baby through the birth canal is a ridiculously immature, utterly helpless, baby. It must be born very early, before its brain becomes too great an obstacle to being born at all. Many months pass before it can even walk. If, in the dangerous days of prehistory, women had had to raise such totally dependent creatures on their own, their success rate would have been poor, and our species would have never had a chance. Their replication imperative needed more than good genes; it needed also a male that would contribute to the raising of the young. A woman had to find a mate who would be a good provider for her and her babes. If a man wanted to be chosen by a desirable woman, or by her guardians, he

had to have something desirable to offer. She needed a successful, reliable mate, and that would be indicated by his skills, intelligence, wisdom, the respect of his peers and, most of all, by his resources.

The more resources a man has to offer, the more appealing he is to women. The more women a man can appeal to, and the better the quality of those women, and the more he can invest in his children, the greater the success of his genes. Among those genes, therefore, is a set that gives men a powerful propensity for acquiring resources. Matonabee's exceptional ability to gain resources allowed him eight wives, doing great service for his genes. Perhaps this was the reason for his dangerous journeys into the land of the Athapascans, for by making peace with them he greatly expanded trade and therefore the opportunity to gain resources for him and his beloved Hudson's Bay Company. And of course he also greatly enhanced his status. All this was worth considerable risk.

Status is of the essence. The relationship is intricate: resources will gain a man status and status will gain a man resources. It is, in effect, a resource in itself. It can be gained by being a good man through earning respect, by being a bad man through instilling fear or engaging in conquest, by exercising talent or hard work, or by no effort at all through inheritance. It carries powerful advantages. It allows a man to dominate other men thus suppressing the competition. It represents to women or their guardians either resources or ample ability to obtain resources and therefore a profitable relationship. Its importance in human affairs is vast and complex, in government, in economics, in all areas of human behaviour, as we shall see in following chapters. The better a man is at something, the higher his status and the better his chances of reproductive success, thus the powerful male drive to prove himself.

Evolution selects differently for women. Males may be eager to spread their attentions broadly, even indiscriminately, but women are more concerned with choosing than competing. They can only nurture one fertilized egg at a time, a scarce commodity. Evolution will select for the traits of women who choose good genes to fertilize that egg and who choose a good provider to help care for the results. And they cannot afford to risk their investment in aggressive, possibly violent, confrontations. Other than for defence, violence is to be avoided.

Thus evolution, in its patient way, designed two unique patterns for our species, two sets of attitudes and behaviours—two ethos—based on gender, on sex, the master strategy of replication.

The Dichotomy Revealed

How our genes direct the male/female dichotomy was long a mystery, a source of both much romance and much mischief, but now we have captured the secret. It is a matter of hormones. It is all about estrogen, the queen of hormones, and about testosterone, the king. Both do various things for us, but most particularly they sex us. Estrogen creates our sexual receptivity and testosterone our sexual aggression. Not surprisingly, the gender most under the influence of estrogen, women, manifests the more receptive traits and the gender most under the influence of testosterone, men, manifests the more aggressive ones.

The dichotomy begins in the womb. All fetuses start out essentially female but those with an XY chromosome get a testosterone bath four times that of XXs and become boys. Thereafter, the core of our sexual selves lurks somewhere deep in our brains, probably a cluster of cells inhabiting the hypothalamus.

Different brains mean that we think differently. Women tend to think more right-brained, more intuitively, while men tend to think more left-brained, more logically. Women are also more inclined to use both sides of their brain—their corpus calosum, the bridge of tissue that connects the two hemispheres, is much larger. As a result, men tend to be more project-oriented, women more holistic, not surprising considering that ancient males focused on projects—hunting food, finding a

female, launching a raid—and females on adapting to circumstances, over which they often had little control, to best safeguard themselves and their children. As Dianne Hales points out in *Just Like a Woman*, women tend to think “and-but,” men “either-or.”

As we differ intellectually, so we differ emotionally. Brain scans show that when people are relaxed, sex differences appear in their limbic systems, that part of the brain that lies at the centre of emotion. Most men’s brains “idle” in the evolutionarily ancient “reptilian brain,” the area that prompts aggression and mating. Most women’s brains “idle” in the more recently evolved cingulate gyrus, an area involved with expression, including words and gestures. Women, it seems, are more emotionally evolved than men.

Men, according to Hales, are inclined toward Descartes’ dictum, “I think; therefore I am,” while women incline toward, “We feel; therefore we are.” Men tend to define themselves by what sets them apart, women by what connects them.

When surveyed about what they wanted to be like, men from a variety of cultures replied practical, shrewd, assertive, dominating, competitive, critical, and self-controlled. They sought power and independence above all. Women from the same cultures wanted to be loving, affectionate, impulsive, sympathetic, and generous. They sought to serve society above all. Studies of male conversation find it to be public ... domineering, competitive, status-obsessed, attention-seeking, factual, and designed to reveal knowledge and skill. Female conversation tends to be private ... cooperative, rapport-establishing, reassuring, empathetic, egalitarian, and meandering.” The ethos incarnate.

Patriarchy—from Equality to Hierarchy

The dominating nature of the male replication ethos became increasingly exaggerated as civilization ascended and societies evolved into groups of thousands, then tens of thousands, then millions. Males remained the core of society, no less than they are among chimpanzees, but now male dominance ran amok. Status-seeking within society developed into elaborate and powerful hierarchies. Classes of society became groups or tribes unto themselves, often defending their privileges as vigorously and as violently against other groups as societies defended their territories against neighbours. The Other could exist within as well as without.

As the need for order waxed, the old equality waned. A tribe did not have to become particularly large before more powerful clans and clan leaders, and even medicine men, turned themselves into aristocracies. The arrogance of leaders ultimately went so far as to claim divine right—a king had absolute power over everyone else because God Himself had arranged it so. And God help the individual who dared reject this leadership.

As male status and dominance asserted itself with expanding influence internally to society, so it did externally. Raids against neighbours became conquests much grander than the simple scale of a chimpanzee assault on a stranger or a Chipewyan raid on another tribe. At the core of society was an institution dedicated to the defence of that society and to the aggrandizement of that society through expansion, even unto empire—the warrior class, the military. The chimpanzee political practice of coalition-forming to defeat rivals now existed on a vast scale, even between and among empires. And it was also as often tenuous and short-lived.

Women were included in the hierarchy but merely as appendages of men. Their role at each level was strictly defined as keeper of hearth and home. No power for her; power was the property of the patriarch.

The Deadly Replicator

Humanity's genes have been particularly clever, perhaps too clever. They constructed a replication machine, or rather a pair of replication machines, with a big brain, intelligence being a good survival technique and therefore a good replication technique. This intelligence is sufficient that it can add to its stock of gene-driven behaviours with its own inventions—culture.

Our brain can not only deal with its environment but with itself as well. It can explore itself. It is self-conscious. With it, the replicating machine we know as Homo sapiens can analyze itself and its natural behaviours, and design cultural behaviours accordingly, behaviours that can exaggerate natural behaviours to extremes and even undermine the purposes of the genes themselves. It can design rituals where the healthiest, most fertile young women are slain in sacrifice to a god, or where the most gifted men self-emasculate themselves with abstinence, in service to yet another god. Thus are the finest of genes wasted and their purpose thwarted.

Once again, we must note the gender that applies its intelligence to such extreme purposes and destructive ends. It is not the feminine one. Self-consciousness is safe in the hands of a gender principally devoted to nurturing but highly dangerous in the hands of a gender preoccupied with competition, dominance and status. The genetic imperative and the cultural capacity are an explosive combination in this gender. When the urge for dominance devises weapons that can annihilate not a band but an entire city in a flash of light and allow the perpetrators to fly away without a backward glance, Homo sapiens itself is threatened, not just some Other. And when culture allows us to not simply pick fruit and hunt small animals but to deplete oceans of their inhabitants and move mountains in the search for resources, all species must shudder.

Did our genes outsmart themselves in creating this higher intelligence, this big brain, as the genes of the dinosaurs did when they created the big body? Did our DNA design its own Armageddon? Is our big brain, stuck in the head of an aggressive male ape, going to be the death of us? Will the insatiable appetites of our male libido drive us to extinction? How ironic if we with our big brains, after only 300,000 years on the planet, were to consume ourselves in a holocaust of our own making, when the lizard-brained dinosaurs lasted 600 times as long. Yet if we set our course on a patriarchal heading, as we have done in the past, that may indeed be our destiny.

Nonetheless, there is hope. Men can behave themselves. Just as they use their intelligence for competition and status-seeking, they can use it for co-operation and sharing. And they will have to. We will need all of our intelligence and all of our wisdom to overcome the mire of inequality, violence and environmental degradation into which we have sunk. Most of all, we will need that other replication ethos, the one designed principally into women.

Four: Toward Matriarchy

Matonabee in Love

SAMUEL HEARNE DESCRIBES an event involving Matonabee and another man when they were camped at a place called Peshew Lake.

He no sooner heard of the man's arrival, than he opened one of his wives' bundles, and, with the greatest composure, took out a new long box-handled knife, went into the man's tent, and, without any preface whatever, took him by the collar, and began to execute his horrid design. The poor man, anticipating his danger, fell on his face, and called for assistance; but before any could be had he received three wounds in the back. Fortunately for him they all happened on the shoulder-blade, so that his life was spared. When Matonabee returned to his tent, after committing this horrid deed he sat down as composedly as if nothing had happened, called for water to wash his bloody hands and knife, smoked his pipe as usual, seemed to be perfectly at ease, and asked if I did not think he had done right?

Hearne was shocked by the assault. He was at such a loss to explain his friend's behaviour, a man of "such universal good sense" and "of such great humanity" that he explained it away by saying that Matonabee must have been tainted by "having lived among the Southern Indians."

Matonabee had, on an earlier occasion, taken one of his wives from this man by force, a common practice among the Chipewyan. According to Hearne, "She was certainly by far the handsomest of all his flock, of a moderate size, and had a fair complexion; she apparently possessed a mild temper, and very engaging manners."

The man had been disparaging Matonabee for taking his woman and for this Matonabee knifed him. To do less would have meant a loss of status, something he felt Hearne would instinctively understand.

Certainly we can understand, having the advantage of knowing the powerful need for status that the male replication ethos evolved long before it evolved men. But there is something else here as well. Matonabee's show of force did him little good. Shortly after the stabbing incident, the young woman stole away in the night to rejoin her former lover and they disappeared from the camp. Hearne described Matonabee as "entirely disconcerted, and quite inconsolable for the loss." Matonabee, it seemed, loved the young woman.

The status-seeking man is not the status-seeking monkey. Men, like chimpanzees, vigorously seek status to advantage them in the pursuit of sex but, unlike chimpanzees, they also develop genuine feeling for their female partners. If they did not, there would never have been a *Homo sapiens*. Men, unlike their ape ancestors, could not afford to be cavalier about their progeny when it could not survive, could not perpetuate their genes, without their help. They, too, had to be caring. The male replication ethos had to expand beyond competition and fornication; it had to adopt a trait or two from the female ethos.

Why Are People Good?

Biologist Gerald Wilkinson, studying vampire bats in Costa Rica, observed an intriguing behaviour. A bat that has had a good night, finding a fat cow to feed off, will return to the cave in which it roosts gorged with blood, replete with resources we might say. If a colleague's luck has not been as good and it returns empty-stomached, the first bat will disgorge blood to feed it.

Now why would a bat do such a thing? Keeping in mind that its genes, like all genes, design it for their replication alone, why would it give up resources that could contribute to that purpose and instead offer them to a competitor? We would consider a businessman who gave his profits to a competitor a fool, unless of course the competitor had suffered a tragedy and was in need of charity. Then we would recognize the workings of conscience. But the bat doesn't have a conscience. It is a creature of instinct. It doesn't learn morality at its mother's knee nor does it read the Bible, yet it is as generous as the Good Samaritan.

Our first guess might be what naturalist William Hamilton described as kin selection. A host of creatures are designed by their genes to be good to their offspring in order to ensure their offspring's success and therefore the success of the genes they inherit. Creatures like us, because we share genes with other kin—a brother or sister shares as many genes with us as our offspring—are programmed to be generous to them as well. A gene that programs us to help our relatives, the closer the relative the greater the help, is a successful gene that replicates into the next generation and spreads through the gene pool. Thus kindness to kin is selected for and common among us.

But kin selection doesn't explain the generosity of the bats. They are not necessarily closely related to their roost-mates. Biology offers a reason, a wide-ranging reason with a multitude of ramifications, that explains the bats' beneficence, and the Good Samaritan's, and ours, to those with whom we share no familial genes. This extraordinarily powerful discovery explains kindness and a host of other human feelings and behaviours. Biologist Robert Trivers called it reciprocal altruism. According to the concept of reciprocal altruism, we are generous to others in their time of need in the expectation that they will be kind to us in our time of need. Thus we are both made stronger, "fitter" from our genes' point of view. Reciprocal altruism is an "adaptation," an evolved strategy that helps each individual's genes get passed along into the next generation. Kindness pays.

Our kindness is, you might say, the result of our genes' selfishness. They are just molecules, incapable of emotion or purpose, so accusing them of selfishness may be excessively anthropomorphic; nonetheless, they are marvellous designers.

The behaviours genes impose act in us consciously and subconsciously. If we pay a merchant a hundred dollars for a pair of shoes, our reciprocity is conscious and calculated, but we don't go about consciously calculating our potential future benefit from every act of kindness, generosity, co-operation, etc., that we perform. If we help a stranger in trouble, our reciprocity is instinctive, like the bats', driven by subterranean impulse; we cannot expect the stranger to repay us—we may never see him again—and if we tell no one about our kind act, even our reputation, and therefore our status, among those who know us is not improved. If we save a child's life at the risk of our own, we have gone beyond reciprocity into the realm of pure generosity, pure selflessness. Our genes implant reciprocal altruism in us for their selfish purpose but once implanted and manifested as kindness, or generosity, or co-operation, these manifestations become their own masters. And often ours, too.

Behaviour commanded by a characteristic may even rise above the interests of both the organism and its genes. For example, a man who jumps into a river to save a puppy and drowns has defeated both the self-interest of his genes and himself. Thus our gene-implanted characteristics assume a momentum of their own.

Morality is part of what we are. It is embedded as deep and as instinctively in us as it is in the vampire bat, although in us it quite naturally expresses itself in much more complex feelings and behaviours, and we have the added facility of being able to analyze it and direct it toward purposes of our own—cultural purposes—purposes that may in no way directly relate to replicating our genes.

Iron Ladies

Margaret Thatcher, former prime minister of Great Britain, was once referred to as “the only man in her cabinet.” The redoubtable Margaret was, as far as we know, a perfectly normal woman. Why then this reference to her as the “only man”? Technically, it is utterly wrong, yet it fits. It fits because it captures the style, the behaviour, of Ms. Thatcher; it captures a set of qualities we associate with her. She is, in our minds, uncompromising, dominating, competitive, aggressive, individualistic—in short, she has a “manly” style. Her manly way was well-illustrated by the fact that in all her years as prime minister she never chose another woman for her cabinet. This was a leader who reflected during the Falklands war, “It is exciting to have a real crisis on your hands when you have spent half your political life dealing with humdrum issues like the environment” and who enjoyed sitting down to tea with the mass torturer and murderer Augusto Pinochet. A very macho lady indeed.

The dichotomy of female and male isn't simple. Many girls get a stronger testosterone bath in the womb than others and develop into tomboys, more aggressive and assertive, while many boys get less testosterone than their brothers and grow up more sensitive and creative. In one brain scan study, 35 per cent of the men exhibited limbic activity typical of women while 17 per cent of the women exhibited activity typical of men. Hormone levels vary between people of the same sex and vary at different times in our lives. Men's testosterone level declines as they age thus in a sense they become more feminine. (A feminist might suggest that this is why they become wiser.) The levels vary such between individuals that some women are ultra-feminine and some men ultra-masculine or macho. In the other direction, they vary such that some men are feminine and some women masculine, even macho. Thus Margaret Thatcher.

But we needn't single out Ms. Thatcher. We are, all of us, to some extent androgynous, part masculine, part feminine, subject to a dual hormonal balance. Even Rambo, for all his rampantly excessive masculinity, contained somewhere under the muscle and slack-jawed surliness a smidgen of the feminine.

Hermaphroditus

If we were to draw up a list of traits or qualities to describe the masculine, we might come up with something like aggressive, competitive, controlling, inventive, abstract, stoic, firm, individualistic and adventurous; and in counterpoint to describe the feminine, receptive, consensual, nurturing, creative, situational, sensitive, flexible, sharing and conservative.

We tend to think of masculine and feminine qualities strictly in terms of men and women because “masculine” traits, traits reflecting the male replication ethos, are on average dominant in men and “feminine” traits, traits reflecting the female replication ethos, in women. The key phrase here is “on average.” Great variety reigns from individual to individual. Just as Margaret Thatcher serves as an example of a woman dominated by the masculine to the point of macho, Mahatma Gandhi, or even Jesus Christ, might serve as an example of a man dominated by the feminine. Here were men who weren't passive but were definitely gentle, even nurturing, in their campaigns. One cannot imagine either leading the Falkland Islands war. And just as we frequently find individuals who seem to defy their gender average so do we find variety within individuals. Men are quite capable, at least with the right sort of encouragement, of tenderness, and the gentlest women, again with the right encouragement, of ferocity. Although the male animal is usually thought of as the aggressive fighter, few animals are fiercer and more dangerous than a female defending her young.

Men are thought to be superior in space conception and hierarchal thinking and therefore should be better at mathematics and the physical sciences, yet how many men can do science as well as Nobel Prize winners like Marie Curie, Dorothy Hodgkin or Barbara McClintock? Women are considered superior in verbal skills, yet speakers like Winston Churchill, Tommy Douglas or Martin Luther King, Jr. were magnificent in their way with words. (We must keep in mind that women have been systematically excluded from the arts, sciences and political leadership throughout much of history,

so we don't really know how well they compare.) Even in sports, long considered a male bastion because of its competitive and physical nature, women are often not far behind. The difference between the top men's and women's times in the Olympic 100-meter dash is a shade over half a second. How many men can run 100 meters in 10.49 seconds, the women's record? No man has swum the English Channel—a gruelling test of power and endurance—faster than Penny Dean.

Nor are women always less cruel than men. In Samuel Hearne's journals he observes, "It is too common a case with most of the tribes of Southern Indians for the women to desire their husbands or friends, when going to war, to bring them a slave, that they may have the pleasure of killing it; and some of these inhuman women will accompany their husbands, and murder the women and children as fast as their husbands do the men."

Not only do individuals frequently jump the boundaries expected of male and female, the male/female averages themselves often show little difference with individuals straying well outside them. Indeed how different can men and women be? Most genes, the determinants of what we are, can end up in either sex. Behavioural scientist Valerie Grant of Auckland University has observed that feminine men, men who are more sensitive and artistic, are more likely to father sons while macho men are more likely to father daughters. Dr. Grant believes that women's bodies gatekeep which sperm fertilize eggs, maintaining a balance that precludes the development of extreme characteristics.

And then of course we distort the picture by amplifying nature with culture. Just as men pad their shoulders and women pad their breasts to exaggerate their genders, we pad our cultural concepts of what we think men and women should be, so that often what we see isn't at all what we've got. Nature's reality is often much less than what culture suggests.

What Is a Man?

When comparing the replication ethos of men and woman, clearly all is not black and white. Men's ethos, unlike that of their ape ancestors, must include a component of caring, even nurturing. Reciprocal altruism nudges all of us, men as much as women, to kindness and co-operation. And the dark, destructive side of *Homo sapiens*, like the enlightened, constructive side, is shared across the gender line.

Nonetheless, we cannot avoid the awkward fact that it is men who overwhelmingly exhibit the attitudes and behaviours that endanger our species and our planet. It is they who act out the extremes to which their replication ethos drives them, threatening us all in the process.

After all, how many female Alexanders, Julius Caesars, or Cecil Rhodes, to say nothing of Genghis Khans, Hitlers or Pol Pots, do we know of? The raiders on the Coppermine were all men, men both ordinary and exceptional. And they are still up to their ancient mischief today. They run human society, a society that plagues itself with war and ravishes the environment that sustains it. The role of women in all this savagery, despite the occasional Margaret Thatcher, is trivial. It is men who must be held principally accountable.

So the question becomes, if men have so much potential for good, why are they so often bad? The answer to that question, central to the future of our species, is twofold.

First, men are highly individualistic. They compete aggressively for females, for the opportunity to send their genes on into future generations. Every man for himself in this, the most important of all games. Yet not entirely. A second factor intrudes. The human male is also served by reciprocal altruism, which drives him to co-operate with his fellows for the good of all. Through co-operation, a group of males can maximize their search for status and resources, and therefore the genetic opportunities, of each. The uniting of individual aggression and reciprocal altruism to multiply

male power in the search for status and resources is one of the more formidable forces of nature and, potentially, one of the most destructive.

Subject to both individualism and tribalism, sometimes the human male immerses himself in the former, sometimes in the latter. Abandoning his strong individuality to the siren call of tribalism is the great ecstasy of male experience. Now we can understand why, on the Coppermine, the Chipewyan warriors “though an un-disciplined rabble ... acted on this horrid occasion with the utmost uniformity of sentiment.” “Never,” Hearne goes on to say, “was reciprocity of interest more generally regarded among a number of people, than it was on the present occasion by my crew.”

Tribalism is a powerful force, but it is in constant tension with the other powerful force of male individualism. Men tend, therefore, to develop cultural agents to bind the brotherhood—the painting of bodies, the wearing of uniforms, the singing of songs, dancing, initiation rites, the ritual exclusion of women, and so on.

Men must constantly prove themselves, both as individuals and as individuals fit for membership in the brotherhood of tribalism.

As if the male exercise of individualism and tribalism weren't trouble enough, certain men, and the occasional woman, promote these twin forces to even greater heights. They turn them into fetishes, into belief systems.

They glorify the male replication ethos in its aggressive, dominating, individualistic, tribal manifestations. They may, in their modern personas, extol individualism, but they also, in order to maintain the solidarity of the tribe, insist on rigid rules for social behaviour and harsh punishments for those who sin against them, frame issues in black and white, encourage suspicion of the Other, and worship warriors.

These are the demagogues. Often charismatic, and their narrow and self-righteous intensity with its easy answers highly appealing, they are capable of leading a society, even entire civilizations into the excesses that the male replication ethos is so capable of. They have an exceptional capacity to sweep us all up in their enthusiasms. They have always been a burden upon us—and a threat.

Creating Matriarchy

The logic of humankind's challenge is straightforward, The purpose of life is the replication of genes. Males respond to that imperative by proving their fitness to females. Human males prove their fitness by competing over resources and status (economic, political, social or spiritual). Competition over resources and status leads men, individually and in groups, into conflict with other men and increasingly into conflict with nature Herself.

We must, and nothing less than our survival depends on it, create a society in which the excesses of the male replication ethos are curbed and in which patriarchy has no place. We must identify, isolate and stigmatize the macho, the patriarchal, the excesses of the ethos. We must create a new social paradigm.

We must direct society away from the excesses by modifying our institutions—political, economical, spiritual, all our institutions—to that end. Ultimately, we must ground our institutions in the female replication ethos, the nurturing ethos. This naturally includes vigorously promoting the contribution of the nurturing gender, women. We must shift dramatically from patriarchy to matriarchy. And we must do it globally.

A matriarchal society, a society that precluded violence against humans and their fellow species because of its nurturing character, would not be a society of male emasculation. Men can pursue

their need for status, individually and collectively, in such a society; they simply must do it in constructive, non-abusive ways.

Most men are not macho-men, and in the absence of such influence, are quite capable of living and enjoying rich, full lives without periodic binges of savagery and without oppressing their fellow citizens.

Today, in our complex societies, men have an infinite variety of constructive ways to seek the status they so desperately need, to exercise their individuality and to join their brothers in group projects. Individualism as self-reliance can, after all, in moderation and practiced with a strong sense of social responsibility, be a very good thing, for the individual and for society. And reciprocal altruism, rid of its base tribal associations, is our greatest strength as a species, essential to social cohesion. If men can apply it for base goals, they can apply it for noble ones, and if they can apply it for the brotherhood of the group or the tribe, they can apply it for the brotherhood, and sisterhood, of humankind. As Matonabee could massacre the Inuit, he could make peace with the Athapascans.

The challenge is daunting. It is the way of the male replication ethos to dominate. The patriarchs will not go gently into a feminine world. Matriarchy will demand hard work and eternal vigilance, but the challenge must be joined—our very survival depends upon it. We can prosper in a new paradigm, or face extinction in the old.

Five: Patriarchal Politics

Mr. Monte Solberg (Medicine Hat, Reform): Mr. Speaker, the Liberal pre-election brochure is kind of like a bad smell. I got [it] in the mail yesterday. I threw it away and there it was again in the newspaper this morning. It is kind of like something I stepped in and I just cannot shake off my shoe.

The first thing —

The Speaker: Order. I ask the hon. member not to get in any deeper than he is.

Mr. Solberg: Mr. Speaker, when you open up the brochure one of the first things it says is: “Why support the Liberal Party of Canada?” Why indeed after 37 tax increases and after broken promises on things like the CBC, day care and a number of other issues? The GST promise has to be the biggest whopper of all.

It is very clear the Liberal record is in complete disarray, that the Liberal record is in flames. Why would people of right mind support the same hucksters who sold them off last time, ran away with their wallets and dashed their hopes in 1993?

Hon. Herb Gray (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Solicitor General of Canada, Liberal): Mr. Speaker, the Liberal record is a solid record of achievement for Canadians across the country. If my hon. friend is aware of a bad smell it must be coming from the Reform platform he is carrying around in his pocket.

Mr. Solberg: Mr. Speaker, when we look at the next section of the government’s election document it says: “Liberal policies at work.”

Maybe the policies are at work but certainly Canadians are not at work. Right now we have 1.4 million unemployed Canadians, almost exactly what it was when the government came to power. There is 20 per cent plus unemployment in Cape Breton and Newfoundland. The national youth unemployment figure is 17 per cent. The real unemployment rate when we count all the people who have dropped out of the workforce is approaching 11 per cent.

Given that horrid record, is the government really intending to run on the worst job creation record since the great depression?

Hon. Herb Gray: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member keeps making a statement at the end of his questions that is not accurate as far as I am aware. With respect to the Liberal record on unemployment there is certainly more to be done, but the unemployment rate has gone down by some two percentage points since the last election and close to 850,000 jobs have been created.

When we talk about a good start, this beats the smelly fresh start program of the Reform Party. The hon. member should clean out his pockets. Then he will feel a lot better.

Mr. Solberg: Mr. Speaker, so many people have dropped out of the workforce that unemployment is virtually unchanged from when the government came to power.

One of the other headings in the document states: “Make a donation today.” Indeed if a donation is made, in return the Liberals say they are willing to listen to you. Certainly it has worked for Bombardier. We know that.

I think the Liberal grease my palm approach to gathering public opinion says a whole lot about their opinion of regular Canadians and about their opinion of why they should listen

to regular Canadians. Given their record of pork-barreling, scandal, broken promises and incompetence, why should Canadians believe anything they say when they go to Canadians in the upcoming election?

Hon. Herb Gray: Mr. Speaker, Canadians will believe Liberals far more than members of the Reform Party when they listen to questions like the one just placed because there is an inherent contradiction in the Reform position.

On the one hand Reformers are complaining about not enough jobs being created and on the other hand they are criticizing measures taken by this government, like the Bombardier investment, to create thousands of jobs. No wonder the Reform Party is not believable.

Speaking of dropping out, according to the polls and according to the statements in the House every day, the dropouts are all on the side of the Reform Party. They are quitting and running as fast as they can. Why do they fear the electorate? Let them answer that question.

War by Other Means

“War,” said von Clausewitz, the Prussian general and military theorist, “is a continuation of political activity by other means.” If he had read the rambling incivility above, taken from Hansard, the verbatim record of debates in the House of Commons, he might have said that politics is a continuation of war by other means.

Even the architecture of the House is a model of war. The government benches on one side of the house face the opposition benches on the other side, the two sides confronting each other in serried ranks like two armies. “Us versus them,” screams the arrangement. As does the behaviour of the warring sides. Members hurl insults at their opponents across the floor of the House like warriors hurling spears across a battlefield. Conduct in the British House of Commons was described by a woman member as “very public-schoolboy primitive.” If something is white on one side of the House then it must instinctively be black on the other side.

Debate, even civilized debate, is in itself highly formalized verbal warfare.

The vehicles of political life, political parties, engage in political warfare in the language of their military counterparts. They wage campaigns; they wave slogans and sound bites like battle flags; they declare victory or accept defeat; they take no prisoners; they rally their troops; they strategize; and so on. They are, like military organizations, tightly hierarchal, valuing loyalty to the leader above all. They are hostile hordes, competing constantly for power. They are tribes.

When a party wins an election and forms a government, it celebrates like a triumphant army, puffing itself up, imposing its programs and ideology on the populace as if it were the populace when often it represents only a minority. It bothers little with consensus. The losers are simply excluded regardless of how many citizens they represent. In parliamentary systems, power is wielded for the most part by the executive, by the prime minister and his cabinet, excluding even government back-benchers from any meaningful role. To the victor goes the spoils. The opposition meanwhile dedicates itself to the noble task of trashing everything that the government of the day proposes.

Men’s Work

Where does the warlike manner of politics come from?

Politics and governance have always, from our ape ancestors to us, been tools of the male replication ethos. They have been about status-seeking and forming the coalitions necessary to achieve it. Politics has concerned itself principally with hierarchy and dominance. Former American Secretary of State Henry Kissinger, tweedy professor-cum-power bureaucrat, encapsulated the biological nature of the masculine drive for political dominance with his observation, “Power is the great aphrodisiac,” echoing Churchill’s observation that it was power that kept men young. With men, as with apes, it raises testosterone levels, it enhances virility and it makes men more attractive to women.

Furthermore, it has operated throughout most of history at the extreme, in the realm of dictatorship, the realm of the macho. When civilization ascended and we required strong leaders to manage larger, more complex societies, the most aggressive competitors exploited the opportunity for their evolutionary advantage. With power came riches, resources to be lavished on one’s progeny, on the future of one’s genes, on the purpose of life itself.

Sometimes politics and war have become almost synonymous, with entire social systems based on a military ethos, such as the medieval period in Europe, or even turned into armies like the medieval Europeans’ counterparts in the east, the Mongols.

Party politics creates, according to former MP Jan Brown, “an unnatural and combative setting that does not support positive relationships. A place where power and gamesmanship determine the rules.” It is the quintessence of male bonding for violence against the Other. The rules are derived largely from masculine, even macho, culture. Women dominated by their masculine side, Margaret Thatcher being the quintessential example, do well, but those women dominated by their feminine side, and that means most women, do not.

The rules disadvantage also men who are ruled by their feminine side. Politicians who lead by consensus are deemed to be soft or indecisive. There is, to invoke a masculine expression, no level playing field. Women are becoming accepted in modern politics, even encouraged, but the female ethos is not. The rules are powerfully biased against it and it will not have an equal opportunity until the rules are changed.

A Feminine Perspective

A politics dominated not only by men but by the most aggressive men is inevitably a politics that pushes masculine values and masculine issues to the fore. In recent years, we have seen issues like deficit reduction and lower taxes dominate politics even when most citizens were concerned with issues like unemployment, health, education and the environment. This is precisely what we might expect when the elites of government and the business community, a highly masculine crowd, focus on economic values while the larger community, on average a more feminine entity, focuses on human values. The feminine ethos tends to see government as an opportunity for community; the masculine tends to see it as an opportunity for power. When the masculine sees government as a threat to individual self-interest, it seeks to diminish it.

Jan Brown states, “Validation of the feminine in the political domain would open up new paradigms of leadership, including joint problem-solving that emphasizes win/win rather than lose/lose situations.” Ms. Brown illustrated her convictions with one of the classiest gestures ever to grace the House of Commons. When Lucien Bouchard, arch-separatist and bitter ideological foe of Ms. Brown’s Reform party, lay gravely ill with flesh-eating disease, she placed a yellow rose on his empty desk in the House.

Joycelin Elders, former United States surgeon general, described the changes that would take place if women dominated the U.S. Senate:

Women, for the most part, use their power, prestige and position to try to make a difference in the lives of people, to make the world a better place. Men, on the other hand, look at power in terms of money and control. We'd see a great shift in how we treat our children. We wouldn't have one in four children being poor. We would have more early childhood education centres, more good day care, better schools. We'd have universal health care. Women would consider it most important that we have healthy, educated, motivated children with hope. They would know that's the best way to prevent violence in our streets, to prevent crime and teenage pregnancies.

Even constitutions reflect an interest gap. Made mostly by men, in their concern for rights they have traditionally ignored the most fundamental right of all—the foremost right to a feminine consciousness—the right to adequate food and shelter. A constitution made by women would not ignore basic needs, nurturing needs.

A more feminine perspective would greatly improve the tenor of political discourse. A more civil, more mature, more consensual and less confrontational dialogue would result, a dialogue based more on discussion and less on debate, more on sharing views and less on hurling them at each other.

But issues more important than discourse, more important even than those of Joycelin Elders' enlightened vision, are at stake. From Chipewyan hunters massacring defenceless Inuit to the horrendous conflicts of the modern world, masculine governance always eventually lets the macho genie out of the bottle to satisfy its aggressive instincts. Indeed the genie—the warrior—is considered by patriarchal society to be the fullest model of the real man.

Up until the Industrial Revolution, the damage that patriarchy could do was limited. War was constrained by technological limitations in range and destructiveness, but with the advances of the last two centuries, whole new forms of warfare have been developed—nuclear, chemical and biological—that bring a capacity to destroy beyond anything previously imaginable, the capacity even to destroy our species and other species along with us. And not only war possesses such capacity. The masculine need to accumulate resources has led to exploitation that is nothing less than a massive assault on the planet itself, a kind of geographical rape. Every day, more species go extinct and more noxious gases invade our atmosphere. Bringing more of the feminine perspective to bear on national and international governance is not only fair, not only healthy, but is essential to our survival. In the past we have had an excess of the masculine ethos; now we must have an excess of the feminine. We must have matriarchy.

Matriarchal Stirrings

As the old patriarchies began to collapse under the weight of the Enlightenment and the Industrial Revolution, moderation asserted itself. Out of the Hobbesian jungle of early capitalism struggled ideas suggesting that society could structure itself less competitively, less hierarchically, less patriarchally and more equitably, more compassionately, more matriarchally. Out of the new technologies, particularly mass communication, out of universal public education and out of a newfound prosperity, emerged modern democracy which, with its insistence on equality, is a kind of return to the egalitarian impulses of the hunter-gatherers.

Increasing democracy over the last 200 years has in itself brought progress toward a more feminine ethos. One oft-noted example of the more feminine conduct of democracies is the infrequency with which they go to war with each other. Another is the rarity of famines in democratic countries, even poor ones.

The flexible, sharing, consensual nature of democracy exemplifies matriarchy just as the rigid, controlling, hierarchal nature of dictatorship exemplifies patriarchy. With its consensual sharing of

power, particularly between men and women, democracy is a more feminine construct as well as a more egalitarian one. It is a precondition for matriarchal governance.

And modern democracy has become increasingly feminized, particularly in the 20th and 21st centuries. This has manifested itself in two ways, the increasing involvement of women in politics and the increasing agreement that government has a responsibility to redistribute the wealth that a modern economy can produce. A hundred and fifty years ago, women didn't have the vote; now they are involved in politics and government at all levels. A hundred years ago, the capitalistic ethos of each-against-all prevailed; now we recognize that compassion is a proper goal of society and its government. We have the welfare state—the caring village becomes the caring nation—reciprocal altruism on the larger scale and at an enlightened level.

The increase in women's influence and the increase in compassion are naturally connected. Surveys consistently show significant gender gaps in the voting patterns between men and women, men focusing more on economic issues, women more on social issues.

As political scientist Sylvia Bashevkin puts it, women care more about “things that women are much more likely than men to have to pick up after.” Feminist Rheta Childe Door wrote in 1910, “Woman's place is in the home. ... But Home is not contained within the four walls of an individual home. Home is the community. The city full of people is the Family. The public school is the real Nursery.”

However, despite many decades of this sort of consciousness, women are still minorities in the governing of our communities. They are no longer content to leave the rough-and-tumble of politics and government entirely to the masculine world of men; nonetheless, they often have to adopt a masculine style to succeed. The practice of politics remains very much a macho exercise. It is all about “managing male relationships,” as one women member of the House of Commons observed. Women are involved but only as minorities. The percentage of women in legislatures in modern democracies ranges from highs of 45 per cent in Scandinavia down to 31 per cent in Canada, 29 per cent in the United States and a pathetic 10 per cent in Japan.

Globalization has reinforced the masculine perspective, returning us in some degree to the economic free-for-all of the early Industrial Revolution. As the nation state is asked to subordinate compassion to competition, and its very authority is undermined by global corporations, we submit to the oppressive mantra “we must compete in the global marketplace.” The welfare state, the society of compassion, equality and democracy, finds itself very much on the defensive.

Six: ... and Matriarchal Possibilities

The 50 Per Cent Solution

GIVEN THE NEED for more feminine perspective in governance, how do we proceed?

We must, as an essential first step, bring more, many more, women into the process. This in turn means creating a more feminine ambience: more feminine rules, behaviours and structures in politics and government. The two are complimentary, creating a more feminine system will make it more attractive to women (and feminine men) and bringing more women into the system will create a more feminine system.

The proportion of women will need to be high in order to turn the tide. In his book *Under Siege*, Ian McLeod comments on the influence of women in political parties: “Scandinavian experience indicates that women need to hold at least a third of the effective leadership jobs in order to take a party in a new direction.” The operative phrase is “at least.” It is in the nature of the male to dominate, thus women may require a solid majority in political parties and governments just to achieve equality for the feminine ethos. A legislature made up of 50 per cent men and 50 per cent women would translate roughly into 50 per cent masculine ethos and 50 per cent feminine ethos, and would, therefore, seem balanced, but in fact the masculine ethos would still dominate because of its biological need to do so and its biological aggressiveness in doing so. Numerical parity doesn’t provide a balance. To truly level the playing field, women may have to be given significant majorities. Women would be over-represented, but the feminine ethos wouldn’t.

Nonetheless, 50/50 would be a good start. It would also be perfectly democratic; after all, women make up 50 per cent of the electorate. We might constitutionally mandate equal representation in government of men and women. This would not be a new concept. Constitutionally imposed equality, in some cases extending to absurdly undemocratic lengths, has been around for a long time. The Constitution of the United States, generally considered to be one of the finest ever written, mandates that each state, regardless of population, elect two senators to the U.S. Senate. In practice, this means that each elector from Rhode Island has in effect 30 votes to each California elector’s one vote, a gross violation of the fundamental democratic principle of one citizen/one vote.

If “equality” rules can be stretched to this inequitable and undemocratic degree to achieve parity of jurisdictions, then surely we can tolerate a rule that is both equitable and democratic to achieve parity of genders. Masculine rules in themselves constitute a bias in favour of men and the masculine ethos. They have powerfully discriminated against both women and the feminine ethos. Let us hear no complaints about “affirmative action” when we ask for gender parity.

One approach to parity is running two candidates in each constituency, one a man, the other a woman. When Canada created the territorial government of Nunavut, this approach was proposed for election to the new legislature. Unfortunately, it narrowly lost in a plebiscite. Scandinavian governments have from time to time taken care to ensure that half their cabinets are women. In 1999, the French National Assembly passed a law that obliges parties to run as many women as men for political office and to redress the current imbalance in legislatures. All progress for parity is to be welcomed; whether or not it is wise to trap it at 50 per cent with a constitutional mandate is another matter. It would be better to leave ample room for an even more feminine presence in the future.

All Democracies Are Not Equal

Democracy may be a more feminine form of governance than dictatorship; nonetheless, all forms of democracy do not equally encourage the participation of women. Electoral systems are a case in point. The electoral system used in Canada, the United Kingdom and the United States—plurality—is thoroughly masculine. Under plurality, both political parties and candidates compete for office in a simple first-past-the-post race. The winning candidate is the one with the most votes even when, as is commonly the case, the other candidates have together won more votes. Similarly, the political party that forms the government is the one that wins the most constituencies even if the opposing parties, again commonly the case, collectively amass more votes. This winner-take-all competition tends to strongly discourage those who prefer a more consensual, more collegial approach.

In Canada and the United Kingdom, plurality is combined with the parliamentary or Westminster structure of government. In this system, the government and the opposition determine their position on each issue in their respective caucuses behind closed doors. When the members emerge from caucus and enter the legislature, they vote with unwavering loyalty the will of caucus. Like good soldiers, they avoid opinions of their own. Disloyalty can be punished by dismissal from caucus, a mark of shame from which recovery is difficult. The leader of the governing party, the prime minister, chooses from his party's faithful ranks his, or very rarely her, cabinet. This executive body becomes in effect the government. This structure is as masculine as plurality, very much about tribal loyalty and the strong leader.

The American structure of government is more committed to sharing power, between a bicameral legislature, in which unlike its parliamentary cousin both branches have real power, and a separately elected president. In addition, American political parties demand less loyalty, leaving representatives freer from party discipline. This greater dispersal of power ought to lead to more consensual and, therefore, more feminine government, but it doesn't seem to. Perhaps it is simply undermined by ruthlessly aggressive electoral politics, but in any case, if we measure the femininity of government by the rough measure of the proportion of women representatives, the United States compares badly: less than a third of members of the House of Representatives are women and a woman has never been president.

If we seek a more feminine approach to politics and government, we inevitably look to Scandinavia. Here, legislatures and cabinets both tend to include many more women than we see in North America and, as we might expect, we find more feminized government. Scandinavian countries are famous for pioneering the welfare state, for the egalitarian nature of their societies, for their equitable relationships between men and women, for their healthy attitude toward sex, for their promotion of peace and for their generous aid to the third world. We are not surprised that where we have the most matriarchal of governments, we have also the greatest commitment to compassion, equality and peace.

PR

Why do we find the most matriarchal of governments in Scandinavia? What is their secret? Part of the answer lies in their use of proportional representation electoral systems. Under PR, each party receives a number of seats in the legislature proportional to its share of the popular vote and fills these seats from lists of their candidates. This enhances the feminine ethos in two ways. First, because candidates appear on lists rather than having to personally slug it out toe-to-toe in a constituency, the system appeals to people who may have a great deal to offer the electorate but who prefer rational discourse and compromise to verbal brawling and total victory. In other words, it appeals to feminine people. Second, because PR tends to encourage more points of view to participate and therefore more political parties, governments must usually be formed by alliances of parties, potentially bringing into governance more co-operation and the softening of positions.

However PR doesn't solve the fundamental problem with plurality—the exclusion of large sections of the population. Even though it provides broader and more accurate representation in legislatures, it doesn't provide accurate representation in the actual process of governing, the process of making law. Opposition members are still excluded; legislation still devolves from cabinet. Winning, whether under plurality or PR, is everything; losing is nothing. Win enough seats to form a government and you make the laws; fail to win enough and you spend four years on the fringe. Winner take all—very macho.

How do parties get good people to run for office when they are taking a chance on throwing away four or more years of their lives? Some may run out of ideological conviction but most will simply have to see a hope of winning; otherwise, they will find better things to do. It is no wonder that political parties become so tribal, so desperate to win, and that politics becomes so intensely competitive.

Inclusiveness

If we are to create a more consensual, more co-operative system, we need much more than accurate representation in legislatures; we need a system where every elected member participates in law-making, where governing is shared among all the representatives of the people. PR in itself will not give us that.

Changing the electoral system is, therefore, no more than a first step in creating more feminine governance. A second, critical step is changing the structure of government itself.

We might consider, for instance, a structure where power does not reside principally with the prime minister or premier and his cabinet but instead in committees where all political parties are represented proportional to their seats in the legislature. Such a structure would bring all points of view into the making of law rather than just those of the victorious party or parties. The committees could choose the cabinet, each committee choosing a minister for its particular field of interest—finance, health, education, defence, etc. The choices would require confirmation by the full legislature. The full legislature could also choose the prime minister or premier, ensuring his or her accountability to the representatives of all the people. Votes in legislatures would be free votes, freeing representatives from the straitjacket of caucus solidarity.

We might also consider changes in the environment of government practice. We talked earlier, for example, of the confrontational architecture of legislatures—opposing ranks arrayed against each other like warring armies. Why not a more inclusive, informal arrangement? Why not a circular architecture with members sitting wherever their whims take them rather than always strictly with their ideological soulmates, with their tribe? This would create a less partisan atmosphere and a more civil discourse, as would anything that encouraged discussion more and debate less. Members would be less inclined to “schoolboy primitive” behaviour.

Legislatures could also be made more woman, indeed family, friendly. A major barrier to women in politics and government is the difficulty in balancing political life with family life. As women remain rightly or wrongly the principle guardians of family, they are more affected by the unfortunate fact that political careers are often strongly anti-family, requiring a great deal of travel, long unpredictable hours and working far from home. Government could be a leader in creating family-friendly workplaces by applying sensible work loads and hours, by providing facilities such as daycare and early childhood education for members with children, and so on.

We have considered a number of steps we might take to feminize government: affirmative actions to include more women, electoral reform to include more women and feminine men and to more accurately represent electorates, government structures that are more inclusive and less hierarchal, and a more feminine environment for the practice of government. We now turn to a step that will accomplish all this in one magic wave of the wand.

Direct Democracy

On the 26th of May, 1885, as the North-West Rebellion wound down after the defeat of the Métis under Louis Riel earlier in the month, Poundmaker and his Crees trooped into Battleford in what is now the province of Saskatchewan. They had come to surrender unconditionally to General Frederick Middleton, commander of the Canadian forces. Middleton parleyed with the great chief in front of the fort, he on a camp chair, Poundmaker seated on the ground, his people arrayed uneasily behind him, smoking their pipes. Middleton accused the Indians of theft and Poundmaker of cowardice. Poundmaker deflected the accusations with characteristic wit and eloquence. The Métis Tom Hourie, looking uncomfortable in his ill-fitting suit, interpreted the men's words.

Other Indians rose to speak. One man, Breaking-the-Ice, insisted on having his aged mother have her say. Middleton contemptuously responded, "We don't listen to women." Another Indian quickly reminded Middleton that his orders came from Queen Victoria. As Indian after Indian approached the council to pronounce upon events that were changing their lives forever, Middleton became increasingly concerned that things were getting out of hand; he summarily arrested Poundmaker and four of his headmen, stated the others were free to go, and declared the parley at an end.

Frederick Dobson Middleton was a decent man, if replete with colonial arrogance, but he came from a hierarchal society, a society of dedicated status-seekers, and could not therefore appreciate the remarkable process he was witnessing. He was experiencing direct democracy, a means of decision-making where every member of a society, every citizen, may be heard equally, where the decision arrived at is a consensus, where the leader of that society, the chief, is no more than a coordinator of the people's wishes. It is the purest form of democracy. It was practiced by the ancient Greeks although in a debased form—no woman, old or young, spoke in assemblies in Athens.

Of course the small size of Cree societies lent itself to direct decision-making, requiring minimal organization and hierarchy. With societies of millions of citizens it isn't quite so simple. We cannot fit everyone around the campfire. Consequently, we practice representative democracy, a form in which we elect a manageable number of citizens to represent us.

Representative democracy has various advantages: it allows us to practice democracy regardless of the size of our society; it allows us to choose the brightest and the best among us to make our decisions; and it allows us to give the people we choose the time to study issues at length, something that most of us don't have time for in a complex society with myriad issues. Nonetheless, many democrats believe that only when the people themselves make the decisions that affect them is democracy fully and properly practiced.

The Referendum—Macho Democracy

The most common method of direct democracy practiced today is the referendum, a vehicle that calls upon all citizens to answer to a specific issue or question. Unfortunately, the referendum is a vehicle with many failings.

Simply wording the question can in itself be problematic. Questions can be both difficult to frame and manipulated by their framers.

More serious is the yes/no nature of referendums. Yes/no is divisive; it creates an atmosphere of us and them, winners and losers; it breeds hostility and tribalism. It sucks one of the vital ingredients of democracy—compromise—out of issues. Referendums are the ultimate hammer of majority rule, more in-your-face than face-to-face.

The yes/no nature relieves citizens of the need to think beyond superficiality and thus leads to an ignorance problem. Some citizens will research the issue, think it through calmly and thoroughly, and discuss and debate it with others. Some won't. The ignorance component can be very high. One of the advantages of representative democracy is that decisions are made by people whose job is to study issues thoroughly before deciding. Referendums short-circuit this advantage. If we insist that legislatures read bills three times are we being sensible when we decide an issue in one go in a referendum? A decision made by elected representatives after thorough consideration might well be closer to what the people would decide if they deliberated rather than if they simply voted in a referendum. Democracy, healthy democracy, requires more than the people's voice and the people's will; it requires fully informed, thoughtful voices and wills, and these are often absent from referendums.

Participation, too, is a problem. Referendums held in conjunction with general elections may get decent turnouts, but ones held on their own commonly attract disproportionately those voters who are emotionally involved in the issue or who have a vested interest. In Switzerland, often considered a model of direct democracy because of the plethora of matters decided by referendums, pressure groups have come to dominate initiatives and referendums. Turnouts include only about a third of the electorate, although this may be partly due to referendum exhaustion.

And then of course there is the question of money. Money doesn't guarantee victory—the yes-side in the Charlottetown Accord referendum outspent the no-side fourteen to one and still lost—but it certainly helps. In the United States, where referendums were introduced early in this century to reduce the influence of special interests, they have managed to do just the opposite. Big spenders, often corporations, win most of the time, although the big bucks are much more effective for the no-side than for the yes-side, consistent with the Charlottetown result. Former Progressive Conservative leader Joe Clark observed that referendums “invite citizens to say no ... what our society needs are new ways to say yes.”

Some of the problems with referendums can be mitigated. Legislation can ensure that the two sides are equally matched financially. Negotiation between the two sides (and other interests) could lead to fairer framing of the question. As for the yes/no problem, putting a range of responses on the ballot (we might for example offer yes, yes with reservations, no, no with reservations, reframe) would make for more intelligent and less divisive decision-making. We might also sensibly restrict referendums to questions that can be framed relatively simply and to issues that are straightforward—if there are any such issues. But mitigate as we may, referendums remain by their nature simplistic and divisive. They are a macho vehicle and appeal to a macho constituency.

Citizen Assemblies

So is there a method of direct democracy that is essentially feminine, a method that brings citizens together rather than dividing them, that encourages compromise, that includes all citizens equally, and that insists on decision-making by deliberation, by knowledge and face-to-face discussion rather than by yes/no simple-mindedness? Can we in some sense fit our millions of citizens into a dialogue? Surprisingly, the answer is yes, we can. The answer is citizen assemblies.

We cannot literally assemble every citizen, of course; however, we can assemble a sample of citizens that accurately represents all of us. Through scientific random-sampling, we can choose a small group of citizens, small enough that all participants fit into a room (albeit a large one), that accurately represents the entire population, that in mind and spirit is that population—the citizenry in microcosm.

If 51 per cent of our citizens are women, 51 per cent of the sample will be women; if 20 per cent of our citizens are poor, 20 per cent of the sample will be poor; if three per cent of our population are gay, three per cent of the sample will be gay; and so on, to a high degree of accuracy. Furthermore,

through the wonders of modern transportation, participants can easily be assembled in one place. Assembling the group is important for two reasons.

First, if they are to make a sound decision, they must be thoroughly informed. This requires a great deal more than listening to the evening news or reading the daily paper; it requires absorbing thoroughly prepared background material, listening to and asking questions of experts representing opposing views, and, of very great importance, lots of time for face-to-face discussion with other citizens—particularly those who hold different views. The participants must deliberate. This is the very heart of the democratic process. What we most emphatically do not want is the superficial, isolated views of traditional opinion polls, on which unfortunately too many politicians base their policies.

Second, we want to bring the participants together to create a real society, a society where the conservative is not just an abstraction to the liberal but the guy sitting next to him, where the welfare mother is not just an abstraction to the CEO but the young woman across the table. They look each other in the eye, hear each other's voices, share each other's hopes and problems, breathe each other's humanity. This is the female replication ethos at work. The male ethos is inclined to think in terms of abstractions, the female in terms of real people, of relationships.

Citizen assemblies would guarantee women 51 per cent representation because that's their share of the electorate. That in itself would be a major improvement over current politics. But we want to ensure that the female ethos is guaranteed at least 50 per cent representation, and that's a very different thing. We know that other things being equal, the male ethos will dominate discussion—that's its nature. Assemblies would have to be co-ordinated, rules would have to be set, such that all participants had an equal opportunity to express their views.

Indigenous talking circles suggest an approach. In a talking circle, an object—a talking stick or an eagle feather perhaps—is passed from speaker to speaker. Only the person holding the object can talk, and no one may interrupt. Thus is discussion orderly and fair.

Once procedures were established, citizen assemblies could be empowered to rule upon issues in all areas of modern government and at all levels: local, provincial, national and even international. They could be assembled for a few days or weeks if necessary, depending on the complexity of the issue, even adjourning and initiating an investigation if they needed further information. They could comfortably remain in contact on the Internet during breaks.

Broadly used, all citizens could expect to participate from time to time. Assembly duty would be a normal function of citizenship, just as jury duty is now but much more common. We could even consider standing assemblies in important areas like government finance, social services, transportation, etc., with members being replaced as others completed their term of duty.

Assemblies would have constitutional force so that their decisions would become law, not just sophisticated polls for politicians to play with. We can even imagine extending the idea—and it's very tempting—to replacing legislatures and executives entirely with citizen assemblies. We can further imagine a time when we could do away with political parties, the tribes of modern politics, as well, when cabinet ministers and even the prime minister would no longer be politicians but would instead be professionals chosen from slates of candidates by citizen assemblies. The job of these leaders would be to co-ordinate decision-making by the people rather than assuming it for themselves. The patriarchal political world of winners and losers that currently burdens us would become no more than a bad memory.

Seven: Markets Free, Capitalist and Feminine

Give and Take

FOR A VERY long time before European traders like Samuel Hearne were seen in North America, the Chipewyan had thought of their neighbours, the Inuit to the north and the Athapascans to the west, as alien and had killed them with little remorse. The Inuit and the Athapascans returned the bloody favour. And yet when a far more alien people arrived and built their forts along the shores of Hudson's Bay, both the Chipewyan and the Inuit, and eventually the Athapascans, treated them with respect and developed cordial relations with them. Furthermore, relations among themselves improved.

When Matonabee and Idotliazee made their journey to the Arctic Ocean, they had made friends with Inuit and given them gifts. And prior to his expedition with Hearne, Matonabee had ventured into the land of the Athapascans and eventually won their trust. What was the magic the English brought that calmed base passions? The ameliorating effect of their arrival might seem surprising as they themselves were at war with the French at the time. But they did bring something powerful—trade.

The English had something that the Chipewyan and the Inuit and the Athapascans wanted, many things actually: rifles, metal knives and axes, wool blankets, tobacco of course, and much else. And the Indigenous had something the English wanted, most importantly furs. The result was, in modern jargon, a win-win arrangement. Trade made a hard life easier and was, therefore, more valuable than fighting. The Inuit and the Chipewyan, on the other hand, had nothing the other wanted. On the contrary, they competed for the same resources, as did the English and the French, nothing for it then but war. Trade was the great peacemaker. It allows men to gain both resources and status without violence. It had even bigger magic than the shamans—and still does.

Trade wasn't new to North America. Trade paths criss-crossed the continent long before Europeans arrived. The Copper Indians traded copper east and west from the mines visited by Hearne. Alaskan peoples traded copper, along with ivory, jade and other goods, to Siberian peoples at trading fairs on both sides of the Bering Strait, receiving objects made in Asia in exchange. At a place in northwestern Ontario the Ojibwa call Kay-Nah-Chi-Wan-Nung (place of the long rapids), not far from the headquarters of the Mississippi River, from a time before the Pharaohs built their pyramids, people were trading obsidian from Wyoming, copper from Lake Superior and shells from Florida.

Guided by the genetic impulse of reciprocal altruism, through trade we gain something of value that we cannot provide for ourselves. Our reach is extended, our chances of survival improved.

Even the hunter-gatherer man-woman relationship was founded in reciprocity: vegetable food, sex and the nurturing of children exchanged for meat, sex, support and protection. We succeeded as a species because we co-operated, gaining a strength we didn't have individually. Although we evolved to live in small bands, reciprocal altruism manifested as trade gives us the ability to extend our reach peacefully and constructively much further, to any humans anywhere in fact, breaking down barriers and enhancing the success of all of us. Some archaeologists believe it was a major factor in enabling us, alone among all hominid species, to survive.

If we think of the marketplace in terms of trade, as the simple exchange of goods and services, we envision a social construct that brings people together as equals, that encourages talk and discourages violence, that softens relationships. We envision a construct at least as much feminine as it is masculine. From pre-history to the Greeks to today, markets have been social places, relationship-based places, places to exchange not only goods but pleasantries and gossip and ideas. They are places highly amenable to women.

But there is another side to markets, or at least to economics, a greed side, a power-seeking side. We call it capitalism, and there isn't much feminine about it.

Enter the Capitalist Bull

“If you don't have an enemy, the best thing is you create one. That's the only way you can have a war.”

“What do you do when your competitor's drowning? Get a live hose and stick it in his mouth.”

Nice talk. Very congenial. And who is speaking here? For the first quote we might guess some psychopathic world leader, and who might we guess for the second—a street gang member? a Mafia boss?

In fact, the two quotes issue from neither a dictator nor a street thug. They are quotes from two of the most prominent corporate leaders of recent history, the first from Roberto Goizueta, former chief executive officer of Coca-Cola, and the second from one of the 20th century's most successful capitalists, Ray Kroc, founder of McDonald's. You can't get more bona fide corporate than a Big Mac and a Coke.

These examples may be extremes of ruthless competition, but they are also the logical end point in an economic system dedicated to insatiable acquisition. They are quintessential capitalism.

The macho nature of this marketplace, the capitalist marketplace, is further illustrated by the paucity of women at the top. Women make up almost half the workforce and a third of senior management, yet they remain rare where it counts the most, at the head of corporations, the empires of capitalism. Only about 10 per cent of corporate chief executive officers are women. According to one woman vice-president, “What upper management really means when it says it wants change is, ‘We want women to change.’ These are the money, power and sex guys. They look and act like each other to protect their stock options and bonuses.”

Capitalism, the accumulation of great wealth in an open market, has been around in one guise or another for a long time, although not nearly as long as free markets, which date well back into pre-history. Modern capitalism roared to life with the Industrial Revolution. It exploited technology to not only very nearly capture the economy entirely but to capture society entirely. It became the centre of everything, of economic life, of political life, of social life. It produced great wealth on the one hand and great misery on the other, cleaving society into two, a rift that became the central theme of philosophy and politics.

The rift arises inevitably from a system that derives not from reciprocal altruism as free markets do, but out of the male replication ethos' demand for status and the accumulation of resources. The capitalist male may express himself as an individual entrepreneur or he may bond with other males in a coalition like Chipewyan men did to make war or as chimpanzee males do to establish dominance, but either way he is serving a genetic impulse—the masculine libido—running amok in a cultural environment conducive to that end.

Market Masquerade

We might define a free marketplace as a place where relative equals meet to freely exchange goods and services to the mutual benefit of all. It consists of millions of small decisions made by all of us. The capitalist economy subsumes the traditional marketplace and overlays it with very big decisions made by small elites.

In a traditional marketplace, whether one is opening a shop or buying a product, the decision is personal, involving only buying and selling, and the effects local. In a capitalist economy, many decisions only indirectly involve buying and selling but affect thousands of people, even entire communities, decisions like firing hundreds of employees, moving production to another country, altering the environment in significant ways, replacing full-time work with part-time work, directing advertising at children, owning media, and so on. These decisions are not made by the people they affect, by employees, by customers, by citizens, but rather by small elites, by plutocrats. They are not made between equals, and often are neither freely entered into or mutually beneficial. Former Canadian Auto Workers' president Buzz Hargrove asked how equal employers and employees are when "one side hires, fires, decides who to promote or demote, chooses technology, organizes work, fixes wages and benefits, and unilaterally declares whether to expand, modernize or close workplaces?" Capitalism may contain elements of a free market but it must by its very nature exclude others.

Capitalism has imposed itself on markets and is fond of masquerading as "the market" even when it is sticking a live hose down competitors' mouths, to borrow Ray Kroc's genteel metaphor, in order to establish a monopoly, the very antithesis of a free market.

The struggle over the last 200 years to create an equitable and compassionate society generally has been largely a struggle to contain the macho forces of the capitalist economy, to balance its values with social values, against individual capitalists in the 19th century and increasingly against corporate capitalists in the 20th. The struggle has been particularly successful since the Second World War. We seemed to have stabilized capitalism, a basically unstable system, by constantly modifying it, essentially by constantly improving the distribution of wealth. With the welfare state, we seemed at last to have civilized the beast.

Yet if we had begun to think that, except for a bit of mopping up, Western history was over, we were premature. Capitalist values have slipped the leash. Globalization frees corporations from the democratic hand of the nation state, abetted by trade agreements that serve global corporations to the exclusion of the rest of us, agreements that insist that people exist to serve economies rather than economies existing to serve people and the environment. Neoliberalism beats the ideological drum, and we seem increasingly subject to what the Mexican scholar and diplomat Carlos Fuentes refers to as "economic fundamentalism," a pseudo-religion, a patriarchal religion, which promises that the capitalist market will answer our every problem.

Creeping Feminization

Al Dunlap could make the tough decisions. A legendary turnaround specialist, "Chainsaw" Al cut 35 per cent of the workforce in order to bring Scott Paper Co. into the black. At a meeting with a group of managers at Lily-Tulip Inc., Dunlap, author of a book entitled *Mean Business*, pointed at two of them and said, "You two stay—the rest of you are fired. Good-bye." He more or less summed up his philosophy with the pithy observation, "You're not in business to be liked. If you want a friend, get a dog." A pit bull, no doubt.

Living by the sword caught up to Al when he was employed at Sunbeam Corp. Sunbeam's board of directors, after months of losses and sinking stock prices, unanimously elected to fire him. He was notified in a one-minute conference call that left him, in his words, "personally, financially and professionally devastated." It is reliably reported that he had tears in his eyes as he complained to a journalist about how people were taking pleasure in his personal downsizing. His sister—he was estranged from his family—observed that he "got exactly what he deserved."

The values of Chainsaw Al made him a darling of investors (at least until those same values rose up and bit him); nonetheless, the need for those values, for machismo itself, is now being questioned.

Even as corporations swagger about globally, a creeping feminization is beginning to soften their greedy, capitalist hearts.

Leading management guru and social philosopher Charles Handy flatly declares, “Men have to learn to think like women.” By this he means that in a rapidly changing environment, executives need feminine skills like intuition, trust, empathy and the ability to juggle many tasks rather than relying on orderly process.

Handy is not alone. Nancy Adler, a specialist in international human resources at McGill University, claims that women, with their more inclusive style, tend to build broad bases of support, an approach that increases in importance as corporations flatten their structures and spread out internationally. Judith Rosener, from the University of California at Irvine, the first to argue that men and women have intrinsically different management styles, suggests that the optimum approach is a balance between a male “command-and-control” style and a female “interactive” style. She sees an advantage in diversity. Consultant Connie Glaser, author of *Swim with the Dolphins*, claims that progressive companies have discovered that workers respond better to consensus-building than to command-and-control. Ms. Glaser confidently predicts that “dolphins,” managers who adopt a feminine style, will soon replace the masculine “sharks” in top management.

Managers are being advised to develop their emotional intelligence, to express their feelings openly and empathize with employees. The direction is clear: emphasize the feminine.

The message seems to be sinking in. Management talks about flattening hierarchies and empowering the lower ranks. A team ethos seems to have largely replaced the old ethos of rugged individualism (although teams are all too often less a vehicle for inclusiveness and more another way for our guys to beat the hell out of their guys—essentially an exercise in male bonding).

In addition to the bottom line of profit, talk of the bottom lines of the environment and social responsibility has been heard. Some companies are including environmental performance reports, discussing their environmental policies, targets and accomplishments, along with their financial reports. Words like “female think,” “sustainable development,” “social audits,” and “social-value-added- indicators” have entered the lexicon. Many companies now audit their value systems as well as their books.

Mellowing the Corporation

Progress is slow, but corporations do appear to be mellowing, and not only because of advice from the gurus. Another contributor is the growth of ethical investing. Many investors are refusing to buy stock in companies with poor environmental records or poor employee relationships, or companies that sell products like tobacco or nuclear power or armaments. Some mutual funds buy shares in only those companies that meet ethical criteria. And many consumers are reluctant to buy the products of companies that mistreat workers or the environment. Consumer campaigns against corporations perceived as irresponsible have been successful in getting them to change their habits and successful also in sending a message to the corporate world generally.

The increase of women in the middle ranks is another important contributor. More important is moving them up into the top ranks, not only to the point of equality but to the point of majority, to the point of matriarchy. Here, however, progress is glacial.

In addition to enhancing feminine leadership in the corporate sector by encouraging more women and more feminine men, we must ultimately look at feminizing the structure of leadership. Masculine structures involve dominance, feminine structures involve sharing. Corporate structure is typically masculine—top-down, organization-chart structure. The CEO dominates the vice-presidents who dominate the general managers and so on down the line. A feminine management structure would be consensual. The board of directors would represent shareholder interests, but

within the corporation the structure would be thoroughly democratic. All employees would share in the choosing of supervisors and managers and in the decision-making processes. Accountability would be reversed, hierarchy replaced with collegiality. Some degree of hierarchy is necessary in large organizations, but in a feminine organization it would grow from the bottom rather than be imposed from the top.

Feminizing economics involves in large part restructuring corporations, the great power bases of modern capitalism.

A Feminine Model

In addition to reforming corporations, we might ask if there are economic institutions that are inherently feminine. Are there structures more conducive to a feminine ethos than share-holding corporations?

The answer happily is yes. The leading example is the co-operative. Whereas share-holding corporations are plutocratic, each shareholder's vote proportional to the number of shares held, co-operatives are fully democratic—one member, one vote. The Statement on Co-operative Identity, as adopted at the 1995 General Assembly of the International Co-operative Alliance, reads in its passage on values, "In the tradition of their founders, co-operative members believe in the ethical values of honesty, openness, social responsibility and caring for others." The seven principles of the movement are voluntary and open membership; democratic member control; member economic participation; autonomy and independence; education, training and information; co-operation among co-operatives; and concern for community.

These values and principles combine the feminine with the best of the masculine. They include a measure of self-reliance, but self-reliance in a nest of openness, co-operation and social responsibility. Although co-operatives are generally quite independent, as indeed their principles insist, they nonetheless work together to promote co-operative enterprise both nationally and internationally. Co-operative organizations in the developed countries work alone and with government agencies to assist co-operative development in dozens of countries in the developing world. This form of globalization is in direct contrast to the competitive, exploitive masculine globalization of capitalism. Rather than compete obsessively for market share, co-ops share resources.

Co-operation is innate to a social species. Combining our forces strengthens us all and enhances our genetic chances. Our selfish genes approve. Co-operation is ancient and almost certainly decisive in our survival as a species. Co-operative enterprise is founded in reciprocal altruism, capitalist enterprise in male status-seeking.

Modern co-operative history began in the 19th century as people looked for alternatives to the destructive individualism of capitalism. Those early efforts have since grown into a highly successful, world-wide movement with nearly every country in the world having some form of co-operative endeavour. Co-ops participate in most forms of economic activity and represent all players in the economic game with worker co-ops, producer co-ops and consumer co-ops.

Co-operatives have not completely eliminated the bugaboo of capital/labour conflict. In larger consumer and producer co-ops, member-owners, or more particularly the managers they hire, can become distanced from their employees, and the employees alienated from their management. In consumer co-ops, this is largely overcome when employees themselves become members of the co-op. With the one member/one vote rule, employee-members have exactly the same say as any other member. In worker co-ops the conflict is entirely resolved—the workers and the owners are the same people.

Co-ops are a very great improvement over capitalist organizations. They bring a more feminine style of enterprise and they do it successfully, in economic terms as well as in moral terms. They deserve the greatest support and encouragement from governments. If economic globalization were being undertaken by co-operative enterprises rather than by capitalist ones, the very real and justifiable concerns of ordinary people would be greatly relieved. In place of corporations exploiting cheap labour in the third world, and using it as a lever to reduce wages and benefits in the developed world, global investment would be committed to improving the independence and living standards of all people. The emphasis would be on development to help the less advantaged, not to exploit them.

The need for a sharing economy is particularly acute in the developing world. In Asia and Africa, women produce most of the food, yet the great majority of the hungry poor are women and children. Men, it seems, are fed first. And educated first. Most of the world's illiterate are women even though female literacy is critical to ensuring healthy, well-fed families and economic prosperity generally. Co-ops apply directly to this problem. The sharing, consensual nature of co-operative enterprise is more amenable to women than the macho, individualistic nature of competitive enterprise, particularly from the standpoint of leadership. As a result, women thrive in co-ops. Verghese Kurien, leader of India's highly successful co-operative dairy movement and winner of the United Nations' 1989 World Food Prize, observed (with a commendable lack of male prejudice) that the best run co-ops are run by women.

Copyleft

Richard Stallman, a gifted hacker of the old school, began his career when computer software was something to be developed and shared among like-minded devotees. He was outraged at the idea that proprietary software couldn't be modified, so he founded the GNU Project dedicated to developing a computer operating system free of proprietary restrictions. He invented the GNU General Public License, which allowed anyone access to a system's source code on the sole condition that modifications would be covered by the same license, i.e. would not become proprietary. The code would never become the source of billions of dollars of profit for entrepreneurs who shamelessly exploit other people's ideas. He called his concept "copyleft," as opposed to copyright.

The kernel of the system was developed by another free spirit, Linus Torvalds, at the time an undergraduate at the University of Helsinki. The new system was modified by hundreds of hackers from five continents, a kind of global co-operative, and copylefted under the GNU General Public License. Author Eric Raymond observed, "What Linus realized was that even really deep bugs are easy to solve if you have enough people looking at it, and the only way to do that is to have a community create the stuff, not a corporation." Linux is now used by millions, and Torvalds is probably the most famous hacker on the planet. Because the system is essentially free, it has great potential for bringing the third world, with its limited resources for buying computers and associated software, into the information age. Dozens of countries, including the U.S., use Linux in various departments and in their schools.

And the effort continues. Two undergraduates at the University of California at Berkeley, Spencer Kimball and Peter Mattis, decided to create a graphics program as a class project using the same open source approach. The program, called GIMP for GNU Image Manipulation Program, attracted programmers from around the world who helped develop it into a package comparable to the commercial Adobe Photoshop. Photoshop can cost hundreds dollars a year. GIMP is free and constantly improving.

These devoted and principled hackers demonstrate that commerce can thrive on sharing ideas as well as hoarding them, and on co-operation as well as competition. They are following a tradition

well-established by the Internet which was developed via global co-operation and has always depended heavily on open source software. Greed can be superfluous.

A blow against the knowledge as private property philosophy and in favour of knowledge as a public good that should be available to everyone has been struck by the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. MIT is making most of its course materials publicly available over the Internet for free.

We are told incessantly these days that we have to compete in the global marketplace. We don't. We can instead co-operate in the global society. We can co-operate with other communities to ensure a decent standard of living for everyone and we can co-operate with nature to ensure a decent standard of living for future generations.

Subversive Thoughts

We would be remiss in a discussion about restructuring the capitalist system if we didn't entertain the wicked thought of scrapping it entirely. Constantly struggling to overcome its relentless greed, its need to dominate, its divisiveness, is exhausting. We no sooner domesticate it nationally than it breaks out internationally, and we are faced with taming it all over again. What will vex us next—galactic capitalism?

We need not think apocalyptically to arrive at a solution. The communists thought apocalyptically and arrived at a solution that was worse than the problem. Perhaps the necessary change is already creeping up on us. Godless capitalism may even now be reaching its boundaries. Perhaps the growing sense of environmental and social responsibility that we have witnessed in the last half-century indicate a mutation into a more civilized form of economics, a matriarchal form.

We might imagine a world economy of feminized corporations, small businesses and co-operatives. In the words of Noam Chomsky, "The task for a modern industrial society is to achieve what is now technically realizable, namely a society which is really based on free voluntary participation of people who produce and create, live their lives freely within institutions they control, and with limited hierarchical structures, possibly none at all."

We can hope, but we should not be too optimistic. Capitalism derives from a relentless force, from the darker side of the male replication ethos—the primal lust for resources and status. And, to be fair, it is a remarkable producer of wealth.

We need to think long and hard about hurrying a replacement along, about step by step measures like those we have discussed—feminizing and democratizing corporations, encouraging co-operative enterprise a great deal more and competitive enterprise a great deal less, etc.—and keeping other ideas in reserve as well. The essential steps are more measured than revolutionary, but let us entertain also at least one radical thought.

Land and the Genetic Imperative

Our hunter-gatherer ancestors had little use for the individual ownership of land. Their interests were the resources it provided, not the land itself. Then agriculture came along, they began to settle down, and a sedentary lifestyle eventually brought about the root of great evil—the private ownership of land.

Private property is very much a masculine concept. It gives a man status, it manifests success. Like the peacock's tail, it allows him to strut, it makes him more attractive to the female, and it provides resources for his progeny and therefore prosperity for his genes. Throughout history, male

rulers of all sorts, kings, emperors, dictators, have obsessively expanded their property, with ever more land or ever more gold in Swiss banks. Continuing in this tradition, modern capitalists obsess over market share and mergers—never too many feathers in the tail. To the male, dominating property means dominating other males, even, in the case of dictators, gaining the power of life and death over them, and of course dominating other males means dominating access to the finest females.

The genetic advantage to a man of being alpha male can be spectacular. According to The Guinness Book of Records, the all-time human gene replication champion was Moulay Ismail the Bloodthirsty, last Sharifian emperor of Morocco, reputed to have produced his 700th son before he was 50. Moulay's genes must have been very proud of their replication machine. We can see why genes design men to take great risks to their lives, and show great contempt for the lives of others, for such rich reward.

Even a pre-historic man like Matonabee was quickly captured by the association between reproduction and private property once opportunity arose. To Matonabee, the finest women were not the most beautiful but the strongest. He chose mostly big, strapping women for his wives because they could carry more furs to the Hudson's Bay Company fort, thereby adding more to his wealth and his status. Land may have meant little to a nomadic hunter, but tobacco, steel knives, guns and status—above all, status—were a different matter. More wives meant more wealth and more wealth in turn meant more wives.

Publicizing Property

Matonabee's accumulation of trade goods in a vast, empty land spelled little trouble for his fellows, but once translated into the insatiable acquisition of land and property and status enabled by the agricultural revolution and exemplified by Moulay Ismail, or by any dictator marshalling his armies to conquer his neighbours, or by a capitalist busting a union to maximize his bottom line, ownership of property becomes a source of great mischief, even terrible mischief. Might we then consider doing away with private property, at least in the sense of accumulation beyond a reasonable need? Might we consider a form of democratic communism?

Communism as we have known it has been possibly the greatest failure of both ideology and governance that we have ever seen. Communism in the 20th century was dictatorial, top-down. Its leaders sought power as avidly as capitalists seek wealth. It was highly macho, utterly dependent on the cult of the strong leader and rigid hierarchy. Soviet communism attempted to run everything from the top, an approach that thwarted efficiency, oppressed creativity and treated democracy with contempt. When all power is at the centre, people tend to leave all responsibility there as well, and things fall apart.

Now consider a communism that is thoroughly democratic, a communism that is run bottom-up, that encourages participation, delights in innovation and insists on both responsibility and sharing, a communism founded on the female replication ethos and the best of the masculine, a communism that respects reciprocal altruism rather than betrays it. Such a system might be every bit as much a success as Soviet communism was a failure.

We already have models of democratic communal systems that work and work well—co-operatives. Co-ops not only operate on humane principles, they compete head-to-head with capitalist enterprises and easily hold their own. We can easily imagine a nation, or for that matter a planet, of co-operatives. This system would constitute a humane economic system, a system with an ethos of sharing rather than of accumulating. Rather than rival democratic government as global capitalism does, it would complement it.

Or, if this is too heady a thought, we might consider a return to the concept of property held by men of the Enlightenment. Jean Jacques Rousseau thought private property so important to human

dignity that he believed every man ought to own a roughly equal share of it. In his words, “No citizen shall ever be wealthy enough to buy another, and none poor enough to be forced to sell himself.” Thomas Jefferson concurred and staunchly opposed capitalism on account of what its inequality would do to participation in governance.

These men wisely saw a society where each man’s need for status was satisfied by private property but always in such a way that it contribute to equality rather than undermine it. We may need large enterprises today, but we don’t need inequitable ownership and control over them.

Eight: A Woman's Place

Number Myths

IN THE SPRING of 2016 an unusually hot, dry air mass hung in place over Northern Alberta, an area already parched after a dry fall and winter. Temperatures in the oil sands centre of Fort McMurray were setting records. On May 1st a helicopter crew spotted a fire in a remote area of forest 15 kilometres from the city. The heat abetted by strong winds turned it into a monster.

The fire marched inexorably toward the city. By late afternoon of May 4th the entire population of 88,000 souls, including surrounding communities and a First Nation, were ordered to evacuate. Crossing the main highway, the fire threatened the international airport. By now, it was creating its own weather, producing pyrocumulus clouds and lightning which threatened more fires.

The beast continued to rage and threaten further communities and oil sites, forcing further evacuations, and spreading into Saskatchewan. By the time it was brought under control in mid-June with help from other provinces and the Department of Defence, it had burned 1.5 million acres and destroyed 2,400 structures. The estimated damage of \$9.9 billion made it the costliest disaster in Canadian history.

Any decent person would see the Fort McMurray fire as nothing less than a great tragedy and, as economists are decent people, they would no doubt concur. At least until they put on their economists' hats. Then, if they are conventional economists, they would be obliged to see it as a good thing, a very good thing.

The conventional measure of a society's economic success is its Gross Domestic Product, the total value of all the goods and services produced by that society annually. It was not designed to be an all-purpose economic indicator, but that is just what it has become. Repairing the property damage done by the Fort McMurray fire cost billions, all of which added to Canada's GDP. This demonic beast was then, in conventional economic terms, a howling success.

This seems like madness, yet GDP persists as our most common measurement of economic well-being. The madness lies in the terms. The GDP is the value of all goods and services measured in terms of money. This is why housework has no value, unless it's formally paid for—hiring a maid for example. No money officially changes hands, so it doesn't enter the GDP. Volunteer work suffers the same fate. It is vital to a healthy civil society, but it is not bought and paid for and therefore remains invisible to the GDP.

One might also think that a sensible system of counting economic performance would consider negatives as well as positives, that there would be two sides to the ledger, one for the damage done by the fire, one for the reconstruction. But the fire didn't get paid for its work, therefore its destruction is not counted.

Nor is industry's drain on nature counted. Trees cut down are counted when they are sold for lumber, and later for finished products, but the cost of the loss of a forest, economically and environmentally, is ignored. Nature is not paid a nickel for her losses, so her contribution doesn't count. The GDP has no negatives, not even drafts against the environment. The planet could be sucked dry while the GDP soared merrily upward and we celebrated our success. Nor has the GDP any interest in the future even though sensible accounting would insist that depleting nature is depreciating an asset. At times it can be downright perverse. One of the growth industries in the United States in the declining decades of the 20th century was prison construction. One might think that incarcerating ever-increasing numbers of young men would represent a failure in American society, but the GDP notes the boom in expenditures and declares it a success.

The measure is intensely masculine. It counts the accumulation of material resources only, thus encouraging aggressive materialism. It praises the conquest of nature and man (war does wonderful things for GDP). It largely ignores caring work and holds little regard for environmental depletion and degradation, or quality of life itself, except in a strictly material sense. It lacks a feminine consciousness.

Feminine Accounting

More sensible, more matriarchal, measurements are required. Some economists and others are developing just such tools, tools that speak another language, a feminine language of inclusiveness and balance and sustainability in which all work is measured and nature is accorded her proper due.

New Zealander Marilyn Waring has two books, *If Women Counted* and *Three Masquerades*, and made a documentary with Canada's National Film Board, *Sex, Lies and Global Economics*, challenging current economic accounting. She wants more than wages for housewives. She wants nothing less than to "impose reality on the present system, from which will follow a total redistribution of resources. A whole new notion of value."

She is not alone with the idea of new notions of value. Various groups are calling for measures of economic activity that include human benefits and not just market indicators. Redefining Progress, a group based in San Francisco, suggested complementing the GDP with an index they called the Genuine Progress Indicator. The GPI starts with personal expenditures like the GDP but then deducts costs like crime, environmental degradation, loss of leisure time, etc., adds in non-monetary contributions like housework, volunteerism and natural resources, and adjusts also for income disparities. The GPI presents a humane picture of our economic status, not just a monetary one. Redefining Progress further suggests that our tax system should concern itself with the future by taxing waste and pollution more and productive work less. They simply don't believe that growth in the conventional GDP sense represents progress.

As Marilyn Waring points out, we need not only new indicators but new units. We need to avoid remaining in the dollar trap where ultimately everything is commodified. Perhaps hours would be one of many superior or at least alternate units for measuring economic progress. How much time do we have to properly enjoy work, leisure, family? Here is a more humane instrument.

The Fordham Institute for Innovation in Social Policy has developed an Index of Social Health for the United States which includes indicators like infant mortality, high school completion, average wages, access to health care, poverty, crime, availability of affordable housing, and so on. The ISH showed that from the early 1970s to the mid-1990s, while economic growth was positive, societal well-being declined by half. A Canadian index showed similar results. In a matriarchal society, the ISH would receive greater attention than the routinely reported GDP, Dow Jones, CPI, etc.

Economic activity exists to serve the needs of people and can exist only because of nature's largesse. Yet we often behave as if it were the other way round, that people and the environment exist to serve economic activity.

International trade agreements serve as an example. Typically, under current trade agreements, if one nation passes a law to protect the environment, another nation may challenge that law as a barrier to trade, as a subsidy. The law may then be forced to yield to the trade agreement. But if a nation lowers its environmental standards to make its products more competitive, an action that is every bit as much or more a subsidy, that cannot be challenged. Attempts to protect food safety are similarly treated, and of course maintaining low labour standards provides a competitive advantage that is quite acceptable under trade agreements. The result is the infamous race to the bottom. The cause is people serving trade, or perhaps serving the global corporations that do most of it, rather than trade serving people.

A sensible economic model means a model that puts service to people and the environment first and evaluates itself in those terms, and that means a matriarchal model.

Men's Work?

A few summers ago, my neighbours and I suffered the ordeal of work crews replacing a gas line that ran down the middle of our street. The crews dug a trench two metres deep, replaced the line, backfilled the trench, tamped the fill and paved it over. The workers were generally considerate, but our endurance was sorely tested by the chasm in the middle of the street, huge piles of earth and pipe, and an army of machines clattering about, including a tamping machine with its unique, ear-shattering rattle.

At one time, a job like this would have been carried out much more serenely, without the cacophony of heavy equipment, but it would also have been a brutal job of pick and shovel, suitable only for youngish, broad-shouldered men. On this occasion, however, the workers were by no means all young and they had no need for broad shoulders—they rarely got off their machines. A marvellous array of mechanical servants did all the heavy lifting. Even ditch-digging is now a matter of pulling levers and pushing buttons.

Despite the greatly reduced need for muscle-power, all the workers were men. Construction remains what it has always been: men's work.

Men and women have throughout history fulfilled different economic roles. The term used to describe ancient peoples—hunter-gatherers—is an economic one that assigns roles to gender. Men hunted and women gathered. Even among pseudo-ancestors like the chimps, it is the males who hunt. Hunting, not surprisingly, appeals to the more aggressive gender. Among early humans, this was particularly important because women, pregnant with or nursing big-brained babies, often would not be up to the rigours of the hunt. Good hunting skills would, therefore, make a man desirable to a woman or her guardians, offering him status and the consequent reproductive success, as indeed it did for our old friend Matonabee.

This arrangement has been powerfully reinforced by culture. Men have always jealously guarded their economic arenas against the nefarious designs of women. Hunter-gatherer males could gather food or perform some other “women's work” without social opprobrium, but male-imposed taboos often precluded women from doing “men's work,” or at least the epitome of men's work—hunting.

Women may be precluded from male vocations simply because men need these vocations to symbolize their manhood, their strength, their appeal to women. Even today, in this relatively enlightened age when so many taboos have crashed, many men feel uncomfortable, even threatened, at the presence of women in what they perceive to be the occupations of males, and they will not always easily accept women into their ranks, whereas women rarely object to and often welcome male intrusion into their domains. The divide between the two was still particularly pronounced as late as the 1950s when expectations of women extended little beyond housework which, in the curious world of neo-classical economics, wasn't appraised as economic activity at all. Pretty well everything that was valued as economic, except for a few female job ghettos like nursing, secretarial and elementary school teaching, was the domain of men. And even in fields like teaching, where women made up the bulk of the work force, they were usually subordinate to superior positions held by men.

Traditional barriers to women are rapidly breaking down; technology alone has rendered much work more gender neutral; nonetheless, we retain ghettos of “men's work” and “women's work.” Many women are becoming doctors, few are becoming mechanics, and those who go into medicine tend toward branches of the profession that involve children and families while avoiding the surgical specialties. Caring professions, including school teaching and nursing, continue to have

disproportionately high numbers of women. Men tend to predominate in technical fields such as construction and computers, and in authoritative, potentially violent professions like the police and the military, and of course in the rough-and-tumble arenas of politics and corporate business.

Goals and Rewards

Economic gender roles arise partly from tradition and prejudice, but also from very real gender differences. Men and women are, on average, not only tailored differently physically in their suitability for different tasks—e.g. the stereotypically broad-shouldered male ditch digger—but mentally as well. We think and feel differently.

Men, dominated by the male replication ethos, drift into work that manifests strength, offers control, or provides competition, work more concerned with symbolism and possessions. Women drift into work that involves nurturing, sharing and consensus, work more concerned with relationships and intimacy.

Culture then complements nature. If a profession is innately masculine, it will tend to add trappings and develop traditions that emphasize its masculinity even further. The military serves as an excellent example. A heavily masculine line of work, it has hardened its hierarchy, exaggerated its pomp and ceremony, and emphasized its male bonding to the point where it has become a macho caricature.

And what about the glass ceilings that women bump into? Do they exist because men, as has been their wont, are protecting their prerogatives? To some degree this is no doubt the case, but women are also dissuaded from climbing the corporate ladder because of its macho nature. They are often uncomfortable in the ambiance of corporate ambition. Corporations are about more than the marketplace; they are about size, about acquisition, about status, about power. And women just don't have the same lust for status and power.

Even the communication styles of women disadvantage them. Men talk to establish their individuality and to compete, women to seek rapport. Women's more consensual speech patterns, including the tendency to listen as much as they talk, not only puts them at a disadvantage when conversing with aggressive men but creates the impression that they are indecisive and lack authority. Corporations may be softening in the face of feminine influence; nonetheless, upper management remains a male, workaholic domain.

Too much so for many women. Many leave the corporate sector to create their own businesses, partly, according to Beth Milwid in *Working with Men*, because of their "disdain for a world dominated by power, ego and competition." The highly charged masculine atmosphere is uncomfortable for a feminine sensitivity. It is even bad for women's health: macho men flourish in this testosterone-bathed world while women suffer from stress.

Always underlying the ambitions of men and women are the insistent if subconscious influences of the replication ethos. Corporate structure appeals to men because it lays out a path for success in terms of status and the control of large resources, and these are of the very greatest importance to men. They make men attractive to women. They are a genetic imperative. But not for women. Men prefer women first for their youth and beauty, and women cannot gain these by climbing the corporate ladder of success. They become no more attractive to men and, more importantly, from the perspective of their increasingly elevated status, they find fewer and fewer men as successful as they and therefore fewer and fewer men worthy of their consideration. As a result, far fewer successful women than men are married and far more are childless.

In terms of the instinctive drives of replication, hierarchal success for a man is appealing to both men and women. Hierarchal success for a woman has little appeal to men and actually reduces women's choice of suitable mates.

And Women's Work

None of this is to suggest that women cannot manage successfully in a masculine atmosphere. They can and do. No doubt some of the women who climb the peaks of the corporate hierarchy are masculine women and can be expected to thrive in a macho atmosphere, but by no means all are, any more than all the women who achieve success in politics are Margaret Thatchers. Given an opportunity, women can more than hold their own. An American study reported that women managers performed better than men in 28 of 31 categories, including maintaining high productivity, generating ideas, meeting deadlines, problem-solving and, of course, intuitive skills. *Entrepreneur* magazine reports that more daughters are succeeding their fathers as heads of family businesses, partly because they are more patient and more willing to work with their fathers than sons are. Fathers are recognizing first-hand that women manage as well or better than men.

Women are particularly excelling in starting their own businesses. As women yearn to develop skills and ideas that they feel go unappreciated in a corporate atmosphere, they increasingly head off on their own. They may have difficulty shattering the glass ceilings of the corporate sector, but they are succeeding wonderfully in small business. Most small businesses in Canada are now owned or co-owned by women—an emerging matriarchy.

Women can create their own atmosphere, their own culture, in their own businesses, a culture that we might expect to be less hierarchal, more consensual, more family-friendly, a culture with more emphasis on relationships and on process over ends—in a word, more feminine. This is a culture where women might not feel that taking time off to have a baby would harm their career as many do in corporate culture. Women are inclined to consider success more broadly, including family and other relationships, not just money and power. As Paula Brook, author of *Work Less, Live More, A Woman's Guide*, observes, “To a growing number of women, equality is not about measuring themselves against the same yardstick as men. It's about making a new yardstick.” Precisely.

Women have, of course, despite the burdens of birthing and nursing babies, and all the prejudices levelled against them, been major contributors to economies since the earliest times. Among many hunter-gatherer groups, women gathered not only most of the bands' food but most of the protein. Women's status was much higher in such groups than it was in societies like the Chipewyan, largely because hunting was less important. Women continued to be pillars of the economy as hunting-gathering gave way to agriculture. Today, in the agricultural societies of Africa and Asia, most food is produced by women.

Toward Genderless Job Markets

Despite the growing importance of women in the workplace, intrinsic differences between the sexes means job ghettos will persist. Two concerns will, therefore, also persist: achieving equal opportunity and achieving equal compensation.

We must ensure, in a matriarchal society, that every citizen is able to fulfill his or her potential and make his or her contribution to society. Gender should not stand in the way. If a macho woman wants to fly a fighter plane or operate a bulldozer, the fact that most of the workers in those areas are men should not be used as an excuse to keep her out. Nor should a feminine man be discouraged from nursing or teaching because most nurses and teachers are women. Because of the need to feminize some areas, we may need more than an equal opportunity—leadership in both government and business come immediately to mind. In these cases, we need preeminence of the female replication ethos if we are to move toward a matriarchal society, so affirmative action is called for, at least until we have a truly level playing field between the feminine and the masculine.

Affirmative action means more than simply increasing the number of women in workplaces, it means feminizing work. It means measures like daycare and early childhood education, sensible and flexible hours of work that accommodate family needs, generous maternal and paternal leave—measures that tend to tie work and home together.

Good day care is essential. While many male executives have non-working wives to provide a complete support system at home, few women do, most having to maintain the work front and at least half the home front as well.

Often in workplaces, those who work long hours and ignore their families are rewarded while those who take time out for family are penalized. The poverty of women in their old age is directly related to how long they stay home to take care of children. We have to no small degree an economic system that turns child-rearing into a punishment.

To create real equality of opportunity for promotion, we have to overcome the prejudices against feminine candidates intrinsic in a masculine hierarchy. The European Court of Justice, in a ruling on an affirmative action law in Germany, observed, “Where a promotion is involved, men tend to be chosen in preference to women, since they benefit from deep-rooted prejudices and from stereotypes.” Peter Hanau, of the University of Cologne’s Research Institute for Social Rights, noted that, “The idea of equal opportunity in Germany used to be based on a blindness to sexual differences. Today it is about recognizing the difference and acting on that basis. It is about real, not formal, equality.” Providing women, and feminine men, with equality requires recognizing the intrinsic masculine need to dominate and neutralizing it.

The Bottom Line

When it comes to equal compensation, the waters muddy. A just system of compensation would concern itself with values—equal reward for work of equal value—but values are elusive, and the system we tend to rely on to determine reward, the market system, particularly its capitalist manifestation, doesn’t necessarily appeal to the most enlightened ones. Its leading value, competition, is masculine. Competition is fine when we are buying oranges or shoes but not so fine when we are rewarding people. Employees are citizens, not products, not “resources” or “skill sets.” The market would leave reward to the omniscient guidance of Adam Smith’s “invisible hand”; unfortunately, when it comes to relating reward to value, the guiding hand is often very invisible indeed.

Technology alone can circumvent market theory. Professional athletes are paid extraordinary salaries because through the miracle of television they can perform their services for millions of people at the same time. If a waitress could wait on millions of tables simultaneously, she too could command a seven or eight-figure income.

The market can also be outwitted by organization. Those workers that organize themselves into professional associations or labour unions find that they are much better compensated when they stand united, and the market be damned. Those workers who are more aggressive in organizing and more aggressive in exercising their collective power are rewarded much more generously than those who aren’t. And we all know which gender is the most aggressive. When bus drivers are better paid than child care workers, it isn’t because society values their service more highly, or that the supply of bus drivers is less and the demand higher; it means that they are better organized and more militant in making their demands. It also suggests that they are mostly men and child care workers mostly women.

The ultimate example of pay inequity is housework, a job traditionally done by women. Even though it is hard work and makes an enormous contribution to the economy, the market accords it no reward at all. Masculine work is often better rewarded for no other reason than the masculine is, by its very nature, more aggressive in insisting on its due.

If this is unjust, the market couldn't care less. It doesn't concern itself with fair play or, for that matter, any moral concept. If we feel that moral values have a place in determining rewards for work, then we must impose them on the market. We must resort to government fiat if necessary to at least provide equal pay for work of equal market value and possibly for work of equal moral value also.

Slow progress is being made as various jurisdictions make pay equity the law. The Canadian Human Rights Act reads, "It is a discriminatory practice for an employer to establish or maintain differences in wages between male and female employees employed in the same establishment who are performing work of equal value." The important point here is that equality applies to comparable jobs, not just within the same job. The next step may be to apply the concept between establishments as well.

Even housework is starting to get its due. Statistics Canada now includes in its labour force measurements some of the unpaid work done in the home involving care for children and elders.

Governments are beginning to contribute to feminine restructuring of the system through both legislation and example, as they should. So, too, are other institutions. Labour unions, for example, have been particularly successful in improving the lot of women. Prior to unionization, nursing and school teaching were low-paid, patronized professions; today they are well-paid, powerful professions, and nobody patronizes them anymore. Not only do unionized women make substantially more money than non-unionized women, but they make wages much closer to those of their male colleagues. The growth of female membership has been remarkable to the point where over half of union members are now women. Their presence has changed the culture of the labour movement, expanding its focus to include such issues as child care and sexual harassment.

The workplace is slowly but surely becoming, as it should and must be, a woman's place.

Nine: Science Fictions

Boys' Toys

The male is motivated by toys and science because men are born with no purpose in the universe except to procreate. There is lots of time to kill beyond that. They've got to find work.

SCIENCE FICTION GRAND master Ray Bradbury's judgment may be as harsh as it is humorous, yet it contains a great deal of truth. His genes would certainly agree with his view of male purpose. Bradbury went on to say, "Men read science fiction to build the future. Women don't need to read it. They are the future." This too contains no small measure of truth. Science, not just science fiction, and technology as well, often seem to be predominantly masculine playthings.

Two seminal events in human history suggest that technology, perhaps more than any other cultural overlay, more even than politics or religion, can change the course of human history. First, the Agricultural Revolution, and second, the Industrial Revolution, both of which, with their great capacity to consolidate resources and status, performed useful service for patriarchy.

The invention of agriculture might seem to have been a feminine event. It settled humankind down and eliminated the need for hunting and all the macho mystique associated with it. The macho was not, however, to be easily dispensed with. Quite the contrary. The Agricultural Revolution eventually brought about the development of large, complex societies, and with large societies came the need for hierarchal rule, the domain of the masculine. It also brought about the potential for scale. Alpha males who wanted to expand their status and resources could build empires. Agriculture provided both the wealth to support such enterprises and the spare time to carry them out. As Bradbury suggests, men had time to kill.

The domestication of nature also provided the tools, everything from the horse, a splendid war machine, to iron weapons. With all the means for the aggrandizement of the male replication ethos readily at hand, patriarchy gained absolute control and persisted for millennia.

Eventually new worlds of rationality, including science, emerged, and as the 18th century turned into the 19th, a whole new world of technology, heralding the greatest revolution since the invention of agriculture, created a new way of life. This, too, glorified and advanced the male ethos. Capitalism, always alert to opportunity, took first advantage, and capitalism is supremely masculine.

The old hierarchy was undone. Money cares not a whit for rank; a poor aristocrat is no more than a beggar next to a rich commoner. Capitalism, with its ally consumerism, levelled the notions of hierarchy based on religion and rank and produced its own aristocracy, one based on wealth. The new technology, rampant in its progress, both creates and serves this new aristocracy, this new patriarchy.

Mine's Bigger than Yours

In Jane Jacobs' masterpiece *The Death and Life of Great American Cities*, she talks about Le Corbusier's Radiant City concept for reforming and transforming urban life. The idea was robust: cities that were utopias of "majestic skyscrapers" surrounded by public buildings and expansive areas of green space. "The whole city," enthused the famous architect, "is a park." Projects inspired by Le Corbusier were constructed throughout North America, including many public housing projects for the poor. Older slums were torn down and their inhabitants moved into "radiant cities." A grand idea that often produced grand failures.

The projects not only broke up established communities, but they isolated people from the amenities of urban life: work, shopping, entertainment, etc. They became traps. The older communities may have been rundown, but they were truly communities and they were complete. They had a variety of activities and a variety of people. The radiant city residents were all tenants and often all from the same social class—the poor. Many of the massive projects quickly deteriorated into ghettos, worse than the slums they were meant to replace.

Architecture has long been a fertile arena for the male ego, from the soaring spires of the Middle Age's gothic cathedrals, masterful statements of the glory and power of a masculine church serving a masculine god, to modern skyscrapers. Real estate developer William Zeckendorf described his Place Ville Marie as “our great masculine building standing up against the Montreal skyline like a man surrounded by boys.” In due course, Place Ville Marie became a boy among men itself as even taller towers sprung up around it. When the Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce heard that its rival the Royal Bank of Canada would headquarter itself in Zeckendorf's new building, it began building an even taller tower just down the street. When the CIBC finished its building, Zeckendorf announced that Place Ville Marie would add three more floors.

Nor is skyscraper envy the only source of overwhelming architecture. Massive suburbs composed of patterns of nearly identical housing units have come to dominate the urban landscape. Architect George M. Popper claims, “The suburban home of the sixties and seventies represents the triumph of the individual at the expense of the community.” Robert Kaplan, writing in *The Atlantic Monthly*, observes about Tucson, Arizona, “While Tucson becomes increasingly connected to the outside world through immigration and electronic communications, its people are increasingly isolated from one another, the houses farther and farther apart, the public spaces empty.”

Massive structures like hydropower dams and freeways have also fed the libido of macho design. And they, too, have notoriously assaulted communities, both environmental and civic.

Many of the most important technological breakthroughs have occurred in the service of violence, from the invention of the bow and arrow to the domestication of the horse to the development of nuclear power. During the Cold War, this abuse of science and technology resulted in a macho shop of horrors as the two greatest powers on earth focused most of their research on methods of destruction that now threaten our entire species.

The Masculine Mystique

The brute nature of so much technology arises largely because patriarchy has jealously kept anything of importance within the male purview, including technology and its mentor, science. Women, the principal agents of the feminine ethos, have for millennia been sequestered from the halls of influence.

Science and technology also seem to have a certain intrinsically masculine air about them. We see science as a solitary pursuit, at odds with the more communal sense of the feminine. It deals with things rather than relationships, and things are much easier to control. It even represents, in an odd way, a method of procreating without women, a way of passing on something of oneself without the messiness of sex, a kind of womb envy.

Early Chinese science saw nature as something nurturing to be lived in harmony with and truth something that emerged from synthesis, but Western science, rooted in the Greek idea that truth emerged from opposition, and grounded in a medieval priestly culture of celibacy, misogyny and isolation, saw nature as something quite different. The father of empirical science, Francis Bacon, referring to nature, called upon men to “bind her to your service and make her your slave ... conquer and subdue her ... shake her to her foundations.”

Aside from its predilection for control, the male brain may have certain traits, such as a more finely honed spatial ability, that are conducive to the practice of the physical sciences and technology. Men's tendency to left-brain thinking may give them an advantage in the logic of science. On the other hand, we would expect women's right-brain thinking to give them an advantage in the intuitiveness of it, but the feminine ethos has largely been excluded in determining the directions that science and technology, and material progress generally, take.

Joseph Glanvill, an early promoter of the Royal Society of London, warned against the influence of the feminine: "The Woman in us, still prosecutes a deceit, like that begun in the Garden; and our Understandings are wedded to an Eve, as fatal as the Mother of our miseries."

The Not So Invisible Hand

As science and technology have faithfully served other macho institutions so, too, have they faithfully served capitalism. Indeed we might fairly say that technology created modern capitalism.

The free market offers us a great range of choices, choices we make as individuals, not as a community. At one time, both sellers and buyers were individuals, intimately connected, but now the sellers are more often than not large corporations, indeed global corporations, while the buyers are still individuals, isolated in their decision-making. The individual only sees the end-products of choices made by corporations, and by scientists and engineers who are in the service of corporations. Decisions about what products will be produced, and therefore where technology will take us, and increasingly where science, too, will go, are largely in the hands of capitalists. Decisions are made on the bases of accumulation and of domination, of market share. And if demand for the products resulting from those decisions is insufficient, then more demand is created through advertising. Few societies in history have been as propagandized as ours are today, not in a theological or political ideology, but in the ideology of consumerism.

Corporations thrive mightily. They merge and globalize into entities bigger than countries. They sponge up power formerly in the hands of nation states, replacing the democratic with the plutocratic. Great change takes place, but it is not in the hands of citizens. Citizens are fobbed off with mantras: "we must compete in the global marketplace," "embrace change," "grow or die," "there is no alternative." And some do adapt and prosper—a minority, the technically sophisticated and well-educated—the rest barely hold their own or slip behind.

Even pure science increasingly becomes a tool of capitalism. As government budgets shrink, universities become increasingly dependent on corporate largesse and their research shifts away from the pure toward the applied and the profitable. Patents and royalties from products developed by the private sector from ideas generated at universities yield lucrative substitutes for government funding. Governments collaborate by linking funding to post-secondary institutions' success in luring private sector support. This may be all very helpful for cash-strapped universities, but it raises the questions of who's in charge and whose values prevail. When universities seek clients and sell ideas as products, a major philosophical shift has occurred. The role of the university as a place of independent inquiry serving the whole community blurs into the role of an entrepreneur serving the corporate sector.

We need at least one sanctuary where feminine research can hold its own with the masculine. Can a partner of the corporate sector do that? Can a school of management heavily funded by industry study bioeconomics as readily as neo-classical economics? Will agricultural scientists do research on organic farming if the big research grants come from chemical companies? Can the humanities hope to compete with hard sciences whose studies are partnered by wealthy corporations? Probably not. Capitalist values are waxing and social values waning on our campuses. The university is betraying its trust. When university research is driven largely by business interests, the expansion of our knowledge is not shaped by an impartial search for the truth, nor by social need, nor by

democratic and feminine forces, but by commercial forces, by the search for profit. Society is shifted in the direction the corporate sector wants it to go, not necessarily the way its citizens want it to go.

King Ludd Had a Point

Early in the Industrial Revolution, the English authorities were kept busy for a time dealing with a unique group of miscreants whose crime was breaking machines. As punishment, some were flogged, some jailed, some transported to Australia, some hanged, in keeping with the severe view of law and order that prevailed at the time.

The villains were Luddites, groups of weavers who, seeing their jobs usurped by power looms, attacked the machines and destroyed them. They rioted under the name of King Ludd or General Ludd, a character identified variously as a lunatic who broke into a house in an insane rage and destroyed two knitting machines, a village idiot named Ned Ludd, or a youth named Ludlum who destroyed a weaving machine that his father had told him to fix.

Today, we dismiss the Luddites as benighted fellows incapable of dealing with change, but there's rather more to their story. They were distraught not only about their loss of work but about the loss of their way of life, about being transformed from craftsmen plying their skills into automatons serving machines, and possibly about being replaced by women and children at a fraction of their wages. They had no say in all this change even though it was overwhelming them. No matter, the law put an end to the Luddites' politics by vandalism and they passed into history.

Today, we are far too appreciative of the prosperity that technology brings to go about smashing its machines. We are, however, still confounded by how science and technology change our way of life.

Aside from the social and environmental effects of technology, the rate of technological change is in itself so rapid, so aggressive, we don't have time to reflect on those effects, to assess whether they are taking us where we want to go. We raced willy-nilly into the "information age," driven by the silicon chip and the personal computer. These technological darlings have brought us the wonderful ability to communicate cheaply and instantaneously around the globe. They can create nice, gossipy, informed communities without regard to distance, yet overall the information age seems to be more anti-social than social. Workplace stress runs rampant, social programs have been undermined, the gap between the rich and the poor grows, we see more poverty, more homelessness.

We even tend to evaluate our success as a society more by our technological, or at least material, progress than by our social progress, in essence more by our masculine than by our feminine. We are obsessed with efficiency at the expense of reflection. Warned incessantly that we must adapt to technological change or be left behind, we hardly have time to ask if the machines are still serving us or if we are now serving them, or their masters.

We might be well advised to put the brake on technological change, certainly on its market imperative at least, slow down, and ensure that feminine values can at least keep pace with masculine values. Even the founder of cybernetics, American mathematician Norbert Wiener, appealed for a slower pace of automation.

We might remind ourselves that our modern healthy way of life was brought about by only four technological advances—clean water, effective sewage disposal, good nutrition and immunization—and only one of these is hi-tech. Throw in literacy and the mass media to satisfy democracy's need for good communications and we realize that most technology may be nice to have but isn't necessary for a healthy democratic society. We might also keep in mind that technology may advance ever more rapidly, and information pile up even faster, but our intellectual capacity, to say

nothing of our wisdom, to handle it remains pretty much the same. More technology fleshes out our material way of life but it imposes no need to proceed with change at more than a leisurely, non-disruptive pace. The rat race mantra “embrace change” is masochistic.

A caution comes from the heart of modern technology itself, the computer industry. Sun Microsystems’ chief scientist, Bill Joy, expressed profound concern about where areas of rapid change such as robotics and genetics are taking us. He points out that technologies in these areas, unlike inventions of the past, could be self-replicating. “It is no exaggeration to say we are on the cusp of the further perfection of extreme evil,” he warns, “We are being propelled into this new century with no plan, no control, no brakes ... The last chance to assert control—the fail-safe point—is rapidly approaching.”

More recently a statement signed by industry leaders and researchers in Artificial Intelligence warned, “Mitigating the risk of extinction from A.I. should be a global priority alongside other societal-scale risks, such as pandemics and nuclear war.”

Small Is Beautiful

In contrast to Le Corbusier’s macho fantasies of “radiant cities,” we have Jane Jacobs’ concept of an architecture of human scale and variety which makes inner-cities the most livable of places. Neighbourhoods with a variety of people, a mix of renters and owners, rich and poor and a middle class to provide leadership; with places that offer a range of amenities—barber shops, dry cleaners, cafes, grocery stores, small parks, movie theatres—to keep the streets lively and safe; with a variety of human-scale buildings to house the people and their services.

Rather than obliterating slums and imposing grand paternalistic designs, probably the best approach is to involve the residents of older neighbourhoods, where community already exists, in simply upgrading those neighbourhoods. The happiest result will be achieved through a feminine sharing of space rather than a masculine conquest of space, in keeping with E. F. Schumacher’s dictum that beauty is to be found in the smaller scale. When it came to science and technology, he praised the small scale and the sustainable. Interconnectedness, Jane Jacobs might have added, is beautiful too.

Small scale, people-sized and people-centred, sustainable. Feminine science and technology, a science and technology that emphasizes caring over quantity, sharing over acquisition, social values over capitalist values, co-operation over competition, consensus over imposition. Healthy people, healthy communities and healthy environments over bigger freeways, bigger vehicles and bigger buildings. Here is the science and technology to let King Ludd rest in peace.

A fine example is Canadian physicist Ursula Franklin’s study of strontium-90 in babies’ teeth. Twenty thousand Voice of Women members across Canada collected their babies’ teeth for analysis. The study, a delightful marriage of social activity and science, was sufficiently conclusive that it contributed to the U.S. government’s termination of atmospheric nuclear testing. This research contrasts vividly to the masculine research of testing nuclear devices. Yet work like Franklin’s lacks emphasis in the commercial environment that dominates science and technology.

Under the commercial regime, technology seems to be a tyrant. It creates imperatives to which we must respond. Like competing in the global marketplace, there is no alternative. We are like amoebae; we swim in an environment in which we can only react to stimuli but which we can never control. Yet this is true only to the extent that we allow it to be. We live in democracies; we are the masters if we choose to be, and technology our servant. We can allow the macho men of commerce, acting in their own best interests, to be its master or we can bring it into the decision-making purview of ordinary people, into the province of democracy. Indeed, democratization is the first step toward the de-patriarching of science and technology, toward creating a feminine science and technology.

We can, if we insist, involve ourselves not only in end-products but in the overall direction science and technology take. We can decide as a society how we want science and technology to serve us and demand that it do so.

We might ask questions of change. Do we want technology that builds global corporations or that builds self-reliant communities? Do we want technology that serves materialism or that serves social needs and environmental sustainability? Do we want workplaces designed for efficiently producing ever more stuff or for pleasant, satisfying work? Rather than always asking how to improve products, why not ask how to improve the work that goes into them? Why not research to develop new forms of work that are highly satisfying? These are all quite properly communal concerns, democratic concerns. They are also nurturing, feminine concerns.

The Public Voice

We are by no means without communal influence on technological development. For example, major projects that affect the environment are now routinely subjected to public hearings.

A classic example was the MacKenzie Valley Pipeline Inquiry, led by former British Columbia Supreme Court justice Thomas Berger. The inquiry was a remarkable grass-roots exercise in public input to a major technical project. Berger listened to hundreds of Native people who would be affected by the proposed pipeline, visiting them in their own villages. Formal hearings were held as well for other interested parties. The inquiry's report, *Northern Frontier, Northern Homeland*, became the Canadian government's best-selling book ever. Royal commissions like Berger's are a useful tool for bringing expert opinion and public views to bear on questions of technological change.

We would be well advised to extend our concerns about technology's affect on the environment into its affect on our social and political life. In *Democracy and Technology*, Richard Sclove suggests "a law requiring corporations and government agencies to publicly file a succinct Social and Political Impact Statement prior to introducing or importing a significant technological innovation." The statement would be based on the environmental impact assessments now commonly required. He suggests further that potentially affected citizens, interpreted broadly, be empanelled to help prepare or oversee the preparation of an SPIS, and that if the basis for predicting the consequences is weak, social trials could be conducted.

The latter would be rather like market research—a tool developed to determine a technology's market value would now be used to determine its social value. Those technologies showing high social values could be encouraged, others discouraged.

Just as legal requirements for environmental assessments of major projects have given the public a direct voice, government initiatives in various areas have historically directed technology toward broad social objectives. Governments have funded research in agriculture, defence, forestry, fisheries and the environment, for economic reasons and for the preservation of heritage. Government subsidies have also pushed industries in desired directions, and the universities have been provided what independence they have by the public purse.

Citizen Science

The trend we discussed earlier toward increasing corporate participation in university research is not encouraging. Society should be increasing its say in corporate research, not the corporate sector increasing its say in public research. The community is losing ground.

The Europeans have recognized this in a way we have not. In the Netherlands, universities involve the public in research through “science shops” which accept for study requests from public interest groups and unions. Approval of a request requires that the group not be commercially motivated, be able to apply the results and be unable to afford the research on its own, although some shops accept requests from groups that can afford to contribute to the research as long as the requests are socially motivated. Much of the work is done by students as part of their normal workloads, so costs are minimized. Of the greatest importance, citizens are involved not only in reacting to new science and technology but more importantly, directing new science and technology. Other European countries are copying the Dutch example.

In Sweden, research in emerging areas is funded by the Council for Planning and Coordination of Research. The council, made up of six scientists, five legislators, three labour representatives, one employer representative, and three members at large, was designed to give the public influence over national research priorities.

The Board of Technology in Denmark appoints panels of ordinary citizens to attend conferences on new technologies. The panels question experts, deliberate among themselves and report their conclusions, which are widely publicized by the board. The Netherlands and the United Kingdom have adopted the idea, and the European Union is considering it. The Danish model is enticingly similar to the concept of citizen assemblies that we discussed in Chapter 6, differing only in that the panels are selected by a government body rather than randomly. Add random selection to the Danish approach and we have, in yet another arena, society in microcosm doing what it ought to be doing, making the decisions that affect its future.

Citizen assemblies hold great promise for determining our technological future. They would help bring about consensual change. A citizen assembly could, for example, consider the direction we want to go with energy. How do we want to encourage any changes? With tax incentives? Subsidies? Or mandate energy companies to move research, development and production in the appropriate direction, like some jurisdictions have so successfully done with automobile emissions?

All these questions need not be answered by one assembly but could be built on by a series of assemblies. If the assembly recommendations were binding on both government and industry, we could ensure that technology changed in directions the community wanted, not in directions determined by special interests, especially not those interests with very deep pockets whose sole objective is to make them deeper.

We cannot predict all the results of new technologies. We are not prophets. Even the inventors of technology often have very little idea where their inventions will lead. Nor do we want to be constantly looking over researchers’ shoulders. Nor do we want to suppress the masculine curiosity about how things work. But we do want science, most particularly applied science and technology, moving in directions broadly determined by public deliberation. We cannot foresee everywhere new technologies might lead, but if we don’t set the general directions, we can be sure that they will serve masters whose interests may or may not be those of the community. At the very least, if we bring technology under community control, we will be better aware of what it is doing to us and be in a position to discuss, debate and change its direction.

A Feminine Conclusion

Part of feminizing science and technology is democratizing it, sharing the decision-making, and part also is bringing more, many more, women into it. It has long been the domain of men and therefore of the masculine ethos. Feminists, sensitive to the nuances of a masculine prejudice, intuitively understand this. In her essay “Letter to a Graduate Student,” Ursula Franklin wrote, “As a feminist, you are less vulnerable than young women who have no understanding of the social and political structures of science and technology, and who might still fall for the myth of the

objectivity and neutrality of science and technology,” illustrating as she writes that research has always been a matter of politics and philosophy as much as science.

Only a feminine-driven science and technology will create the political and philosophical culture necessary for post-patriarchal research and development. We are not concerned with discouraging masculine skills, number and spatial skills for example; we are concerned with harnessing them with feminine skills, skills of language and relationships, for socially constructive purposes, for a world after patriarchy. In the last chapter we saw, in the development of the Linux computer operating system, a nice balance between the masculine traits of independence, curiosity and a facility with machinery and the feminine traits of co-operation and sharing, a balance that defeated greed in favour of community.

Science and technology have served patriarchy in the past. The birth control pill freed women from the dictates of biology and helped undo patriarchy in the process. The caring areas have witnessed enormous progress. Scientific and technological developments in hygiene, nutrition and health care have greatly increased people’s well-being and longevity. Scientific evaluation of our effect on the environment is giving us critical in-sight into our responsibilities in this realm. These are the directions in which patriarchy leads science and technology, toward the well-being of all of us and of our planet. And given the now-apocalyptic threat of masculine technology, these are the directions in which we must go.

Technology allows us to produce enough wealth to ensure everyone a decent standard of living, and we are grateful; now it’s time to turn it away from the service of competition and militarism toward the service of sharing, equality, compassion, pleasant work, peace, democracy and a healthy environment. In E. F. Schumacher’s words, “Wisdom demands a new orientation of science and technology towards the organic, the gentle, the non-violent, the elegant and the beautiful.” If science and technology are not so oriented, they would no longer seem to serve much purpose.

***Ten:* The Golden Rule**

The Good Gene ... and the Bad

Whatsoever thou wouldst that men should not do to thee, do not do that to them. This is the whole law. The rest is only explanation.

THUS PRONOUNCED HILLEL Ha-Babli circa 30 BC. The good rabbi was stating the golden rule, versions of which have been expressed throughout the millennia, by wise men from Confucius and earlier to Muhammad and later.

The golden rule is simply a theological version of reciprocal altruism—sound, ancient, genetic. Rabbi Hillel and his fellow sages were anticipating the discoveries of modern biology, in particular those of the great biologist Robert Trivers whose contribution was to explain from the heights of science that the golden rule is embedded in our genes.

Genes that caused us to be kind to each other, to be generous, to co-operate, were selected for because they made us more effective replicators of those and our other genes. Thus we are made moral.

But here a problem arises. What if a mutated gene, call it a cheater gene, were to produce an individual who exploited this goodness, who took but never gave? Wouldn't the cheater gain an advantage? Wouldn't he accumulate resources at the expense of others, thereby prospering at the expense of others, thereby replicating his genes at the expense of others?

He would and he does. Cheaters of all kinds saturate society and often prosper. The cheater gene provides an advantage, but so does the reciprocal altruism gene, so the two battle constantly for our hearts and minds.

As with many evolutionary struggles, like the classic struggle between prey and predator, at some point a tenuous balance is reached. The human population has, therefore, a mix of cheaters, honest individuals, and everything in between. The result is highly complex as cheaters evolve traits that better help them cheat (con men are notoriously charming) and honest people evolve traits that better enable them to detect cheating so as not to waste their resources. All of us are part cheater and part honest, varying only by degree. Human society is a dance between cheating and honesty in which we all participate, most of us usually honest but all of us, except for saints, sometimes slipping into deceit. We constantly evaluate and judge each other as to usefulness and reliability, most of the evaluation and judgment going on subconsciously under the subterranean control of genetic imperative.

But none of us like to be deceived, so we defend ourselves. One way is through social disapproval. We respect the honest person, the “good” person, and scorn the cheater, the “bad” person. We reward the “good” person by offering status and punish the “bad” person by withdrawing it, or worse.

Most importantly, we make rules, rules of law and rules of theology. We will discuss rules of law, rules dealing principally with the reciprocal altruism/cheater dilemma, in the next chapter; here we will ponder theology, where metaphysical concerns intrude upon the dilemma.

Blood and Sacrifice

In my early teens, behaving for once as a dutiful if somewhat surly son, I heeded the wishes of my mother and was confirmed into the Anglican Church. I remember as part of the ceremony my

fellow initiates and I consuming the body and blood of Christ, not real flesh and blood of course, just a thin, tasteless wafer and a parsimoniously small draft of wine, but symbolically we were indeed dining off the body of our Lord. We were partaking of the ancient rite of sacrifice.

Our bloodless ritual lacked the enthusiasm that attended sacrifice in olden times. The Aztecs, for example, would cut out the hearts of thousands of human victims to consecrate a new temple or to celebrate the ascension of a new king. Sacrifices in the valley of Mexico might go on for days, the priests flaying victims, eating their flesh and wearing their skins. The conquering Spanish were horrified at these practices, and the Aztecs were horrified in turn by the quaint Spanish practice of burning people alive. Aztec society was obliged to wage continuous war in order to capture enough sacrifices to keep their gods in the proper frame of mind. Warfare was a close companion of these mythologies. The Aztecs were extreme although by no means alone in their brutality; however, other civilizations were more economical with human life, keeping human sacrifice to a minimum, often substituting the blood of lesser species for that of their own, a practice not unknown today.

Because we are a species with self-consciousness and imagination, we concern ourselves not only with the behaviour of our fellows but also with the behaviour of the larger elements. Why have the herds not come to give us food and skins? Why has the rain not fallen to nourish our crops? Why must we be taken from our loved ones in death? What is the purpose of all this anyway?

Guided by instinctive reciprocal altruism, we feel that someone, something, must be making deals with us. Some great spirit, some god, or gods, must decide upon these matters, and if it or they are deciding against us, then we must not be holding up our end of the bargain. If only we offer up the right behaviour, the proper respect, some material goods perhaps, or even our finest virginal young women, the almighty will be content, and will take care of us in this life and the next. We have been very much involved in reciprocity with gods no less than with each other. Gods are capable of great generosity, but they can be demanding of great tribute as well.

In early days, as patriarchy assumed its dominance over emerging civilizations, the gods were quite naturally portrayed as macho spirits, demanding, dominating, fierce, gods like the Aztecs' bloodthirsty Tlaloc, the rain god, and Tezcatlipoca or Smoking Mirror, the god of gods.

Over time, however, the gods mellowed. Sacrifice, except in symbolic form, became passé. In the Middle East, the pantheon of gods was narrowed down to just one all-powerful deity, a god of everyone everywhere, not just of one tribe, a sort of ultimate alpha male.

At first he was as demanding, angry and vengeful as the old gods, but eventually he had a "son" who interpreted Him in a gentler light. He became a god interested rather more in things like justice and compassion and rather less in things like war and power, interested more in the welfare of individuals and less in the welfare of tribes. He appealed to non-warriors, or even anti-warriors, at least as readily as to warriors. Sacrifice became but a pale imitation of its former lusty self. The Christian spokesperson on earth for this one god, the son Himself, Jesus Christ, sacrificed himself for all mankind and for all time, no more real blood required—a wonderfully efficient approach, an act of ultimate reciprocity. Eventually even animal sacrifices seemed too barbarous, or perhaps just too wasteful, and sacrifice became minimal or merely symbolic. Consuming wafers and wine would do.

This new god, despite His proselytizing followers, is almost a feminine god. Nonetheless, He has experienced continuing difficulty in extricating himself from the jealous grasp of patriarchs, who continue to prefer Him in His old persona.

Thus do moral codes arise. From reciprocal altruism and its social monitoring arise law, morality and religion. But not from reciprocal altruism alone. Other genetic programs, too, including male parental investment and status-seeking, make their contribution and thus demand our consideration.

Morality With a Long Beard

Imagine a little girl growing up in a country in Africa or the Middle East. Her father is a successful businessman, a kind man, who dotes on his little girl. She is spoiled and happy.

But then her father dies. According to the patriarchal law of the country, her care now falls into the hands of her uncles. To them, she is not a little girl to be doted upon but an asset to be fobbed off to a rich old man. The rich old man will not, however, accept delivery of his young bride until she is appropriately “cleansed.” One day the uncles arrange for a group of older women to waylay the girl. They assure her that this is an important day for her, the day that she will become a woman, the day that she will be prepared for her life as a good wife. The women hold her down and spread her legs. One takes a rusty razor blade and slices off her external genitals. What remains is sewn up to dissuade her from sex and to provide her husband-to-be with a warranty of virginity. Finally, she is swaddled tightly in bandages to heal. Her chances are fairly good, perhaps four out of five that she will not die of bleeding or infection, although if she does survive she may go insane from the pain and the shock, and may feel pain for the rest of her life.

This story is commonplace. The practice of genital mutilation of women, or female circumcision as it is often hygienically referred to, is not sanctioned by any religion (although it is by some governments); nonetheless, in the countries in which it is practiced the prevailing religion often views it with indifference. As it commonly does the practice of “honour” killings—allowing male relatives to murder women who they feel have besmirched the reputation of the family by committing such outrageous acts as choosing their own husbands.

Such customs may not be religious practice, but they have commonly been tolerated if not encouraged by religion.

Consider, for example, the practices of Islam. Muhammad, the founder of the faith, was generous towards women, but Islam has degenerated into a major oppressor of women. Women are still frequently sequestered not only from spiritual leadership but largely from society itself, sequestered even from the gaze of other men. In modern Iran, a woman is worth precisely half a man, her evidence worth only half that of a man in court and, in yet another convoluted perversity, if a man is executed for killing a woman, her family must compensate the murderer’s family for their loss.

Christianity was founded by a feminine man, a man of tolerance and love. His disciples, too, were all men. This all-maleness is misused to this day. The Roman Catholic Church persists in insisting that if all the disciples were men, then all priests must be men, thus neatly precluding women from the corridors of power. (The fact that the disciples, like Christ himself, were all Semites, would seem by the same logic to preclude an Argentinian pope.)

We needn’t pick exclusively on the Catholics. Other Christian faiths have been as exclusive, often relying on Old Testament thunder to justify their bigotry, curiously relying on a harsh, often violent, philosophy inimical to that of the gentle Jesus. Nor need we pick on Christians. Women have been excluded from the mystic circle of priesthood in all the sects of all the major religions. Priests, ministers, rabbis, mullahs—up until very recently, all men. Wicca, a religion in which much of the magic resided with women, has been brutally suppressed.

Open the New Testament and read on the first page from The Gospel of St. Matthew: “Abraham begat Isaac; and Isaac begat Jacob; and Jacob begat Judas and his brethren; and Judas begat Phares” And on it goes, verse after verse of lusty begatting. We cannot help but notice that the begatting is carried on by men; women, it seems, are incidental to the process. Solomon’s mother is mentioned as “her that had been the wife of Urias,” without even the simple good manners of introducing the lady. This all-male begatting is central to the monopolizing of custom, morality and religion by patriarchy.

Investment Strategies

We are all genetically programmed to love our children. We have to be; if an ancient mother didn't love her child, she would have tossed it to the leopards the first time it messed itself, and where would her genes' future have been then? Where would ours have been? A child-loving gene is obviously essential to our survival. The genetic programming for men and women, however, is very different.

We have two replication ethos. A woman makes a huge investment in every child she has. She must bear it for nine months, nurse it for years, and continue to care for it even after it is independent of her body. She simply must—her genes insist. And, as she can have very few, each child is precious.

Men by contrast can, theoretically at least, have an almost unlimited number. Matonabbee had eight wives to bear children for him. Moulay Ismail, Sharifian emperor of Morocco, had many hundreds of children. Moteuczoma, king of the Aztecs, had thousands of concubines. We might expect, therefore, that men would find each child somewhat less precious.

But there is another factor at play here that is much more important than number. While a woman always knows exactly where her genes are, a man can rarely be so sure. Is his woman's child his, or the child of another? This is critical. Nature has only one purpose for us, to replicate our genes; if a male doesn't manage that then his life, from his genes' perspective, is an utter failure. They have designed him for this, for this alone, and he has betrayed them. Even worse, if he is cuckolded he may waste precious resources on a child that carries the genes of a competitor. And cuckolding is always a potential threat; a female is always tempted, to some degree at least, to improve the chances of her genes by matching them with those of a male more vigorous than her husband's. (Research on women from the Canela Indians of South America to denizens of Manchester, England, shows that women are most likely to be unfaithful when they are the most fertile.)

Here we enter an entirely masculine area of human morality: the biological necessity for men to control their women's fertility. A man's chastity has always been of minimal moral interest—indeed promiscuity among men, at least single men, has often carried a certain cachet—but women's chastity has always been central to morality, with loss of virginity resulting in a loss of value in the sexual marketplace. Much sexual morality has been little more than patriarchal self-interest, about males protecting their genetic investment.

All this jealousy is, of course, a bit of a conceit. We don't perpetuate ourselves, we perpetuate our genes. Our children are only half us, our grandchildren one-quarter, our great grandchildren one-eighth, and within a few generations we have disappeared back into the gene pool. But then jealousy is a characteristic imposed on us by our jealous gene to ensure its replication, not ours. And indeed it is the gene that goes on forever while we die and fade away, even in posterity.

It works its powerful way with us and here we find explained those practices designed to control women's sexuality, tolerated by patriarchal religion if not condoned, including everything from the horrors of female circumcision to foot-binding, purdah and chastity belts, practices where female sexuality is obliterated for every purpose but to provide heirs, preferably male, for the man who possesses her.

Men have suffered few restrictions. Alpha males have been free to have many wives (most human societies have been polygamous) or, if only allowed one wife at a time, many mistresses.

Religious Immorality

The capture of religion by patriarchy inevitably turns it in a harsh direction. Dominant, status-seeking males, fuelled by the passion to protect their parental investment, filled with the self-righteousness befitting those who speak for God Himself, tend to the extreme in their stewardship

of morality. Patriarchal religion easily lapses into violence and oppression. Lack of belief, or even lack of enthusiasm, can elicit harsh reaction toward errant souls within, as well as those without, the religious community.

Christianity serves up many infamous examples. In the 13th century, Pope Innocent III rewarded with indulgences French knights who joyfully hung, beheaded and burned Cathars, a sect who had the temerity to believe in nonviolence, a belief they shared with Christ himself. During the extermination of the Cathars in the city of Béziers, the papal legate, when asked how the knights were to distinguish between the heretics and proper Catholics, gave his immortal reply: “Kill them all; God will know which are His.”

The Vatican was also the instigator of the most infamous of religious persecutions, the Inquisition, which included a virtual holocaust against the old religion, Wicca. Tens of thousands, perhaps hundreds of thousands, of women accused of witchcraft were tortured and murdered. How much of this was to eliminate enemies of the Church, how much to save souls, and how much to fulfill perverted male sexual fantasies, we will never know, the truth lies buried with the sadists who perpetrated the horror. The Inquisition in its rampage against witches always had the stench of rape about it: stripping women, humiliating them, mastering them, violating them, forcing them to submit or die.

The Catholic church was by no means alone in its Christian brutality. John Calvin, a pathetic, sickly little man with neither sense of humour nor taste for pleasure, whose Institutes of the Christian Religion stood as the principal statement of Protestant theology for centuries and who saw the world as a “vestibule of Hell,” was quite prepared to torture, behead or burn at the stake those who challenged his perverse proscriptions against the enjoyment of life.

In recent years, Muslim extremists have unleashed waves of terror in a number of Middle Eastern and North African countries against those they perceive as less devout than they. They have been known to issue fatwas, edicts allowing the murder of individuals perceived as threatening the faith. The Catholic Church isn't threatening to kill anybody, but it still flaunts its arrogance. In this the 21st century, it continues to declare that, “There exists a single Church of Christ, which subsists in the Catholic Church,” while claiming that the declaration is based on “infallible” doctrine.

Nor are religions reluctant to lay siege to each other. When you are without doubt that God is on your side, you can become mightily self-righteous; believers can become the most aggressive, the most strident, the most macho of males. Priests, and their enraptured adherents, have not been loath to spread the Word with fire and sword. War was as sanctified in the crusaders' attempts to wrest control of the Holy Land from the infidels as it was when those same infidels, the Muslims, had advanced their hegemony across it in the first place. Christ talked about turning the other cheek; His Church talks about “just war.” Muslims engage in jihad, or holy war against their enemies. The rivalries rage to this day. Muslims fight Jews in the Middle East; Hindus fight Muslims in the Indian subcontinent.

Even nuclear war can take on a religious cast: in the United States, fundamentalist Christians were always among the most fervent supporters of nuclear arms to protect the country against the rival “religion” of Communism; and in 1998, Pakistan tested what its fundamentalists proudly referred to as an “Islamic bomb,” as opposed to India's “Hindu bomb.” Religious passions can be as tribal as any, and certainly as bloody.

Fundamentalists of all stripes do not rest easily with dissent and are not reluctant to bring down the wrath of God upon it. For an institution theoretically dedicated to morality, religion's behaviour is all too often massively immoral.

***Eleven:* Kinder, Gentler Religion**

Feminine Faith

JESUS CHRIST, NAMESAKE and prophet of Christianity, was a deeply feminine man. He blessed the meek and promised they would inherit the earth. He listened, he nurtured, he rejected violence. Epitomizing the opposite of domination and control, He proclaimed, “Whoever wants to be first must be last of all and servant of all.” Some Christians down through the history of the faith have echoed his gentle approach, including a great many individuals and even entire sects like the Cathars and the Quakers. The Quakers were prominent in bringing an end to slavery in Great Britain and its colonies, and have set themselves apart in their active opposition to war, preserving the early Christian commitment to non-violence.

Finding a feminine component even in apparently patriarchal religions like Christianity and Islam is not surprising, considering their roots.

The founder of Islam, Muhammad, was no pacifist, was on the contrary quite prepared to use violence to promote the faith, but He was at least, regardless of how much one is deceived by the misogyny that runs rampant through the faith today, a friend to women. The Muslim holy book, the Koran, in journalist Irshad Manji’s words, “screams affirmative action on issues of paid work, marriage, political participation and land ownership.” Professor of Middle Eastern Studies Elizabeth Warnock Fernea states in her book *In Search of Islamic Feminism*, “It was the emphasis on women’s rights, especially women’s rights to own, inherit and manage property that distinguished Islam from its two monotheistic predecessors, Christianity and Judaism.” (Although, considering it allows both polygamy and the beating of women, it is something less than a feminist handbook.)

Some religions born feminine have remained feminine. Jainism, for example, a tiny religion by modern standards with few adherents outside of India, is gentleness in the extreme, rejecting the concept of an all-powerful supreme being and holding all life in reverence. Buddhism, too, at least in some of its forms, has retained the transcendent calm of its founder. Buddhists have shown little interest in either converting or oppressing members of rival theologies. One non-organized religion that is making a modest comeback is that of Wicca, the “old religion” of Europe, once nearly exterminated by Catholic zealots. Rooted in earthy feminine wisdom, some women see it as antidote to the patriarchy of Christianity.

Male Conflicted and Conflicting

When we consider the forces of reciprocity, status-seeking, and parental investment, we find men in constant conflict. The male need for status and for protection of their parental investment lead men to oppression and violence. At times, reciprocal altruism in the form of coalitions for mutual benefit may create peace and co-operation within a group, but it may lead equally to violence against the Other, as we saw with Matonabbee and his colleagues on the Coppermine. Yet at the same time, men need to exhibit generosity to their wives and children and other kin, and they can benefit greatly from engaging in reciprocal altruism with the Other, through trade for instance.

Masculine codes of behaviour, therefore, tend to recognize the need to constrain males’ aggressive nature so that they, members of a social species, can live constructively with others, in the family, in the band and, in more enlightened cases, with the Other. Moral right has to do with inhibiting the violent impulse. It would seem to require deterrence—rules and punishments. The forces to be constrained are very powerful, so the rules and punishments to deter them are often also powerful and unforgiving. The patriarch tends to be harsh even when he is moral.

Is there another solution to the dilemma, one gentle rather than harsh, one tolerant rather than rigid, one better designed for the modern world? We might look for such a solution to the biological imperative of women. Women need not seek status violently, are confident in their parental investment, and need rely on reciprocity for constructive purposes only. Women's lives have traditionally revolved around the birthing, nursing and caring for children—this is where their parental investment principally lies. Morality in a feminine context would serve this purpose. Moral right would have to do with encouraging the caring instinct. It would be flexible and forgiving—rigidity and force are not conducive to caring.

Because feminine morality concerns itself with relationships, it tends to adapt itself to the circumstances of relationships. It has less need of rules and proscriptions, indeed these inhibit its natural flexibility. Masculine morality, because it must be imposed, requires enforcement and, although it is rigid within a society, it will vary from one society to another and thus is often self-righteously confrontational when it encounters the Other. Feminine morality is inclined to avoid confrontation. Masculine morality, largely a cultural construct, is abstract, intellectual rather than felt, inclined more to logic than compassion, and dogmatic—rule-based rather than situation-based. In an increasingly shrinking world, where individuals and cultures confront each other in chaotic fashion, situational morality, grounded in broad-based reciprocal altruism, is our only hope for peaceful and productive coexistence.

Religious Evolution

Patriarchal religion has reigned in the western world for 10,000 years. Christ was a mere moment before the patriarchs re-asserted themselves.

But, like other patriarchal institutions, its grip has increasingly loosened under the onslaught of new knowledge, new technologies and new prosperity. Dogma has suffered a series of shattering revelations: our Earth isn't at the centre of the universe after all; life wasn't miraculously created in six days but rather evolved over billions of years; we aren't God's chosen species but just another evolutionary product among many, not distinct from and above Nature but just another creature in Nature, and just as accidental. A new way of thinking, the modern scientific method, has given religion no peace. Faith is no longer quite good enough; science demands satisfaction of the senses and the intellect. Organized religion has battled gamely to adapt to these heresies, but things just aren't the same.

The feminine side of the patriarchal religions, constantly struggling to assert itself in the past, has had increasing success. Even the church of the Inquisition, the Church of Rome, although stubbornly retaining its patriarchal view of sexuality, has nonetheless become a spokesperson for sharing and co-operation among peoples. Pope Francis is a voice for the poor and the environment and a voice against materialism. The pope has even spoken out strongly for the rights of women to study, to work and to speak out in public. (But not to become priests, of course.) Other Christian sects, too, speak out for a fairer world. Some have even been known to criticize capitalism.

The aggressive, masculine, proselytizing side of religion, the side that has always felt the paternalistic, self-righteous need to impose its revelations on everyone else, is softening. The United Church of Canada has even announced it will no longer attempt to convert Jews, no doubt bringing great comfort to Jewish people everywhere. In multicultural countries like Canada, the major religions are on good speaking terms, although they don't seem ready quite yet to embrace Wicca. Much of this new-found tolerance arises from a decline in religious interest in the West—religions must perforce seek each other out for comfort and support. What is important however, regardless of the reasons, is that ecumenism is on the rise. A part at least of organized religion appears to be facing up to its dilemma.

To the degree that organized religion can adapt to the new realities, it is relevant; to the degree that it cannot, it is irrelevant, or worse. Christian writer Elizabeth Dodson-Gray calls for “another Reformation of Christendom, freeing us this time not from the power of pope and priest but from the power of patriarchal males whatever their position.”

From Patriarchy to Free Love

In our quote from the good rabbi Hillel Ha-Babli at the start of Chapter 10, we might take particular note of his addendum that the golden rule is in itself sufficient for moral law—no dogma required.

Situational morality it seems has powerful antecedents. It has been much maligned by patriarchs, rule-obsessed as they are, yet it is even more appropriate for the third millennium AD than it was for the first century BC.

Even in a predictable, homogeneous society, a one-set-of-rules-are-best-for-everybody-all-the-time approach is dubious. In a society of great variety, complexity and change, the idea is ludicrous. A morality that can adapt to circumstances, thereby optimizing what is best for everyone in a given situation, is clearly superior. The key is tolerance. If we create an atmosphere of tolerance, we can count on the fundamental human decency rooted in reciprocal altruism to direct individuals to “do the right thing,” regardless of the circumstances. It may seem inadequate for a moral code, but in the modern world it may be the only adequate guide.

Science has challenged orthodoxies; technology, by facilitating or even demanding mass education and mass communication, has given people the tools to seek their own truths.

Technology has even created its own religion, a mighty competitor to the established religions—consumerism. Ordinary people no longer have to wait until they die to get into heaven, nor genuflect to clergy to get the key; they can build their own little heaven right here on earth. Money is a great equalizer; it can create great disparity between rich and poor but it is too crass a measure to convey the sense of superiority granted by aristocracy and divine right.

Of the greatest importance is the breaking of the bonds with which patriarchs once shackled women. In one century, the 20th, women achieved political freedom, economic freedom and sexual freedom. The birth control pill alone created a sexual revolution, one of the great revolutions of history—women gaining control over their wombs. Women are now as free as men to choose, to choose when to have sex but, more importantly, to choose when and whether to have babies.

As organized religion has lost much of its rigidity, so has society as a whole. We have moved well along the road toward a feminine morality. The old structures cannot stand. This is what the 1960s was all about. They signalled the end of patriarchy. They didn't reflect a decline in values per se, as was commonly announced, but they did reflect a decline in straight, white, male control over values, a decline of patriarchal values. At the same time, they demonstrated that the problem of establishing values in a complex, consumerist, high-tech world isn't easy. The 1950s' claim that all society could cleave to one simple, monolithic set of values was at best an illusion, at worst a fraud.

The 1960s did not, could not, provide all the answers, but they pointed the way. As the pendulum settled back toward the centre, some things became clearer. We will almost certainly depend much less on dogma. When information is plentiful and communication instantaneous, it is hard to keep the masses in thrall to some concept of esoteric knowledge reserved for a select few, or even to convince them that such knowledge exists. When different systems of morality are thrown into intimate contact with one another, coexistence becomes an ultimate moral objective.

Those of an authoritarian bent, patriarchists to the core, will continue to need the reassurance of authority and simplistic truths, and they will have no trouble finding inflexible religious (and political) institutions to meet their need, but most people will be inclined to rely more on the basic

values of reciprocal altruism, values intrinsic to a social species, values like kindness, co-operation and tolerance, particularly tolerance. People will be more inclined to work out for themselves what is proper behaviour and rely less on revealed truths. Morality is becoming a more individual matter. Sexual morality particularly has become much more a matter of choice and much less a matter of hierarchal imposition and social censure.

The Limits of Tolerance

In our future, we will require more faith in our fellow humans and less in deities. Dogma always required isolation, by geography or class, to thrive, and in a shrinking world, isolation is becoming harder to find and maintain. In societies that are becoming increasingly complex as people move around the globe, as societies include a greater variety of races and religions, and as people tend to work out their own moral codes, tolerance will grow.

Tolerance will have its limits, however. That, too, we are seeing. If people are not harming others, then as far as contemporary society is concerned, their sex and family lives are pretty much their own business. If they are harming others, it is a very different matter. For example, we observe today a greatly reduced tolerance toward wife beating and child abuse, behaviours that up until fairly recently were left to the family, which is to say they were left to fathers.

Historians have observed an increasing intolerance for interpersonal violence in Europe, and to a lesser extent in North America, that intriguingly coincides with the increasing influence of women in all institutions. The banning of capital punishment, a more enlightened attitude generally toward treatment of criminals, stricter gun laws, rejection of corporal punishment for children, are all examples of this changing attitude. The United States can be expected to lag this trend with its greater influence of fundamentalist religion and therefore of patriarchy.

At the level of the global family, we see similar change. Not long ago, national sovereignty was as supreme as the privacy of the family, but today we no longer recognize the right of dictators, the supreme political patriarchs, to treat their citizens any way they wish. The creation of an international court for crimes against humanity speaks for the rights of ordinary people over the rights of self-appointed patriarchs. As tolerance toward individual choice increases, tolerance toward abusive choice diminishes.

We become increasingly intolerant as well toward the cavalier and exploitive treatment of Nature, so common in our past. The gods that we invented for ourselves quite naturally focused their attention on us. The one god of Christianity made the planet, indeed the universe, for us, His chosen species. “Let us make man in our image, after our likeness,” the Old Testament God proclaims, “and let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, and the fowl of the air, and over the cattle, and over all the earth.” It was ours to husband, to tame, to exploit. Nature may be a seamless web but in God’s eyes (or rather our eyes), it was linear—God at the top; then us, arranged in a patriarchal order; and then everything else. We were a thing above the rest of Nature. The male ethos, with its urge to kill prey and fight enemies, saw the earth as a hostile environment to be dominated, divided up among possessive males, and used by those males for the perpetuation of their genes. From warlords and aristocrats amassing feudal estates to capitalists amassing great wealth, and on to modern CEOs amassing market share, Nature has been something to own, to provide resources not simply for life but for status.

The female ethos, the gathering ethos, has languished. A sense that we should live within the bounds of Nature, as part of Her family, taking no more than She can afford, has been subordinated to macho forces. But this, too, is changing. Whether due to the breakdown of patriarchy, or advancing knowledge, or necessity, or just sheer horror at what we are doing to our planet, a sharing attitude towards Nature is growing. Major projects like power dams, once the peaceful equivalent of nuclear weapons as balm for the macho ego, are now being cancelled or at least

subjected to environmental reviews. Organic farming, a nurturing approach, now challenges chemical farming, a dominating approach. Animals, both domestic and wild, are considered to have intrinsic rights to a place on the Earth and humane treatment. Nations gather to develop global strategies for environmental protection and planetary preservation. Environmental organizations like Greenpeace and the Sierra Club have come to the fore as opinion-moulders.

There is a developing recognition that the earth belongs to all of us, and to all other creatures, not simply to Homo sapiens constituted as nations or as individuals. There is recognition, too, that we must garner the resources we need by co-operating with Nature not by dominating and exploiting Her. We hear talk of living in “voluntary simplicity” and of “making a smaller ecological footprint.” Younger generations are beginning to see an environmentally-friendly philosophy as essential, as serving a sacred trust.

A New and Natural Morality

All of this represents a new morality, a refreshing and healthy one, one at peace with the natural world. It represents an expanding of the female ethos and a shrinking of the male, a shifting from master-of-all-creation patriarchy to sustaining, nurturing matriarchy.

Men are most assuredly not excluded. Through the understanding of themselves that neo-Darwinism and other new knowledge gives us, and from learning from the feminine, men can involve themselves with women in creating a feminine moral code, a matriarchal code, based principally on the kindlier dictates of reciprocal altruism. They can back off on the genetic mandates imposed by male status-seeking and male parental investment.

As a species that now threatens its own existence as well as that of its neighbours, we must not only curb our violent instincts but simultaneously encourage our caring instincts. We must act within a feminine moral framework as opposed to a masculine moral framework. This should include the constructive side of the masculine, particularly those components of individualism and risk-taking that lead to a love of freedom and the search for knowledge. We need Matonabee’s heroic quest for peace with the Athapascans more than ever just as we need his macho raid on the Inuit less than ever.

People everywhere seem to seek a spiritual connection, a connection with something larger than themselves. It may be innate in us, a product of evolution. For a long time our spiritual quest has been absorbed by organized religion, a highly masculine absorption, focused on control rather than sharing. Perhaps it is now returning to the simple hunter-gatherer notion of a spiritual connection with the Earth, rejecting the arrogance of patriarchal religion for a humility before Nature.

The hunter-gatherers’ awe of the natural world arose in part from their ignorance of it and their fear of what they didn’t understand. That same fear created in the agriculturists the need for fearsome gods to mediate with the unknown. Our mediator is science, which reveals the unknown. We can face Nature with no less humility and awe but without fear. Here is a spiritual connection that satisfies the need for a morality compatible with sustainable relationships between each other and with Nature. And it is inclusive. It unites us as human beings rather than dividing us as competing religions infamously do. Even atheists can belong, they are no less able to feel at one with the universe than anyone else. After all, it is the simple truth—we are one with the universe. No faith is required. Former Japanese Prime Minister Yasuhiro Nakasone wrote a haiku that expressed this very nicely:

Man is born by the grace of the great universe.
Afar and above the dark and endless sky,
the Milky Way runs
toward the place I come from.

***Twelve:* Crime and Punishment**

Natural Law

DURING THEIR RETURN from the Coppermine in the spring of 1772, Samuel Hearne and his party encountered “some families of strange Northern Indians . . . who were all so poor as not to have one gun among them.” Superior in numbers and well-armed, his companions took brutal advantage of the luckless strangers. They “robbed them of almost every useful article in their possession; and to complete their cruelty, the men joined themselves in parties of six, eight, or ten in a gang, and dragged several of their young women to a little distance from their tents, where they not only ravished them, but otherwise ill-treated them, and that in so barbarous a manner, as to endanger the lives of one or two of them.” Hearne reproached the men for their brutality and was told, “in the plainest terms, that if any female relation of mine had been there, she should have been served in the same manner.” The crime was monstrous, but nothing could be done.

Hearne’s men cheated, they violated reciprocal altruism, but we are designed to be cheaters as well as altruists, and if cheating offers an advantage, and there is no power to deny it, it may well win the day. Justice, in the absence of such power, may become a highly arbitrary business.

As human societies increased in size with the advent of agriculture, they could no longer afford arbitrariness. Something had to be done, otherwise chaos would rule. Structure was required to ensure order, so with civilization came formal systems for guiding the conduct of citizens and punishment for those who transgressed. Systems might be religious or secular. In this chapter, we will deal with the secular, with what we refer to as systems of justice.

Author Robert Wright refers to our sense of justice as “the governor of reciprocal altruism.” Just as reciprocal altruism, Nature’s golden rule, finds expression in theology, it finds expression also in law. The law is all about detecting and dealing with those who offend reciprocal altruism—with cheaters.

Vengeance is Mine

Mark Young was by all accounts a handsome but harmless charmer who liked life in the fast lane. He doted on attractive women and motorcycles. In his youth, his wildness brought him numerous scrapes with the law, but nothing serious, a number of misdemeanours and two felony convictions, both of which earned him suspended sentences and one dollar fines. None of his offences involved violence or drug trafficking. In 1989, he was making a living rebuilding motorcycles and selling cars when he was approached by an acquaintance who had a barn full of marijuana and no buyer.

Young agreed to accept a commission for putting him in touch with someone who might be interested. He had been fishing with a man who said he knew people who would buy large amounts of dope. He likely never knew who the ultimate buyers were and had nothing further to do with the deal. When the growers were caught by the police, they agreed to testify against Young in return for lighter sentences. He was charged with distributing and conspiring to manufacture. The prosecuting attorney offered him a reduced sentence if he would co-operate with the investigation. He refused. In February, 1992, he was convicted, entirely on the testimony of his acquaintances, and sentenced to life in prison with no chance of parole. Now Mark Young, never convicted of raising a hand to anyone, sits in Leavenworth Penitentiary, surrounded by rapists, murderers and international terrorists, a place where a close friend of his was stabbed to death in the dining hall over a fifty dollar debt after which the killer courteously handed the knife to a guard, handle first.

We might wonder what kind of a system would send a man to prison for life—that’s life in capital letters, no hope of parole—for a victimless crime, a trivial crime at that, and this a 38-year-old man,

gainfully employed, who in all likelihood would have spent the rest of his life paying taxes to keep serious threats to society in jail.

A vengeful system certainly, a patriarchal, Old Testament, eye for an eye system, and an adversarial system. In short, a macho system. Mark Young was tried and sentenced in Indiana under U.S. federal law, in a country in which the most politically correct position a politician can take is to be tough on crime. The United States has more people in prison per capita than any other country, probably even more than China. We do not have quite the incarceration mania they do; however, our justice system, too, is adversarial. We, too, see justice in a masculine framework of police and prisons.

The law, like religion, was captured very early in its history by patriarchy. Made by men, usually by alpha males at that, justice conformed to the strictures of the male replication ethos, in particular to its aggressively competitive nature. A law-breaker is perceived as issuing a challenge, and men instinctively rise combatively to a challenge. Even our courts, despite all their ritual and formality, are essentially battlefields for the rampant egos of macho lawyers.

Due Process

Consider the process when a crime is committed. The perpetrator is arrested by the police, charged, and assigned a lawyer to advise him. (“Him” is not sexist—most perpetrators are young men). The advice usually includes keeping his mouth shut. If sufficient evidence is available, he is tried in court where the prosecution contends with its adversary, the defence, while a judge, and perhaps a jury, wrestles with the facts and ultimately determines a winner. The crime is considered to have been committed against the state. If the accused is found guilty, he is fined or imprisoned, subject to appeal and yet more court time.

We can hardly imagine a worse system. Victims of crime are ignored, irrelevant to the procedure unless they are required as witnesses or invited to make a statement after the fact. Norwegian criminologist Nils Christie claims that professional justice “steals conflict” from victims, undermining their confidence that they are able to maintain peace and order. It creates dependency.

The state, which ought to be fundamentally concerned about victims, acts as if it is the aggrieved party, which of course it usually isn’t. The perpetrator hides both his guilt and himself behind his lawyer, rather than standing accountable for his actions.

The prosecution and the defence formally array themselves on opposite sides of the courtroom. The courtroom itself is a very masculine place: austere, formal, the judge elevated in a position of superiority, lawyers commanding the floor, strutting in robes and even, in some jurisdictions, Monty Pythonesque wigs. A disinterested observer might wonder if all this was about justice or about winning and losing, or even, on some occasions, about showmanship. Finally, if the defence wins, the accused goes free, innocent or guilty, free perhaps to violate again. If the prosecution wins, the guilty party is locked away, sequestered from society.

Many rape victims have refrained from pressing charges because of what they will endure in the courtroom, one assault being quite enough. When women were finally allowed to sit on juries, the number of sexual assault cases grew rapidly, victims recognizing that they would no longer be objects of scrutiny by all-male juries. They have been encouraged, too, by laws curtailing defence lawyers’ verbal abuse of victims who dare to testify. Nonetheless, many rape victims remain terrified of being re-victimized by aggressive cross-examination designed not to elicit justice but rather to impugn their reputation.

Our militantly confrontational style of criminal justice is paralleled by a style of civil justice often equally combative. Divorce, for example, has earned a reputation of being particularly nasty. No doubt, good lawyers assist their clients in reaching settlements as amicable as is reasonably possible

and in avoiding the courtroom except as a last resort; nonetheless, the last thing that divorce needs, given that it is already a stew of emotions boiling over, is professionals trained in the art of confrontation. For that matter, it's the last thing most civil conflicts need.

We need to ask ourselves if we must do justice in this patriarchal fashion, or if there is a feminine alternative. To answer that properly, we need first to examine the source of those who most offend our sense of justice, the ultimate cheaters, the criminal element.

Manufacturing Criminals

In 1937, in the village of Al Auja, near Takrit in Iraq, a man abandons his family, his wife and a baby boy only a few months old. The mother remarries, to a distant cousin. The cousin is a brute. He torments his stepson, subjecting him to vicious physical and verbal abuse. Among his favourite epithets for the child are "dog" and "son of a whore." He turns the boy to theft, teaching him to steal chickens and sheep from the neighbours for sale in the market. The boy is a quick study; he is never caught nor punished for his crimes. When he is ten years old, he escapes his stepfather's home and goes to live with an uncle in Baghdad.

But the damage is done. The sorry little chicken-thief goes on to fulfill his psychopathic destiny on a grand scale, becoming undisputed leader of his country and one of the most brutal dictators of the late 20th century, a cold-blooded killer who had fifteen hundred political opponents shot in one year alone and in an exquisitely sadistic twist, charged their families for the bullets. He is, of course, Saddam Hussein. We cannot help but wonder how many millions have died, how many empires have been built, and how much history has been made by the products of dysfunctional family life.

In our society we are, fortunately, not concerned about psychopaths rising to such positions of power—democracy pretty well takes care of that. Nonetheless, if we look to the background of our serial rapists, murderers and other violent criminals, we find the same source: dysfunctional family life, especially child abuse.

The first few precious years of life are critical. Study of the human brain has resulted in one of the most important discoveries ever: hard evidence that a child's potential, including its emotional development, is determined largely by its environment in its first three to five years. Its environment plays a key role in determining whether the cells, circuits and chemicals of its brain will develop properly, whether the wiring and chemical balance will be healthy or impaired. Just as a child kept in a dark room for the first five years of its life will be forever blind, a child deprived of healthy nurturing in its early years will grow up to experience difficulty with sharing, co-operating and socializing. And when this failure is excessive because of particularly noxious abuse and neglect, or subject to a genetic trigger, the child is directed toward a life of antisocial behaviour, including crime. It has been largely deprived of the great gift of empathy, one of the essential ingredients of reciprocal altruism.

A second rich source of criminals is brain damage. Brain damage has various causes but it, too, is all too common among dysfunctional families, arising predominantly from alcohol abuse during pregnancy. (Strictly speaking, infant and child abuse, too, cause a form of brain damage.) Alcohol abuse may cause fetal alcohol syndrome, one symptom of which is brain damage. In severe cases, the result is a retarded child with a sociopathic personality, often complicated by, among other things, facial deformities and hyperactivity. Such children are cursed. They are doomed to a lifetime of not being able to cope with society, of not being able to appreciate its rules or its purposes. Because they cannot cope, they become frustrated, and because they cannot deal with frustration, they become angry and potentially violent. As many as 50 per cent of incarcerated young offenders suffer from alcohol-related birth defects, and perhaps as many adult offenders as well.

Criminals are made, and they are made early.

Serial Criminals

And they are often made serially. Generation after generation, grievous sins are committed behind closed doors, and dysfunctional families pass the art of abuse down to their children like some kind of inheritance. The sins of the fathers do indeed fall upon the sons.

And sons they usually are. Men are most often the abusers and sons most often become the criminals. Daughters suffer equally, of course, but it is males who are least able to cope and who most often turn to anti-social behaviour. Fuller of the masculine replication ethos, they are more prone to aggression, including criminal aggression. They commit the overwhelming majority of crimes, including 90 per cent of murders, the ultimate act of aggression. Most murders are men killing men; other crimes, like rape and child molestation, are directed at women and children. As one feminist observed, “All men are not rapists, but all rapists are men.” Ironically, patriarchal society insists that men are the protectors of women and children, yet it is these “protectors”—husbands, other male family members and boyfriends—that threaten women and children the most.

Women are quite capable of crime too, of course, including violent crime. For example, they kill their children as often as men do. (This is not surprising considering that they spend by far the most time with children. According to criminologist Neil Boyd, women kill their children out of feelings of helplessness and hopelessness, men because they want to hurt someone.) Women are quite capable of killing their sexual partners as well. In her book *When She Was Bad*, Patricia Pearson mentions a Chicago study which revealed that the people most in danger of being murdered by a sexual partner were Black men. Masculine aggression, in crime just as in politics and business, is principally but by no means solely the prerogative of men. But it is mannish—criminals, female as well as male, tend to have higher than average levels of testosterone.

Is Punishment Obsolete?

One of the pieces of knowledge to emerge from our rapidly increasing understanding of the brain that both awes and amuses me is the fact that I can place the end of my finger on my forehead, toward the right side just above my eyebrow, and know that it is within centimetres of my conscience. Even more amazing is that my conscience, and yours, can be physically measured and observed in action through techniques such as brain electroencephalography, positron emission tomography and functional magnetic resonance imaging.

Our moral compass, neuroscientists believe, lies in our orbital prefrontal cortex, a part of the brain residing behind the ridge above our eyeballs, and its communication with other structures in the brain. Here lies our social intelligence, our emotional regulation, our impulse control—our conscience. If the orbital prefrontal cortex, or associated regions, or the connections between them, doesn't develop properly or is damaged, if our neuronal communications are malfunctioning, we are unable to properly regulate our emotions thus our behaviour may be inappropriate, even antisocial, even criminal.

All this poses profound questions about how we deal with antisocial behaviour. If criminals are created by social or medical conditions beyond their control, conditions experienced when they are infants or even still in the womb, how can they be held responsible for their characters, and if their brains are damaged, how can they be held responsible for their actions?

We don't punish mentally ill people who engage in antisocial behaviour because we have long understood that their brains don't work properly. Their behaviour is out of their control. Now we suspect that many “criminals,” too, are the victims of malfunctioning brains. We have always

attributed criminal behaviour to a lack of conscience, but we never really knew what conscience was. We have always known what it does—it regulates our behaviour, or fails to do so—but we haven't known what it actually is. Now we do. And it isn't just an abstraction as we long thought, it is a physical thing, part of the organ we call our brain. It makes no more sense to punish someone because of a crippled brain than to punish someone because of a crippled heart or a crippled limb. It not only fails morality, it fails logic.

When victims of brain disorder threaten others, they must of course be sequestered. But they should be sequestered in order to protect the public and for treatment of their condition—just as we quarantine people carrying contagious diseases—not for punishment. Indeed, they have been punished more than we can imagine already.

We do not yet know how to fix an impaired conscience. Evidence suggests, however, that the brain can develop throughout the life cycle, so its regulatory function can be improved. The environment offered to victims is critical; understanding can help us to help them with empathic approaches rather than punitive ones. Victims of fetal alcohol syndrome, for example, can best be helped not by boot camps but by early diagnosis, special education, enriched environments, structured long-term residential support and, where necessary, drug rehabilitation.

If the condition is diagnosed early enough, a victim may be able to avoid debilitating antisocial behaviour altogether and live a happy and constructive life. This is of limited help to the more violent sufferers, but drug and psychological therapies, even electronic implants, hold promise. Perhaps one day we will be able to repair a malfunctioning conscience, perhaps even cure a serial killer.

As we gain ever greater knowledge of the brain, aberrant behaviour becomes more of a health problem than a legal problem. Crime becomes less sin than symptom, illnesses to be cured rather than offences to be punished.

Regardless of how we respond to crime, the ultimate answer lies in eliminating its root causes: dysfunctional child-rearing and fetal alcohol syndrome. As former Justice Minister McLellan asked, commenting on a serious case of home robbery and vandalism, “I’m not convinced the best way to do it is through a law. How do we provide families with the support and the skills and the ability to bring up their kids so these things don’t happen?” In partial response, she offers the federal government’s National Strategy on Community Safety and Crime Prevention which supports broad-based community coalitions that target high-risk children up to six years of age to address crime-creating conditions like child abuse and neglect.

The challenge lies in the preeminently feminine virtue of healthy nurturing. When all women have healthy pregnancies and all children have healthy infancies, crime will be reduced to a minor nuisance.

A Better Way

Until that grand day arrives, we do not have to persist with patriarchal justice. Just as the male ethos sees law-breaking as a challenge, the female ethos sees it as a fracturing of society. Whereas the male in us tends to rise combatively to the challenge, the female in us tends to want to see the errant son returned to the fold.

A small, but significant, step away from patriarchy would be to reduce the macho nature of the courts. They do not, for instance, have to be adversarial. In the French and German legal systems, fact gathering in the courtroom is controlled by judges, not by lawyers. Judges do most of the questioning and establish the facts of the case. Lawyers are allowed to ask questions but cannot cross-examine witnesses. This contrasts to our system where lawyers are allowed to exaggerate and distort issues in order to conceal the truth, confuse and discredit witnesses, and generally pursue not

the truth but the interests of their client even at the expense of the truth. The French and German systems are designed to investigate rather than compete, to get at what really happened rather than to win.

These systems represent improvement but a truly matriarchal system requires much more. It requires a legal system that attempts to unite rather than divide, that employs co-operation rather than competition, that recognizes the conditions that create criminals, that relies more on humane solutions and less on abstract principles.

In a feminine system, indeed in a just and sensible system, the victim would be at the centre of things, very much involved in determining punishment and restitution. The perpetrator would be encouraged to own up to his offence, to pay his dues to the victim and to society, to accept those responsibilities like a man, and thereby earn the right to rejoin his society. The state's concern ought to be to bring its people together. It ought to facilitate a process by which the hurt suffered by victims is recognized and made plain, particularly to the perpetrators, a process where that hurt is assuaged, where those that caused it can face their victims and atone, and where the truly remorseful perpetrator is ultimately welcomed back into his society, and where his society accepts some responsibility for its member's failure and asks itself what has gone wrong.

Some crimes are too grave and some criminals too incorrigible for such a system at this time. Violent sociopaths, tragically, are currently incurable; they can be controlled but only with patience and time, perhaps only after age has quieted their demons or burned out their rage. Such criminals once made cannot be unmade although that may be possible in the future. Sometimes there is nothing to do but incarcerate a dangerous offender for a long time, perhaps for life.

But these are a small minority of criminal cases. Despite Hollywood's attempts to convince us that all criminals are diabolical monsters, most men and women are behind bars for relatively minor offences, and even then they wouldn't be there if they could get their drug and alcohol use under control. Sober, they can be decent citizens, and their problems are treatable. Incarceration is gaining in popularity as aging populations cry out for increased public safety, but sequestering non-dangerous offenders in brutal institutions, institutions sometimes described as universities for crime, is at most a marginal answer. Ultimately public safety, like the resolution of particular crimes, is best found in the community.

Alternatives

Recognition that there is a better way than confrontation and segregation is slowly growing. Canadian courts may now impose conditional sentences, sentences that impose certain conditions, such as house arrest, as an alternative to jail time. Cases must meet criteria that include public safety.

Communities in Canada, the United States, New Zealand and other countries are trying various approaches at bringing victims, perpetrators, affected families and the community together to deal with offences rather than going through the court system. Under legislation setting up a forum called a family group conference, New Zealand reduced the number of young people in custody by 80 per cent in the first two years of the program, dramatically cutting costs and reducing the number of offenders who graduated into the adult system. A program set up in the small town of Sparwood, British Columbia, to refer young lawbreakers to "resolution conferences" rather than courtrooms, reported 99 per cent compliance with settlements, and a reoffending rate after one year of two per cent compared with the national average of 42 per cent. Families were reconciled and victims often helped the young people who offended against them straighten out their lives.

Aboriginals find community approaches, resonant as they are with ancient traditions, particularly appealing. The people of the new territory of Nunavut have adapted Inuit folkways to modern needs by setting up justice committees consisting of six or seven respected members of the

community. The committees hold hearings to deal with offences against the Criminal Code. The hearings are informal, no lawyers are present, both accused and victim speak and are encouraged to tell the whole truth. Hearings often end with apologies given and accepted, or the offender referred to an elder for counselling, or sent out to live off the land. The Kwanlin Dun Circle Court in the Yukon, a sentencing circle, has reduced reoffending by up to 80 per cent among persistent offenders.

The aboriginal belief that deviant behaviour isn't something to be punished as much as something to be healed is, interestingly enough, a concept quite in tune with recent scientific advances in our understanding of the brain.

Finland has had a policy in place since the 1970s to reduce incarceration for non-violent crimes and replace it with alternatives like community service. While prison populations have exploded in many other countries, Finland's has dropped by 70 percent. Its approach has been aided greatly by politicians refraining from demagogic promises to get tough on crime and a press that avoids sensationalizing crimes.

Restorative Justice

These new approaches have a name: restorative justice. Crime is seen less as a conflict to be resolved by logic, rules and judgement and more as "a fracture of human relationships that must be mended with its own thread." The goal is to restore harmony to the community rather than to punish the individual. Rather than emphasize and expand the rent in the social fabric caused by a crime, the idea is to provide solace and restitution to the victim, reconcile the offender to society, offering him the opportunity to regain his place as a responsible citizen, and to involve the community in the process. In other words, heal the rent and regain a healthy society.

Very often when victims confront their offenders, punishment is their last concern. They are inclined to want first an apology, a sincere apology that shows genuine remorse. They want to look their tormentor in the eye and see his recognition that they have been hurt. Secondly, they want compensation for any losses, and only lastly are they concerned with punishment, and even then they are often satisfied with less than what the state would demand.

Accused persons should not of course be coerced into confession by the promise of better treatment. Some will be innocent; others will feel no remorse. They must have the option of a trial. The idea is to replace as much as possible a masculine system of competition, isolation and hostility with a feminine system of co-operation, community and restitution, to replace an exclusive system with an inclusive one.

Some jurisdictions are pushing the civil system as well toward greater use of arbitration and mediation and less use of litigation. Some members of religious communities resort to dispute resolution mechanisms provided within their faith, such as the Jewish court of law known as Beit Din, Muslim judges or qadi, Catholic marriage tribunals, and so on. A process called collaborative family law requires the parties to agree at the start not to go to court and to negotiate a solution face to face assisted by their lawyers. If the process fails, the lawyers involved are not allowed to handle the court case.

Mediation offers a range of advantages over court resolutions. It is much cheaper and quicker. It allows disputants to tell their own stories in their own ways, rather than have them filtered through lawyers, and it allows them to assist in crafting their own resolutions; by-products of this are a greater sense of control for the disputants and a greater respect for the legal system. Settling their dispute together also allows disputants to continue, even enhance, a constructive relationship after the dispute is settled.

The goal is to move away from court-structured solutions of us and them, winners and losers, and towards problem-solving exercises that bring the sides together. We might look forward to a day when the former is common, the latter rare and lawyers, inasmuch as they are still necessary, are versed little in disputation and much in mediation.

Drug War and Drug Peace

To return to Mark Young, enemy captive in the war on drugs. The macho idea of a “war” on drugs is typical of a masculine perception of justice. Even if hard drugs were involved, we might understand but what has marijuana, the most innocuous of recreational drugs, ever done to provoke a war? And quite a war. Young is serving life without parole; the average murderer in Indiana serves twenty years. Part of the answer may lie in the fact that marijuana is a feminine drug. It creates a sense of easy good will and sharing, contrasting to alcohol, a masculine drug which enhances aggressive, even combative behaviour, a drug strongly associated with robust male rites of passage.

Quite aside from Mary Jane’s problems in a masculine world, the U.S. war on drugs has accomplished little except increase the number of Americans incarcerated for drug offences from 15,000 in 1980 to 350,000 in 2023. Countries that have tried softer approaches, and looked upon drug use as more of a social and medical problem than a criminal one, have done considerably better. The Netherlands has strict penalties for trafficking in hard drugs, but has depenalized if not decriminalized the use of marijuana and other soft drugs. Soft drugs are sold openly in Amsterdam. The result has not been a nation of potheads. To the contrary, hard drug use in the Netherlands is one of the lowest in the Western world and marijuana use far lower than in North America. In 1994, Switzerland initiated a heroin-dispensing program for the most intractable addicts. Two years later, criminal activity and death rates among addicts had fallen sharply, the number of addicts holding permanent jobs had risen to 32 per cent from 14, and the program was saving 45 dollars per day per addict in reduced medical and law-enforcement costs.

Even the United States is catching on. It now has hundreds of drug courts where addicts can choose treatment programs and supervision over jail. The courts have “cut down drastically on the number of children who are either born to crack-addicted mothers, reared by neglectful parents or placed in foster homes.” Restorative justice—treating addicts as troubled citizens to be brought back into the fold rather than as enemies of the state—works.

None of this is terribly surprising. Drug crime has the peculiar attribute of being more rewarding the tougher the penalties. (At least if you don’t become addicted.) Low penalties mean low prices and therefore little profit, attracting only petty criminals; but severe penalties mean high prices and high profits to accommodate the greater risk, and this means organized criminals: biker gangs, the Mafia and cartels. A drug war brings in the armies. A softer approach is both less rewarding for career criminals and more rewarding for society.

In contrast to Mark Young’s interminable days in prison, a convicted drug dealer in Greenland, where four-fifths of the residents are Inuit, would spend his nights in jail but not his days. Except for a few of the most dangerous offenders, who are sent to a closed prison in Denmark, Greenland’s convicted felons—including drug dealers, rapists and murderers—walk the streets freely during the day, holding down jobs, visiting friends and family, even going hunting. They are locked up only at night. Counselling is mandatory, as is paying for their board and room and sending money to their families. They are accepted in their communities despite their sins if they have something to offer. Fewer than one per cent ever return to crime.

Thirteen: Macho Triumphant

They did battle against Midian, as the LORD had commanded Moses, and killed every male.... The Israelites took the women of Midian and their little ones captive; and they took all their cattle, their flocks, and all their goods as booty. All their towns ... they burned.... Moses said to them, "Have you allowed all the women to live?... Now therefore, kill every male among the little ones, and kill every woman who has known a man by sleeping with him. But all the young girls who have not known a man by sleeping with him, keep alive for yourselves.

"Camp outside the camp seven days; whoever of you has killed any person or touched a corpse, purify yourselves and your captives on the third and on the seventh day. You shall purify every garment, every article of skin, everything made of goats' hair, and every article of wood."

READING FROM THE Old Testament, Numbers 31, of the Israelites gratuitously wreaking genocide upon the Midianites is eerily similar to reading from Hearne's journals about the Chipewyan massacre of the Inuit: stories from the Coppermine to the Holy Land, from the old world to the new, echoing throughout time of the macho run amok, stories about war, about rape, murder and pillage ... and about purification.

Military Mystique

War is the ultimate test of reciprocity within the tribe. It proves that a man is willing to sacrifice everything, to give up his life, or take the life of others, for the sake of his fellows. It intensifies reciprocity to the extreme of life and death, and offers, therefore, the most intensely satisfying male bonding. Other benefits, equally powerful and primordial, may accrue as well. Men, as was the case with the Israelites at Midian, may increase their replication potential directly by acquiring women and indirectly by acquiring resources and status. The military life has, therefore, always had an almost mystical appeal to men. No wonder that in a patriarchal world it often carries God's blessing.

Once the macho is in the ascendant, most men become efficient killers of other men, and of women and children as well. On the Coppermine as in Midian, children were cut down as quickly as old men; in the high-tech bombings of Dresden and Hiroshima in the Second World War, babes-in-arms were incinerated like garbage.

European civilization grew out of the warrior hierarchies of feudalism, a system that dominated Europe for six hundred years. Ultimately Europe created a new system, the nation state, it too arising as often as not out of violence. Modern nations like Australia and Canada which were not "born" in violent revolution think of themselves as "coming of age" through their blood sacrifices in the First World War.

Often glorified in the past, war is less admired today. Even the more aggressive nations and their leaders pay lip service at least to the cause of peace and decry war as a means of pursuing objectives. Nonetheless, the trappings of war remain essential to a nation's status. A third rate nation like Russia still has a loud voice in the world because it has nuclear weapons and the means to deliver them anywhere, anytime.

This doesn't go unnoticed. Japan, which has experienced the horrors of war more than most nations, becomes increasingly uneasy under its pacifist constitution as it yearns to firmly establish itself as a world power. Even countries that cannot feed themselves adequately manage to find billions of dollars to buy guns. North Korea maintains a massive army and terrifies its neighbours

with long-range missile tests while its people eat grass. When Pakistan formally joined India in the nuclear club by exploding five nuclear devices, when it had its nuclear erection, Prime Minister Nawaz Sharif asked his people to cut back to one meal a day so they could afford the bomb. The ability of war and its symbols to unite the tribe and feed its ego was sadly illustrated by the rejoicing of populations in both countries as they went nuclear. Festive celebrations exploded in Pakistan at news of the country's first successful nuclear explosions while mosques echoed with prayers of thanksgiving. Over 90 per cent of Indians supported their government's decision even though half the country's population had no electricity and most hadn't water fit to drink.

But we shouldn't be too hard on these two countries for wanting nuclear clout. If you want to strut on the world stage, and in a masculine world it's hard to resist, a nuclear weapon is the best badge to show you're one of the big boys. And, in any case, it's unfair to criticize India, bordered by two hostile neighbours with very large nuclear-equipped armies, for wanting to join the nuclear club when Britain, France and the United States, all bordered by friendly neighbours, are members of long-standing.

Global squandering of funds for armaments is about three trillion dollars a year, almost four hundred dollars for every man, woman and child on earth.

Warrior Worship

Just as we disparage mass killing as a method of resolving disputes while we continue to honour its symbols and tools, we continue even more enthusiastically to honour the practitioners of the noble art—the warriors, the ultimate macho men. This, too, has deep roots. Among prehistoric peoples, often the most important criteria for a chief was that he be an accomplished warrior. This has its echoes today. One of the criticisms levelled at Bill Clinton when he became president of the United States was that he hadn't seen military service. For years, Prince Philip, consort to Queen Elizabeth II, donned his sailor suit for formal occasions, long after the British Empire, the principle justification for the British navy, had faded away.

Turning men into warriors has always been easy, especially young men. War has served as a convenient outlet for their reckless male energy. Neil Wiener and Christian Mesquida of York University suggest that the best predictor of a society's potential for aggressive warfare may be the proportion of young men in its population. Even some primates have been known to position their adolescent males on the periphery of the troop—best to direct their youthful aggression outward toward leopards than inward toward their companions, and if the leopard wins ... well, adolescent males are the most dispensable members of the troop. From hunter-gatherer societies to modern times, military service has been considered part of becoming a man.

Reciprocal altruism cannot, however, be entirely constrained to those of our tribe. It has the annoying habit of overflowing. We, men included, recognize, to some small degree at least, ourselves in the Other, and are therefore inclined to treat them, too, with kindness. Our genes gave us guilt to keep us on the high road of reciprocal altruism and it can be a hard taskmistress. If we treat a fellow human badly, we will be assaulted with guilt to get us back on the straight and narrow. This must be overcome if we are to do violence to the Other, and it is overcome, by dehumanizing them, by convincing ourselves that only we, in our superiority, are deserving. If we can dehumanize our victim, reciprocal altruism is circumvented and we can proceed guilt-free. We practice the classic art of the cheater—we deceive. In this case, we deceive ourselves. We are, in fact, masters of self-deception, and nowhere is this better illustrated than in things military.

And we do more. We use ritual to transform young men into killers. Brutal initiation ceremonies, repetitive drilling, propaganda, pomp and ceremony—ritual has long introduced young men into warrior-hood and thus into manhood. Militaries masterfully create an atmosphere of tradition and duty that nicely camouflages the dirty fact that their business is killing other human beings. Ritual

may also include purification rites, to cleanse the warrior's heart and mind of any lingering doubts, of any guilt, about his failure to reciprocate altruistically with his victims. War is driven principally by genetic impulses but it is overlain by thick layers of culture that magnify its mystique wonderfully.

Warriors, killers of their fellow humans, are the most honoured of men. While on a visit to Germany, former U.S. President Ronald Reagan honoured German soldiers who fought in World War II. The fact that these soldiers were hit men for Adolf Hitler, the most evil leader the world has ever known, was of no consequence. They were warriors and that was good enough. Little is more offensive to political correctness than to criticize "our boys in uniform."

We may not quite appreciate the joy of conquest manifested by Genghis Khan, the macho man's macho man, when he exulted, "Happiness lies in conquering one's enemies, in driving them in front of oneself, in taking their property, in savouring their despair, and in outraging their wives and daughters," but when we endure two world wars in a century, along with endless regional bloodlettings, we are inclined to believe the old conqueror's passions are far from stilled.

The Enemy Within

Nor do warriors threaten only the foreigner. A society's own military may represent a greater danger than its neighbour's. Hunter-gatherer warriors were all the men of the band, or at least all of the younger men, but in larger civilizations, warriors are often professionals, a breed apart, and become in effect a tribe of their own. Armies become distinct institutions, tightly bonding their members with codes, traditions, uniforms and ceremony. Armies are frequently both parasite and predator on their own people. The Other, in their eyes, may be a group within their own borders and the military tribe then becomes a threat to those it is sworn to protect. Groups within society rather than external to it may be the target of dehumanization.

When General Augusto Pinochet captured Chilean society, he proceeded to torture, murder and disappear thousands of his own countrymen, but he could do it in good conscience because they were "leftists" and therefore, in his eyes, less than human. And when criticized, he was comforted in his assumption by no less a figure than U.S. Secretary of State Henry Kissinger. We are quite capable of deceiving ourselves out of reciprocal altruism toward groups within our society as well as groups without.

Societies frequently wage war against themselves. Advanced civilizations, in their size and complexity, include many tribes, often hostile to each other. In the 20th century, we saw spectacularly bloodthirsty ethnic confrontations: the mass brutality of Rwandan genocide, the ancient feuds of Yugoslavia wiping that country off the map, and the masterpiece of incomprehensible horror, the Nazi holocaust against the Jews and other minorities. Religious tribes battled each other in Ireland, the Middle East and the Indian subcontinent. Tribes continue to vie for political and economic power. The tribe may be a royal family, an aristocracy of birth or wealth, a priesthood, a military caste, a political or economic ideology, a labour union, or simply a psychopath and his acolytes. In modern society, Capital and Labour have sparred over economic spoils for two hundred years, their quarrels frequently turning into violence, even revolution.

Just as violent men, particularly those of a psychopathic bent, have long exploited external enmities, so have they exploited internal ones, even in the name of virtue. Men from Robespierre to Lenin to Mugabe have attached themselves to just causes in order to satisfy their megalomaniacal urges. Only with victory are they revealed as the monsters they are, and then it is often too late, underlining yet again the danger of employing violence as a solution to problems.

As long as we persist in approaching our differences with warrior values, they will lead to bloodshed. With all due respect to Genghis Khan, this is not the road to happiness for most of us. Indeed, with modern destructive capacity, it is increasingly becoming the road to Armageddon.

The values of the warrior are not only excessively masculine but strongly anti-feminine. They exaggerate the masculine side of men and the feminine side of women, creating a strong man/weak woman syndrome that limits the potential of both. All the complexity of male and female, of individual men and women, is force-fitted into two stereotypes: man the warrior, the protector or ravisher, and woman the dependent, the charge or the spoils. Similarly, the complexity of issues is force-fitted into simplifications: us or them, black and white. These are not the values by which complex human beings can best deal with deeply complex issues in an increasingly interdependent world.

Black Hats and White Hats

High noon in Hadleyville. The town shimmers in the heat. Marshall Will Kane writes his last will and testament in his office, then strides out onto main street, into the brilliant and unforgiving clarity of the scorching sun. The long, dusty street is deserted. Frightened eyes peer out from behind well-shuttered windows and locked doors. The cowed citizens wait silently, some in their homes, some in church. The rowdier ones drink in Helen Ramirez' saloon, betting on how long the marshal has to live, eagerly awaiting the excitement the day offers.

At the railway depot, three men, dirty, unshaven, hard-eyed men, members of the "old bunch," greet the noon train. A big man with a pock-marked face alights from one of the coaches. Frank Miller, "crazy" Frank Miller, who with his fellow wild men rode roughshod over Hadleyville until Will Kane sent him to prison, has returned. He has threatened to kill Kane. No one doubts his resolve.

"Is everything ready?" he asks.

"Everything is ready, Frank," replies his brother, Ben Miller.

The four men, long-barrelled Colt revolvers swinging low in their holsters, walk purposefully down the street into town.

Will Kane wipes sweat of his weathered face and stares down the length of the street, squinting his eyes. The noon train whistle shatters the silence of the day. Kane walks slowly up the street to meet its lonely sound. The Oscar-winning "Do Not Forsake Me, Oh My Darlin'" plays mournfully in the background.

Stanley Kramer's 1952 movie *High Noon*, starring Gary Cooper as Will Kane, is considered by many to be the classic western. The epitome of the ancient struggle between right and wrong, it pits relentless evil against a reluctant hero. Ordinary, decent people are helpless against malignant macho forces because they lack the capacity and the skills for the violence necessary to protect themselves, but fortunately they have a macho man on their side (always outnumbered by his evil counterparts) who has what it takes to wreak destruction upon the bad guys and save the day.

One of the reasons we loved the old western movies was because they made morality easy for us. The good guys were stereotypically good, and the bad guys were stereotypically bad, and the former inevitably triumphed over the latter. The good guys wore white hats, the bad guys wore black hats, and the white hats always won. (Well, almost always—in *High Noon*, Gary Cooper wore a black hat.)

In war, against a foe external or internal, we are inclined to think in the same simplistic way. Usually it isn't simple at all. Yet sometimes it is. Sometimes there clearly are good guys and bad guys, white hats and black hats. Sometimes life is like a classic western. Real villains, who have waged war against their neighbours or their own people or both, abound. The last century alone threw up some of the biggest and baddest: Adolf Hitler, Joseph Stalin, Pol Pot, Slobodan Milosovic,

Saddam Hussein, the list runs on and on. We are stuck with thugs arising from time to time out of the confusion that is humanity and having to deal with them.

If we seek a more feminine world, a world in which violence wears a badge of disgrace rather than a badge of honour, we must respond to the challenge of dealing with evil. The answer has generally been that we must either have white-hatted macho men of our own to protect us from the black-hatted macho men, or we must resort to violence ourselves. People have had to adopt the latter alternative to defend themselves from oppressors within their society as well as from aggressors without. Almost every society today has a standing professional army and drafts men and women or seeks volunteers to expand that army in times of crisis. We accept the need for violence.

This acceptance is, however, becoming increasingly untenable. Quite aside from the cataclysmic destructive potential of modern weapons, war has increasingly become less a matter of warriors slaughtering warriors and much more a matter of warriors slaughtering innocents. In the First World War, 15 per cent of those killed were civilians; in the Second World War, this rose to 65 per cent; and in the “low level” wars of today it is 90 per cent. This reminds us of Hearne’s tale of the Chipewyan raid on the Inuit—Matonabee and his warriors faced little risk and emerged unscathed; their victims were annihilated. Only the scale has changed, magnified a thousand, even a million-fold.

We are faced with two questions. In the short term, what conditions justify adopting violent behaviour of our own to legitimately ensure our security? And in the long term, how do we avoid these conditions in the first place?

Let us examine the first question first. How do people committed to peace justify violence?

The Just War ...

How does the good society, the matriarchal society, justify war? The answer lies in meeting two criteria. First, the cause for which violence is to be committed must in itself justify its use. We must use violence only in causes of the highest import. The most obvious of course is self-defence or the defence of others. This would include little outside of defending our lives, and defending our basic liberties and needs, or the lives and liberties of others.

The second criterion is that there must be no peaceful alternatives. Violence, in other words, must always be a last resort.

Principles for a just war were laid out almost three hundred years ago by Dutch lawyer and theologian Hugo Grotius in his *On the Rules of War and Peace*. He stated that a just war would require *jus ad bellum*, justice in the cause, and *jus in bello*, justice in the conduct. Just causes include defending legitimate property, protecting the weak from the strong, honouring sovereign borders and defending peoples’ lives and liberties. All diplomatic means of resolving the conflict must have failed. Just conduct includes not harming civilians, not using excessive force, not pillaging, and treating prisoners well. Grotius’s dictum is as applicable (and as ignored) in our time as it was in his.

The premier example of a just war is the one the Allied powers waged against Adolf Hitler and his Nazi horror. The cause was clearly justified: Nazi Germany intended to deprive its neighbours of their freedoms and subject them to a totalitarian, racist regime. And no peaceful approach was about to deter the aggression. The Nazis also initiated the greatest atrocity in history, the Holocaust, and this, too, would have justified war, although it was not in fact the reason for the hostilities. The world is slowly coming to recognize that genocide or ethnic cleansing justify war, even if national sovereignty must be violated, when other preventatives fail.

... And Just Alternatives

One of the most promising developments of the 20th century was the introduction of passive resistance as a substitute for violent methods of redressing injustice. Introduced by Mahatma Gandhi, man of the century for devotees of peace, he applied it with great success in the struggle to free the second largest nation on earth from colonial bondage. He inspired other paragons of non-violence, notably Martin Luther King who employed passive resistance in his campaign against segregation in the American south.

The justification for violent solutions has steadily lost ground as leaders like these have clearly shown that techniques such as boycotts and passive resistance to unjust laws can be powerfully effective at undoing oppression. In the past, critics claimed that non-violence would only work against democratic governments, but we have seen it topple a host of dictatorships—in the Philippines, Bangladesh, Thailand and South Korea, for example, not to mention the almost entirely peaceful collapse of the Soviet empire. These techniques allow ostensibly powerless people to redress wrongs without raising a hand against their oppressors. Political and social circumstances that might arguably have justified violent solutions in the past no longer do. Feminine leaders like Gandhi and King were not passive in the sense of submissive—quite the contrary—but in the sense that they would do no harm to others, even their enemies, in the sense that two wrongs don't make a right.

We might compare their quite remarkable successes to that of the IRA in Northern Ireland and the ETA in the Basque country of Spain. Both of these movements were rooted in ancient and justifiable grievances. Both resorted to macho methods, the gun and the bomb. Both would have been more successful if they had not. Catholics in Northern Ireland make up 40 per cent of the population; if the republicans had resorted to techniques like the boycott (invented in Ireland), they could have brought the province to its knees. Instead they left the matter in the hands of the “hard men” who mutilated and killed thousands, most of them innocents, earning nothing but retaliation from hard men on the other side and the furtherance of hatreds that will take generations to quell.

The Basques have gained a considerable degree of autonomy under Spain's now democratic government, a degree that most find satisfactory. Not the ETA, however. They have even turned against their own people and murder Basque leaders who are willing to work peacefully with other Spaniards. They have turned legitimate grievance into insanity, in circumstances where feminine solutions have overtaken and reduced to redundancy the need for violence.

Global Action

Non-violent resistance to oppression remains ad hoc, however. International peace requires international systems of justice and dispute resolution. Some are already in place, foremost of which is the United Nations. The UN is a very imperfect institution, grossly unrepresentative of the world's people in the General Assembly and subject to paralysis by the veto powers in the Security Council, but it does at least provide a forum for international disputes as well as many services to help bring about a more equitable globe. It has also provided a sound standard for international justice with its Universal Declaration of Human Rights. The International Convention Against Torture was instrumental in at least attempting to bring the Chilean dictator, torturer and murderer Augusto Pinochet to account for his crimes when the legal system of his own country wasn't up to the job.

In an increasingly globalized world like ours, Grotius's rule of honouring sovereign borders must, when the cause of justice is sufficiently demanding, yield to his rule of protecting the weak from the strong. Indeed, globalization seems to be creating a sense of international solidarity in respect for the person. The global community has established the International Criminal Court to try cases of genocide, war crimes, crimes against humanity and crimes of aggression. The court builds on

precedents established by the Nuremberg trials and by UN tribunals set up to deal with atrocities in Rwanda and the former Yugoslavia, and helps to discourage psychopaths from brutality against both their own people and their neighbours.

But courts require police forces. The international community is working on that, too. UN peacekeepers have been active for decades separating belligerents in a number of hot spots in Africa, Europe and the Middle East. In the Balkans, they also assisted in arresting alleged war criminals for trial in the Hague. The North Atlantic Treaty Organization's military action against Serbia to preclude the ethnic cleansing of Albanian Kosovars was an example of what the United Nations might do, if it can overcome the crippling effect of veto power in the Security Council, to deal with those crimes the international court is designed to try. Certainly some form of global police force is necessary if international justice is to be more than an ideal and international courts more than symbols.

Police forces and courts are not the only instruments by which aggressive behaviour can be deterred in a global village. Economic sanctions, too, can be persuasive. Globalization has been largely an economic affair, but even economic globalization can be a tool to promote justice. Sanctions are used by the World Trade Organization to punish nations errant in their trade behaviour; sanctions can also be used to punish nations errant in their social and political behaviour.

Sanctions, in a matriarchal world, must be humane. They must be directed against immoral governments, not their people. Banning travel by dictators, freezing their assets abroad, banning arms sales, freezing development aid but not humanitarian aid, are all valid tools in a sanctions tool box.

Nations that are too muscular to be dissuaded from aggression or oppression by military pressure can still be dissuaded by economic pressure. The new economic interdependence can serve justice as well as profit.

Precluding the Horror

The answer to the second, deeper question—how we avoid the conditions that lead to war and revolution in the first place—is multifaceted. A good place to start is with democracy. The more democratic nations we have, almost certainly the less violence we will have. Democracy is, by definition, a peaceful way of resolving differences. Furthermore, by opening up a society to all points of view, democracy opens up a society to feminine approaches. One might fairly say that it is in itself a feminine approach. Democracies have been known to swagger and bully their way around on occasion—macho forces will have their way—but not nearly as much as dictatorships do, and they rarely wage war against each other. Democracy is, therefore, an essential starting point for avoiding the conditions of state violence. If all countries were democratic, there would be no Adolf Hitlers, Pol Pots, Saddam Husseins or Vladimir Putins. The leaders of dictatorships are inevitably macho and, therefore, prone to violence. The leaders of democracies are generally less macho, and cannot easily dismiss, or jail or murder, those in their society who oppose military solutions. Democracies are self-critical. Peace has a chance.

Just as democracy dilutes the macho in international relations, so it does in national relations. Modern democratic nations consist of many tribes pursuing their own interests, interests that often conflict and result in one tribe exploiting or oppressing another; nonetheless, hostility is minimized because democracy provides other avenues for the resolution of disputes and opportunity for dissenters to make their case. Canada, sometimes flatteringly referred to as “the peaceable kingdom,” serves as an example of how a remarkably diverse collection of people can live together in relative harmony. Writer Susan Delacourt attributes this to “characteristics that are typically associated with womanhood expertise in empathy ... preference to resolve matters through

negotiation rather than confrontation ... tendency to decide tough issues in their own context rather than by applying abstract concepts.”

Globalization, too, could create a more peaceful world. It could dramatically reduce hostility by sharing the wealth. Through international economic agreements that encouraged the equitable distribution of wealth rather than the accumulation of it by the most aggressive individuals, corporations and nations, economic globalization could play a major role in eliminating alienation. An equitable world, where prosperity is broadly shared, is like any healthy body—a poor place for disease to grow. If we place as much emphasis on equitably sharing goods and services as we do on freely trading them, the disease of violence will have much greater difficulty in taking root.

The Industrial Revolution introduced the capacity to create unprecedented wealth. Modern capitalism quickly expropriated that capacity to maldistribute the wealth created. The result was hostility between rich and poor, between Capital and Labour, that has consumed our political energies for 200 years. The hostility included the rise of communism as an answer to capitalism and a new, terrifying concept called the Cold War. The new global order of unimpeded trade is freeing capitalism from the civilizing constraints hard won over two centuries and threatening a repeat of that tedious and debilitating history on a grander scale. We could do worse than contain this new capitalism before it runs completely amok and direct its wealth-creating capacity to an equitable distribution between nations just as we had to direct an earlier capitalism’s wealth-creating capacity to an equitable distribution between citizens.

Rather than attempting to enhance our security by buying guns, we can enhance it by eliminating reasons for people to attack their neighbours. A feminine approach to “defence” spending would mean shifting spending from armaments to health and education.

It would mean spending less money on weapons and more to ensure that everyone in the world has clean water, that all children, girls as well as boys, receive good basic health care, sound nutrition and as much education as they can master, and that all women have healthy pregnancies and good natal and post-natal care. This is how we dramatically reduce both the psychoses of violence and the need for it.

Fourteen: Sporting Blood

The Goon Syndrome

ON A COOL evening in February, 2000, in the city of Vancouver, one Marty McSorley silently crept up behind a man called Donald Brashear and calmly and deliberately clubbed him in the head. The blow knocked Brashear down, bleeding and unconscious. He suffered concussion to his brain. The brutal assault took place in full public view.

A debate ensued among the citizenry. Should the police charge McSorley or not? A less enlightened people than Canadians might have trouble understanding what the debate was about. Isn't someone who savagely assaults another person routinely charged with a crime? The Canadian answer is yes and no. Yes, if the assault takes place on the street; no, not necessarily, if it takes place on the ice during a hockey game. And that, of course, is where the incident occurred, in a hockey game between the Boston Bruins and the Vancouver Canucks. Ultimately, McSorley was charged, with assault with a weapon—his hockey stick. He had gone too far, even for a hockey player.

Violence was Marty McSorley's business. Even though he was a no-talent player, described by one sports writer as "a soon to be 37-year-old defenceman who can't skate [and] can't play," he had lasted 17 years in the National Hockey League. This seeming contradiction is an integral part of the sport. In the business of professional hockey, certain players rise to the highest ranks even though they are not the fastest skaters, not the most skilled passers or goal scorers, and not the ablest defenders of their own net. They could in no way be mistaken for Wayne Gretzky other than that they wear skates. What then brings these men to the heights of their profession? Their ability as it turns out has nothing to do with the sport of hockey, or sport at all for that matter; it is the ability to intimidate people, even to beat them up if necessary. These men are "enforcers," or less eloquently, "goons."

The moral rationale for having goons at all in a sport whose appeal, theoretically at least, is its speed and skill is the same as for having armies—because the other guys do. The same sort of circular justification insists that each team must have a goon to protect their quality players from other teams' goons. If one succumbs to the psychosis, all must.

Team sports aren't war, but they are the next best outlet for tribalism. Most sports fans, whether they are watching hockey in Boston or in Vancouver, aren't at the game to appreciate its finer points; they are there to see our guys beat their guys.

When franchises for a northern sport like hockey are set up in cities like Tampa Bay and Dallas where words like "deke" and "bodycheck" are strange to the point of exotic, one suspects that the game appeals less for nuances of speed and skill and rather more for its violence, for its warfare. Enjoyed as a sort of World Wrestling Entertainment on skates, goons become the stars and the quality players the supporting cast. Athletes are perceived as warriors and the goons as the ultimate warriors.

Tribalism easily translates into violence, even at a hockey game—personally on the ice, vicariously in the stands. Team sports are a tribal affair and tribal affairs are masculine affairs. They are mostly good-natured but sometimes slip the leash of friendly rivalry.

War Games

Sport owns ancient origins in violence. Palaeolithic men depended heavily on their physical skills for hunting and fighting. Accomplishment at hunting meant meat on the fire and better odds at winning the best wife or wives. Sex was no doubt a motivator for fighting as well as for hunting.

The Indian males that Hearne encountered raided their neighbours to steal women and wrestled for women among themselves—marvellous incentives to hone one’s fighting skills. They no doubt learned early. Just as the young of other predator species learn to hunt and fight in play, so would young *Homo sapiens* boys wrestle and play games with toy weapons. The practice might very well continue on into adult life.

Among tribal people, organized sports would serve both to maintain fitness and to bond males, important not only for hunting but for war as well. The Iroquois called the game of lacrosse the little brother of war.

As civilization developed, sports became more formal, often associating with religion and some of its darker aspects. Organized sport shows up in the earliest civilizations. The oldest known ballpark was built by Mokaya Indians in southern Mexico 3,500 years ago for a game believed to be “a cross between soccer and basketball.” Drawings connect these ancient games to ritual sacrifice.

Reflections of the violent origins of sport persist strongly today. The Olympic Games include javelin throwing, fencing, wrestling, boxing, archery, judo, and pistol and rifle shooting, all manifestations of combat, all reflecting the martial purposes of the games of ancient Athens, the inspiration for the modern Olympics. The Games are ostensibly a celebration of individual athletes and their skills—even, in rhetorically sweeter moments, a celebration of brotherhood—but they are really about nation against nation, about victory and defeat, war by other means, as the obsessive medal counts illustrate. How many people would be glued to their TV sets watching fencing or Greco-Roman wrestling if it wasn’t us versus them with national flags flying?

Many team sports are a metaphor for war. In hockey and football, for example, warriors suit up in body armour and proceed to battle each other on fields of honour. The violence itself isn’t metaphor—blood actually flows. Teams represent the tribal pride of their cities.

Macho Myths

But at the end of the day, we are told, sports are just games. The hockey goons only break each other’s noses and knock out each other’s teeth. It’s all entertainment, they get very well paid, and no innocents get hurt. Hockey is a relatively harmless way of yielding to the machismo that resides in all of us, particularly in men. The vicarious enjoyment of sport provides a healthy outlet for male aggression that otherwise might be turned to destructive behaviour.

The truth is rather more the opposite. Violence in sports makes men more belligerent, not less. One only has to observe males who have attended a sports match or watched it on TV to see that the aggression level has been raised, not lowered—angry in defeat, exultant in victory. Soccer riots alone disprove any notion that sports, even a relatively non-violent one like soccer, soothe the savage fan. More than one city centre has been trashed by fans “celebrating” their team winning a league championship. Researchers at Georgia State University found that sports fans experienced testosterone surges just as players do, with hormone levels in fans of winning teams surging much higher than those in fans of losing teams. A study by sociologist David Philips showed that murder rates in the United States increased by 12 per cent after heavyweight boxing title fights. If professional sport is an outlet for male aggression, it is neither a healthy nor a harmless one. Violence on the field breeds violence in the stands.

And then there’s the fond myth that sport makes men out of boys. Perhaps it does, but we have to wonder which sport and what kind of men. A disproportionately high number of athletes behave more like spoiled children than men. Few other professions can boast an array of delinquents like tennis brat John McEnroe, rapist Mike Tyson, exhibitionist Dennis Rodman, drugfuelled sprinter Ben Johnson, and a host of others. Many athletes make fine role models for youth, many don’t.

A host of infamous quotations frames the philosophy that generates the behaviour. Football star Alex Karras describes his playing days: “I had a license to kill for 60 minutes a week. My opponents were all fair game and when I got off the field, I had no regrets.” From fellow football player Allen Sack, “We dominate opponents, we dominate other athletes ... and of course, we dominate women.” Basketballer Charles Barkley, as notorious for his fouls as he was renowned for his gifted play, observed, “This is a game that, if you lose, you go home and beat your wife and kids.” From the coaching staff, legendary football coach Vince Lombardi’s wisdom: “Winning isn’t everything. It’s the only thing,” and “To play this game you must have a fire in you, and there is nothing that stokes fire like hate.” And from management, hockey owner Conn Smythe: “If you can’t lick ‘em in the alley, you can’t beat ‘em on the ice.” This is a course in manhood we really don’t need—the bully as hero.

Ironically, bullying drives many kids out of sports. The Minnesota Amateur Sports Commission reported a survey that showed nearly half of young athletes were yelled at or insulted by adults; 17.5 per cent hit, kicked or slapped; and 8.2 per cent pressured to harm others. These figures no doubt explain in part why 70 per cent of children in the United States drop out of organized sport before they are thirteen. We also get a picture of the kind of men those who remain are encouraged to be.

Gun Play

To observe violence and myth mutually complemented, one need look no further than the sport of hunting. Men no longer need to hunt for food or raid their neighbours for women, but some still find weapons intrinsic to their maleness. Nothing arouses the passions of such men more than a threat to their relationship with their guns. Leon Craig, political philosopher at the University of Alberta, petulantly refers to opposition to such manly pursuits as hunting as “the legitimization of the weakness of weak men.” In macholand, apparently men who don’t want to kill something are hardly men at all. Spanish philosopher and aristocrat José Ortega y Gasset referred to hunting as giving yourself the pleasure of “a few hours or a few days of being Palaeolithic.” Killing, one might say, for old time’s sake.

Politically, no other single-issue organization in the United States has equalled the success of the National Rifle Association. Despite membership of only a tiny fraction of the voting public, it may be the most influential lobby in Washington and has been remarkably successful at suppressing gun control laws. (Even more remarkable when one considers that most Americans, including most gun owners, favour stronger gun laws.)

The gun control issue stands out as an example of the gender split in politics. Women, who have no need to kill anything to establish their womanhood, who are guided more by life-affirming values than by life-taking values, are much more supportive of gun control laws. It is principally men, particularly powerless men, clinging to some vestige of male dominance at a time when patriarchy is sorely challenged, who reach for that ancient symbol of male virility, the weapon.

Hunting has always been justified as a “natural” pastime for men, and although men are naturally aggressive, whether or not they are naturally hunters is something else altogether. Some archaeologists suggest that, at least before we invented weapons like the bow and arrow, we did more scavenging than hunting, so that we might be better described as “scavenger-gatherers” rather than “hunter-gatherers.”

So just how “Palaeolithic,” to use Ortega y Gasset’s term, are modern hunters being? We might apply the test of universality. If a behaviour is truly innate to the species, it will be practiced by almost all people in almost all cultures. Marriage, for example, is found in some form or another everywhere, so we can assume that male-female bonding, monogamous or polygamous, relatively long-term or permanent, is “natural.” Hunting, on the other hand, is popular in many parts of the

world but it is nowhere nearly universal. Even in gun-happy North America, the great majority of men don't hunt and show no interest in it. We might suspect, therefore, that male interest in hunting is not so much innate as cultural. Early men hunted to provide protein, but once it could be provided domestically, hunting became irrelevant, persisting only as sport, not as a genetic imperative.

Good Old Boys

Hunting offers some men a sense of power; the tribalism of sport offers ambitious men real power. The male bonding of the "old boys network," grounded in the playing fields, continues to provide a route to success in business and politics.

When prominent Canadian sports figure Alan Eagleson was convicted of fraud, his lawyer read into the court record letters of support from a bevy of prominent figures, including a retired Supreme Court justice, a former prime minister and the head of a major media corporation. When these civic leaders, role models for young men, rush to publicly support a convicted felon, a man described variously in the press as "exuberant and vulgar, charming and violent" and as a "lying, manipulating, conniving, cheating parasite," they exemplify the mindless loyalty of men to sports and their sporting buddies as much as they insult public morality.

As does the exploitation of the public purse to fund professional sports. In her book *The Rites of Men*, Varda Burstyn describes this largesse as "a massive affirmative-action program for masculinism." Just as the male replication ethos warps government spending toward military purposes at the expense of social purposes, so it does with spending on sports. In the 1990s, American taxpayers contributed over \$10 billion U.S. to professional sports facilities, essentially subsidizing wealthy team owners and overpaid athletes—a welfare system for sports.

Businesses that can afford to sign their employees to multimillion-dollar a year contracts should pay for their own premises; only the male obsession with sports can turn staunch free-enterprise businessmen into sports socialists, unashamedly sponging handouts from government.

Almost all of this is for the exclusive benefit of men, a kind of restoration of the patriarchy. Burstyn describes domed stadiums as "cathedrals of men's culture," and goes on to say that "sport has overtaken many of the previous functions of an established patriarchal church ... the moral instruction of children, the ritual differentiation of men and women, the worship by both of a common divinity forged in the masculine mode, and ... collective bonding around that divinity." Marx might have added that, like organized religion, sport also serves as a modern opiate of the people, or at least of male people.

Women are not only less interested in sports but are often excluded by them. In business meetings, for example, women often find themselves shut out of the conviviality by men's mandatory sports conversations. Such is the macho world of professional sports.

Bad Sports ...

When German theologian Dorothee Solle was asked how she would explain happiness to a child she replied, "I wouldn't explain it. I'd toss him a ball and let him play."

Despite the macho abuses of sport, we recognize that it can be a healthy part of children's development and of adults' life, both as spectators and players. It may not make men out of boys, but it does provide an outlet for youthful energies that might be turned less constructively elsewhere. It can provide joy and it can build character, including feminine character. It can instruct youth in co-operation, in working together to achieve a common goal, as well as in competition. It

can demonstrate the value and rewards of commitment as well as of winning. It can emphasize self-improvement, including learning to lose with grace, as much as beating the other guy. Doing one's best doesn't have to mean doing better than someone else. The values can be feminine and the best of the masculine rather than macho.

The question is the qualities we want in the sports we teach children that contribute to a more feminine world. What qualities would an ideal sport have? We can make a list. First, a sport should not only be non-violent in itself but it should not be an heir to violence of the past; it should not flaunt a connection to war and hunting. It should be an equitable sport, that is it should be accessible to all, not only so that all children can play it but so that they can carry it on into their adult life. This means two things, that it should be relatively inexpensive and that it should be suitable for children of all sizes, shapes, skills and genders. It should be as safe as vigorous physical activity will allow. It should be high-energy, aimed at cardiovascular development as opposed to muscle-building, ensuring that it is amenable to lifelong fitness. And of course it should be great fun.

If we were to hold a contest to design a sport that worst exemplifies these qualities, that was the worst possible sport to teach young people, North American football would probably win. It is violent, dangerously destructive to young bodies, requires expensive equipment and facilities, limited to men (women are reduced to the subservient role of cheerleaders) and largely only to men of a certain freakish size at that. Many of the roles emphasize muscle over cardiovascular fitness, not a healthy approach especially with a flood of steroids around. It is an exclusive sport, played by a chosen few, encouraging a cultish military-style ambiance. Hockey, with many of the same characteristics, might win second place.

American football recalls the ancient tie between sport and religion. With a powerful tie to fundamental Christianity, it is common for player prayer sessions before and after games. The male-bonding cult The Promise Keepers was founded by a former football coach at the University of Colorado. A natural alliance we might say—an intensely macho sport and a patriarchal religion. A very anti-feminine alliance.

... and Good

A contest to design a sport that best met our ideal might come up with something like soccer. It is essentially non-violent, as safe as exuberant running can be, requires little in the way of equipment and can be played almost anywhere. It is suitable for all kids, girls as well as boys. It is high-energy, excellent cardiovascular exercise, and certainly fun. Those sports that can be enjoyed without competition, such as swimming and skiing, are also winners.

Aside from the sport itself, the rules and regulations governing play can adopt a feminine approach. The co-operative side of organized sports can be emphasized over the competitive. Many coaches of children's sports insist that all the kids on a team have equal playing time, not just the stars. Even macho sports can be civilized. The Pacific Coast Amateur Hockey Association has adopted the Sportsmanship Point System, a system in which teams are awarded points not only for winning but also for playing cleanly. If a team keeps its penalty minutes below a set level, it gets a point, win or lose. Sportsmanship can be compatible with winning and deserves to be rewarded as an equally legitimate goal.

Taking a broader tack, we might shift our emphasis from elite sport to popular sport. Society gains much more from broad participation in athletics than it does from watching elite athletes, much more from people engaging in sport as active participants rather than as couch potatoes. We might begin in the schools and the community, instructing youngsters in those sports that minimize competition, that preclude violence and domination, that are inclusive and that they can play throughout their lives.

This emphasis can continue on into later life. We can shift funding from training elite athletes to providing community facilities and green spaces such that everyone can enjoy exercise and sport. We might downgrade the hopelessly corrupted Olympic Games and institute instead international conferences of sport for athletes who are enthusiastic amateurs, not pros or pseudo-pros, just ordinary citizens. Participants (as opposed to competitors) could be chosen by local sports associations, by curling clubs, ski associations, and so on. They would receive no prizes, no medals, and they would have to contribute to their travel and living expenses. They would participate for the pure joy of sport and for the pleasure of meeting others from around the world who share that joy.

Equal Opportunity

A different attitude, a non-elitist attitude, towards sport is exemplified by the University of Toronto's Faculty of Physical Education and Health. The faculty attempts to turn out graduates who take a balanced approach to physical activity and who work to broaden participation in it. The curriculum emphasizes the participation of women in vigorous activity and the participation of men in non-sport activities, including dance, to balance masculine and feminine. Students study the cultural and political aspects as well as the biophysical aspects of physical activity.

The University of Toronto approach encourages something particularly important, the involvement of girls and women. Sports are as important to girls as to boys, not only for physical fitness but for self-image. Although boys who are active in sports are only slightly more sexually active than those who aren't, girls who are active in sports are much less sexually active than their classmates. Kathleen Miller, a sociologist at George Washington University, suggests that this is because, "Sports changes the image girls have of their bodies. They see them as tools to be used rather than objects to be desired. ... with this added confidence ... they don't have to trade sex for popularity."

We need the presence of more girls and women not only for the sake of their personal well-being but also to change the reigning ethos of sport. As long as it is considered a predominantly male domain, it will display a predominantly male value system.

Winning Isn't Everything

Changing the system is hard to do in the face of the raging commercialization of modern sport, a commercialization that creates such immense rewards in prestige and money that everything is subordinated to winning. Only all-star status in professional sport and only gold in the Olympics lead on to fortunes in endorsements. Corruption of values is inevitable.

When a group of American athletes were asked if they would take a banned drug if it guaranteed victory without being caught, over 98 per cent said they would. When asked if they would take it if they were guaranteed five years of winning without being caught, but would die from side effects at the end of the five years, over half said they would use it. When slugger Mark McGwire set a new home run record in 1998, he was the toast of the sports world even though he admitted being powered by androstenedione, known affectionately by athletes as "andro," a precursor of testosterone, the "mother of all steroids." Andro is banned in the Olympics but not in major league baseball. Its sales increased sevenfold after McGwire's banner year. High school coaches no doubt face a forbidding challenge in convincing teenage boys not to use steroids when they helped make McGwire an international hero.

With a winning at all costs attitude saturating the world of games with performance enhancing drugs, with the prevalence of violent sports in North America, with the Olympic Games celebrating skills in a host of fighting techniques and weapons, with the profound commercial and media

dependence on sport, we would seem to have a long way to go to feminize the universe of physical prowess.

But grounds for optimism exist. More than anything else we can be encouraged by the numbers of women flocking to sport. Women's tennis, for example, now rivals or exceeds men's in popularity, with top women professionals making more money than the top men. Some pundits have suggested that this is because women play a game that's more "human," displaying more of "the lovely physics of tennis" that's simply more fun to watch, as opposed to the superhuman serves and drives of the men's game. The boys may have to start playing more like the girls.

The most prominent curler of the mid to late 1990s, Sandra Schmirler, won the hearts of Canadians with her vitality, grace and charm while winning three world championships and the first women's Olympic gold medal in curling. If an athlete was ever a good role model, it was Sandra Schmirler.

Women are taking enthusiastically to soccer as well. U.S. soccer star Mia Hamm has shared television commercials with Michael Jordan, the superstar of athletic endorsements. Over 90,000 fans watched the United States win the 1999 women's World Cup over China, with 40 million watching on TV. Despite taking place early in the morning in Canada, the 2020 Canada-Sweden Olympic women's soccer final was watched by 4.4 million Canadians, the most watched event of the games in the country.

Soccer, one of the more feminine of organized sports, is the national sport of a host of countries and none seem to have lost their sense of manhood. In North America, it has rapidly gained ground as a sport for kids.

Sport may yet shed its violent inheritance. It can be much more than a venue "for the regeneration of masculinist mythologies," more than the last stand of patriarchy.

Fifteen: The Mating Game

First Impressions

TWO PAIRS OF eyes meet. Pupils dilate. Eye contact locks for three seconds or more in what anthropologist Helen E. Fisher calls “the copulatory gaze.” Bodies lean toward each other. The brain is alert to aural, nasal, tactile and visual sensations. If the sensations are pleasing, the brain’s hypothalamus triggers the release of a series of neurotransmitters: first phenylethylamine, an “upper,” then dopamine, enhancing attention and motivation, followed by norepinephrine, causing the heart to beat faster and the palms to sweat. Eventually, if all goes well, peptide hormones called endorphins are released, calming the passions. This could be a scene from a cave a hundred thousand years ago or from a singles bar last night. The ancient chemistry prevails.

As do the ancient preferences. Men and women today instinctively seek from each other what hunter-gatherer men and women sought from each other in the dim past. They continue to follow where parental investment leads. Women preferred men who were good hunters and who had status. Both sexes still perceive men as providers. Women continue to favour those males who manifest good genes and who can provide them and their children with ample resources, the best indication of which is success or the promise of success. If women have always been sex objects to men, men have always been success objects to women.

Experienced White House reporter Nina Burleigh, after an appraising look from President Bill Clinton, commented, “There was a time when the hormones of indignant feminism raged in my veins. An open gaze like that, at least from a man of lesser stature, would have annoyed me. But that evening ... I was incandescent.” Highly successful men are magnets to women: rock stars and top athletes are besieged by groupies while balding but rich businessmen marry glamorous young trophy brides.

Success for men is spelled s–e–x. They compete fiercely to be the ladies’ choice, to appear the fittest for mating: pop musicians to become rock stars, athletes to become professionals, politicians to win elections and businessmen to build corporate empires. Successful men display their possessions like peacocks displaying their extravagant tails, and for the same reason. They may not be conscious of it, but as much as anything it’s about looking good to the ladies. The masculine drive to exhibit potency is without bound. It has led to the building and to the overthrow of empires and, on a softer note, to the creation of sweet music. British evolutionary psychologist Geoffrey Miller has noted that the release of albums by jazz musicians, who are predominantly male, coincides closely with age, peaking at about thirty and then falling off steadily along with testosterone levels.

Male groupies, on the other hand, are attracted not by the successful woman but by the pretty one. Men who mate with healthy women ensure the survival of their genes, including those genes that direct men to seek out healthy mates in the first place. Health is best illustrated by physical appearance; youthful beauty is the best sign, or at least the most obvious sign, to a man that his progeny will be well-borne and well-birthed. Thus men continue to be, as they always have, suckers for a pretty face and a pleasing figure.

Modern market culture exploits the male replication urge by turning the female body into a sales gimmick, used to sell everything from beer to clothes to music. The automobile industry has prospered mightily from the male libido, with auto shows and advertisements notoriously juxtaposing shiny new car models with sleek young female models. The sports car, the motorcycle, or in some circles the pickup truck, become the extension of the man, the display of his resources, his success, his genetic fitness.

Ultimately, of course, the market is exploiting only first impressions, only superficiality. Because our children are so long dependent on us, we must pair-bond for relatively long periods, long enough to get them safely out of the nest. In order to remain compatible for years on end, men and women need more from their mates than either resources or beauty. Consequently, many other things appeal to and bond us, including a sense of humour, similar interests, gentleness and intelligence.

When Hearne and Matonabee were returning from the Coppermine, they encountered a Dogrib woman living entirely alone. The woman had been kidnapped by a band of Athapascans, her father, mother and husband killed before her eyes. Her captor had treated her kindly, but when the Athapaskan women murdered her child, she fled and, not knowing the way back to her own country, had set up camp on her own. Hearne reported that she had survived the rigours of a northern winter successfully, even comfortably: "It is scarcely possible to conceive that a person in her forlorn situation could be so composed as to be capable of contriving or executing any thing that was not absolutely necessary to her existence; but there were sufficient proofs that she had extended her care much farther, as all her clothing, beside being calculated for real service, shewed great taste, and exhibited no little variety of ornament." The woman was obviously quite capable of looking after herself, of hunting for food and clothing and providing shelter. She needed a man for none of these things.

Why then were these women the property of men? (Immediately that the party discovered her, the men began to wrestle for her.) The answer is simple: women were prisoners of their children. They were constantly tied to the nursing of their babes, one infant weaned to make way for another. Women could gather food and care for hearth and home with babies on their hips or backs, but only men were free to depart their loved ones and hunt, for days on end if need be, for the concentrated protein that is meat. The more dependent a band was on that source of protein, the more dependent the women became.

Civilization could have freed women from that dependence. The need to hunt largely disappeared. Indeed it often became the exclusive property of the aristocracy. The work and the leadership required— especially the leadership—could as easily have been assumed by women as by men, even with babes in tow. Yet civilization only bound women even tighter to the tyranny of the womb. It gave ambitious men the opportunity for status they could never previously have dreamed of, and they exploited the opportunity to the extreme, institutionalizing aggression, hierarchy and male dominance in the process.

Family Values

Civilization vanquished the equality of the hunter-gatherers, subjecting most men to peasantry and serfdom, leaving them almost as powerless as women. When we became agriculturists, family life probably didn't change all that much for this benighted majority. Band life was replaced by village life. Families extended to grandparents, aunts, uncles, perhaps to most members of the village, all of whom might be involved in some way with all the children. It did indeed take a village to raise a child.

So it was for millennia, only to be shattered by the Industrial Revolution. Both family life and village life fell afoul of a system that demanded large numbers of servants for the new machines. Family and community suffered great stresses. Villages were largely replaced by huge impersonal cities; families were separated from kin; and men, women and children went to work in the factories and mines.

Work separated from home. Older children went to work. Because of their smaller, nimbler fingers and more amenable natures, they were often more useful to the factory owner than their parents. Early in the 20th century, six-year-old children were still working 12-hour shifts in mills.

Eventually, however, working people gained both prosperity and power courtesy of their insistence on a decent share of the wealth created by the new technologies. The middle class expanded. With prosperity came leisure and a new focus on family. By the end of the Second World War a new form had settled in—the nuclear family. The germ of the nuclear family lay in the philosophies developed at the end of the 17th century that emphasized the individual and the individual's right to make his or her own choices, including the choice of marriage partner. But it never really took hold across the social spectrum until the new economy allowed the wives of all classes to remain at home to care for children. It reached its zenith after the Second World War. Two parents and their children forming a household, mother at home and father at work, became a highly uniform pattern.

It was a pattern of inequality. Women, the most gregarious of the sexes, were isolated. Rather than spend their days in the congenial companionship of their fellows, they spent their time with small children or, as the children grew up, alone. As sociologist Sharon Hayes points out, in a highly individualistic, ruthlessly competitive society, the home becomes a sanctuary, and the maintenance of this sanctuary was largely and unfairly up to mothers. Men were free to be out and about in society. They continued to work, continued to receive income, continued to advance their careers and, of no small importance, continued to invest for their old age. Furthermore, they and they alone controlled every aspect of society, from religion to the economy to government. Women were not only deprived of company, they were deprived of financial independence and security, and deprived of any identity in their society but one, one that carried virtually no status at all—housewife. Often their identity was simply as an extension of their husband.

Not surprisingly, they rebelled.

The Game Changes

Just as women unleashed a wave of feminism in the early part of the 20th century to end political exclusion, they unleashed a similar wave mid-century to end social and economic exclusion. They clamoured for release from the stifling structure called the nuclear family.

Their demands, mightily reinforced by technological change, rang in a dramatically new and different era in the mating game. In no small part due to the birth control pill, women were liberated to participate freely in the game and enjoy freedom of choice as much as men, to choose the men (or women) they cohabited with, to choose the where and when of sex, to choose to have children, or not.

The current age is a confusing one for relations between the sexes. We are increasingly free of patriarchal constraints, but just as freedom brings choice, choice brings confusion. The mating game no longer has a single social purpose but many purposes; everyone chooses their own. The principal one might still be children, or it might be companionship, or ambition, or just sex. Those ancillary traits that we always desired in our mates, like a sense of humour or common interests, may now become central to the whole point of the exercise. Individuals are seeking and designing their own bliss, adapting old patterns to their needs or rejecting them entirely.

Despite the variety of behaviours, however, one thing remains somewhere at the heart of the mating game and that of course is producing the next generation. And confusion reigns here as well. Families simply are no longer what they once were.

... and the Family Is Transformed

The new conditions require a new paradigm, and indeed one is forming.

The nuclear family of the 1950s (sometimes erroneously referred to as the traditional family) now represents a minority. An assortment of structures dot the family landscape: both parents working, single-parent families, mixed or step families where children have a variety of parents and step-parents, even same-sex families. Couples are increasingly living together without benefit of marriage, a behaviour now almost mandatory as a pre-marriage ritual. Serial monogamy—pairs cohabiting for a period of time, then reforming into new pairs—is routine. Divorce was practiced as far back as the hunter-gatherers but today, in a society flush with equality, independence and choice, a society that places an emphasis on self-fulfillment unknown to hunter-gatherers, it is commonplace.

So commonplace, in fact, that it is developing ceremony. Some divorcing couples in the United States are engaging in ceremonies in which they return rings and promise to treat each other with respect. Some clergymen, concerned about lingering bitterness between ex-spouses and the effects breaking up can have on children, have embraced divorce ceremonies.

We are driven to ask, What exactly is a family?

Is it, for example, single motherhood by choice? Social conservatives might answer with a resounding no. Yet some women, secure in their new economic independence, are choosing single motherhood, a choice that is overwhelmingly accepted by young people. Actress Sharon Stone, looking for a father for an intended child, commented, “If I get to like the guy, I might just decide to keep him.” Independence, you might say, with a vengeance.

The Supreme Court of Canada has ruled that common-law partners of the same sex should be treated the same in legislation as common-law partners of the opposite sex.

Good nutrition, clean water, efficient sewage disposal and vaccination mean that very few children are now necessary for the future of either families or society. As a result, many couples today forgo the pleasures of parenthood. We are fitted with genes that impose a powerful desire for sex but not for children. That was unnecessary because children were the price of sex. Now they aren't, now they are a choice, and many people just say no. We no longer even need them to take care of us in our old age; we are quite capable of providing for ourselves, individually through private pensions and collectively through public pensions.

Historically, marriage was a social construct, a way of confining sexual desire to collective mores and goals, a way of ensuring that duties, loyalties and property would be passed securely along with genes. Now it's a romantic, individualistic construct.

Society, individuals, the law, governments, all struggle to define just what family is. Meanwhile, people increasingly expand the possibilities.

What's Sex Got to Do With It?

Not all of our relationships are bound up with mating and family, central as those are. We are a gregarious species and enjoy the company of our fellows for company's sake alone. We enjoy political relationships, workplace relationships, neighbourly relationships and many others.

Outside of family, the first relationship we think of is friendship. Even here, however, we cannot escape the influence of the replication ethos.

Friendship among men is riddled with tension between their individualism and their tribalism. While men compete vigorously as individuals, they also find strength in numbers, in reciprocal altruism, whether it involves co-operating with their entire group or forming coalitions to gain status within the larger group. Male friendships, therefore, tend to be bound up with display. Whether it's boozy macho drinking, initiation rites, or the wearing of uniforms, men are driven to

symbolize and to prove their group loyalty. They must pay their dues. Men bond best for specific events, project-oriented exercises with a clear focus that emphasizes action. A range of undertakings from construction projects to political parties to business deals to sports events, enjoyed in reality or vicariously, replace the hunts and raids of the pre-humans and the hunter-gatherers. Symbolism continues to play a part, with uniforms of various sorts used to distinguish group from group, and even to distinguish hierarchy: bishops are contrasted to mere priests, officers to mere soldiers, and businessmen—“suits”—to mere workmen, by the clothes and insignia that they wear.

Female bonding, or friendship, is very different. Less competitive, women are freer to be open and trusting in their relationships with one another. They have had little need to prove loyalties through initiation, sacrifice or symbolism. They have never been very tribal. Furthermore, women’s activities in our long years as hunter-gatherers were less intensely focused than specific events like hunting; women associated casually and continually in the daily conduct of their affairs—gathering, minding children and tending hearth and home. Consequently they tend to bond with “ease and unfettered grace,” as one man enviously observed.

With age, men’s relationships, too, may become easier, in a sense feminized. The tensions that accompany male bonding subside as testosterone levels decline and estrogen levels increase. Older men have less to prove. They become fonder of conversation and congeniality and less of competition. They become wiser.

And what of friendship between men and women? Attraction between individuals of different genders is quite capable of transcending sex, even as it is capable of functioning comfortably alongside it. Even among chimpanzees, males and females, particularly older animals, develop comfortable relationships with one another independent of sex. And humans have a much greater repertoire of interests than chimps. Regardless of sexual interest, a person is attracted to another person with the same philosophy, for example. Human attraction can be awakened for a complexity of reasons, of which sex is by far the most important but not the only one. As the old hierarchal society breaks down, and men escape the boundaries of a tough, in-charge, unemotional male stereotype while women become more involved in all aspects of society, cross-gender friendships become more common and more important to both sexes. And life becomes richer.

The collapse of the old sexual contract—men hunt/women gather—and the end of the patriarchal interregnum that partly replaced it and partly perpetuated it, have given us an uneasy time, for many a lonely, confusing time, but also a challenge, an opportunity to escape the stereotypes imposed by raw nature and hierarchal culture and cultivate a social framework that allows all individuals to explore the fullness of their nature, both masculine and feminine. We cannot escape nature, but now that we are onto its wiles, we can deal with it and create relationships suitable to the more matriarchal world our survival demands.

***Sixteen:* The Next Generation**

Family Matters

REGARDLESS OF WHAT family may mean in the future, creating the next generation will remain at the heart of the matter. Relationships may vary and constantly change in this new arena, but children will be made and when they are their welfare will be of the highest priority.

Much of what is new has come under fire for this very reason. Divorce, single-parent child-rearing, step-family relationships, all have their critics, who claim that they harm children, disadvantaging them in later life. Subject to particularly heavy criticism is the lack of a man around to provide a role model for boys. Thirteen per cent of Canadian children and 25 per cent of American children live in homes without a biological, step or adoptive father. David Blankenhorn, author of *Fatherless America*, believes that the presence of a father determines more than anything else the likelihood of a young man running into trouble with the law. Greater involvement of fathers also seems to result in children developing less gender-stereotyped behaviour.

We might expect that children, who especially need security, would suffer from family break-up and instability. And two-parent families clearly have advantages. Rearing children is a challenging job: two heads and hearts and two pairs of hands are no doubt better than one. They are even better if they are the heads and hearts and hands of biological parents. Step parents, who have no genetic investment, cannot be expected to be as concerned about the welfare of a child as its natural parents. Two natural parents also bring in kinship support from two blood families, an important tie. As for having a man around, paternal love and discipline is no doubt of importance in a world of masculine values.

Much evidence supports all this; however, we might keep some qualifiers in mind. First, what are we comparing? For example, we would expect more dysfunctional families among the divorced than among the non-divorced, so when we compare the effects of divorce on children we may, in fact, be comparing dysfunctional and functional families, not divorced and stable families. If studies don't filter out this factor, they are dubious if not meaningless. A study by Louise Silverstein and Carl Auerbach of Yeshiva University in New York City found that when parents of high-conflict marriages divorced, the psychological well-being of the children improved. Paul Amato of the University of Nebraska, who tracked 2000 divorced families for almost 20 years, found something similar, that the children of high-conflict divorce grew up to be as well-adjusted as children from intact families. These studies powerfully suggest that children are better off in a happy divorce than in an unhappy marriage.

Second, we might keep in mind the disadvantages faced by single women with children. After divorce, men tend to be better off financially and women worse off. And women frequently have to battle recalcitrant fathers for alimony and child support. Single-parent families generally, usually headed by women, are often poor and isolated, victims of an individualistic philosophy, with no extended family, no band or village to support them. We cannot be surprised if they don't do well when we stack the deck against them. Nor can we be surprised that in a masculine culture, where material success is valued very much and caring valued very little, those who concentrate on caring should receive little reward, even be considered failures and burdens upon society.

The problem may not be so much one-parent families as our isolation and oppression of them. Silverstein and Auerbach found that the children who suffered from divorce were those who fell into poverty or social insecurity, while the great majority suffered no significant long-term effects. We can do a great deal to see that they don't fall into poverty by ensuring that poor parents—single, married or divorced—are provided with assistance as necessary with child-raising, decent-paying work or other financial support, and stable, safe housing.

Third, we shouldn't lose sight of the historical perspective. Much about modern family is new. As generations develop experience with the various approaches to family, they will adjust to them, becoming more comfortable with them and more skilled at dealing with their problems. Barely two generations are familiar with widespread divorce, for instance, yet already the social stigma that once wounded children of marriage break-up is fading. Statistics Canada reports that children of divorced parents seem to do as well in the job market as their peers. Interestingly, they wait longer to get married, a not unwise decision.

Even the language changes as divorce becomes more a part of the culture. Parent counsellors refer to "former spouse" or "your child's other parent" rather than "ex" and preclude talk of a child "visiting" another parent. As one counsellor observed, "You visit your aunt, you visit a museum, a parent is forever." The new federal Divorce Act replaces the confrontational winner/loser words "custody" and "access" with the calmer, more neutral "parental orders."

Divorce and a more flexible sexuality generally, particularly for women, are part of a larger trend away from patriarchy and back to a more natural, less rigid society. Some anthropologists suggest that most humans can feel a strong sexual attraction to a partner for only about four years before it wanes, coincidentally about the time it takes to bear and wean a child. Perhaps we are biologically programmed for divorce. From another perspective, divorce is also consistent with the fundamental capitalist value of acting in one's own self-interest. In any case, divorce is now commonplace and most divorced people, especially women, feel better off out of their marriages.

Democratic Family

Family has come a long way from the patriarchal institution it was in the Victorian era when the father was breadwinner and boss, the mother the caretaker of his children, and the children little more than his property. Families today are a very much more equitable, even democratic arrangement. Dr. Thomas Gordon, a founder of the parenting movement with his book *Parent Effectiveness Training*, is one of the better known promoters of the democratic family. He doesn't believe in punishment and aptly applies Lord Acton's famous observation, "Power corrupts and absolute power corrupts absolutely," to family life. Certainly the more coercive methods of exhibiting parental power are in decline. Spanking, for instance, has become much less acceptable generally, and many European countries have banned corporal punishment outright.

Describing the ideal family, Gordon states, "Instead of parents setting rules and making limits, rules and limits are set by the family with kids participating." He suggests that parents who listen to each other and to their kids, know their kids developmental stages, and practice self-discipline themselves, produce children with self-discipline who act out of a sense of family belonging. He points out that autocratic parenting tends to produce anti-social behaviour, and that children from democratic families are more likely to become leaders in school. With thousands of parents now taking courses in effective parenting, the democratic family may fully emerge, leaving the patriarchal model to gather the dust it richly deserves.

Neil Nevitte, political scientist and author of *The Decline of Deference*, suggests that the increasingly democratic nature of the family explains why young people are having difficulty relating to the hierarchal nature of political and other institutions. And so they should.

It Takes a Village ...

Certain early peoples, including the Inuit of the far north, were generous with children. If one family had too many and another too few, the former might simply give one or more to their less-favoured neighbours. The arrangement was very sensible. By balancing the need for resources of

the families involved, the chance for survival of all in a harsh environment was optimized. A future generation was best assured.

Many cultures have followed similar practices: formal adoption, for example, in our own. Even though an adopted child does not carry its parents' genes, the parents are quite capable of selflessly lavishing love and care upon that child, and thinking of it as their very own. A fondness for children, all children, including a sense of responsibility for them, is widespread among Homo sapiens. Even a resolutely childless bachelor who has decided to end his line in wasted seed does not protest paying taxes for the education of the next generation. Even a society as individualistic as ours recognizes that if the future of our civilization depends on children, then surely they are the children of all of us and all of us to some degree or another must accept responsibility for their welfare. We illustrate the African folk wisdom that it takes a village to raise a child.

In these transient, unstable times which batter parents mercilessly, particularly single parents, we need more than ever to incorporate the care of children into the whole community.

In the course of paying lip service to family values, we frequently hear about how healthy it would be for young children if a parent was at home with them full time in their early years. And indeed it might. (Although when psychologist Elizabeth Harvey studied 6,000 mothers and their children, she found that the misbehaviour, self-esteem and intellectual growth of children of mothers who worked during the first three years of their children's lives was the same as the children of stay-at-home mothers.) Unfortunately, when it comes to putting our money where our mouth is, family value often seems to plummet. The stay at home partner, almost always the woman, is effectively precluded from the economy. As Elizabeth Fox-Genovese says in her book *Feminism is Not the Story of My Life*, "Children, not men, tend to make and keep women poor." Only when we ensure that women with children remain fully a part of the economy can we fairly ask them to stay at home.

Commonly, tax breaks are suggested as an inducement to keep a parent at home. Unfortunately, tax breaks reward the income earner, i.e. the one who doesn't stay at home, usually the father.

Closer to the mark are programs that recognize that staying at home to raise a child is work and deserves inclusion in the economy. Child allowances paid to the caregiver, for example. (Currently we do not include homemaking in the gross national product unless it is done by professionals, and even then we grossly under-pay early-childhood workers.) European countries commonly have labour laws that mandate paid infant-care leave, and protect the jobs and seniority of parents who stay at home with their infants. In Canada, we provide unemployment insurance at 55 per cent of salary up to a reasonable maximum for 15 weeks of maternity benefit followed by 40 weeks of parental benefit. Here is concrete recognition of the value of staying at home with young children.

Attaching proper compensation to child-rearing may even attract more men to it. When the work is considered worthless in the economy, the male ego is inclined against it as it provides no status, remaining content to leave it up to women.

Another means of incorporating child-rearing into the community is through subsidized daycare, a system that allows employed parents to leave their pre-school children in a caring environment during the working day. Daycare induces considerable debate, its proponents claiming it is a necessity in a world where single parents must work and where both partners in a couple want, or even need, to work. Critics accuse daycare of such sins as "warehousing infants merely so that we might accumulate ever-nicer possessions," an accusation that might come as a surprise to a single working parent, and insist that daycare contributes disproportionately to mental illness, learning difficulties, and so on.

Edward Zeigler, Sterling Professor of Psychology at Yale University, comments that the problem isn't with daycare but with bad daycare, which is unfortunately all too common and colours the statistics. He states categorically that "good-quality daycare is conducive to the healthy growth of

children and is not harmful.” Work at the Universities of Alabama and North Carolina has shown that high-quality daycare may be the best way to prepare children for a good life.

The quarrel, given its philosophical underpinnings, will no doubt go on. Fortunately, compromises offer themselves up. Daycares at work places, for example, allow mothers, and fathers, to spend a portion of their work-day with their children along with other care-givers, bringing child care and work together as it was for so much of the past. Even small concessions, such as allowing a parent to leave work early to pick up their child at school or be at home when they arrive, a perk provided in Germany for single mothers, can be helpful.

Mother Goose

And we can do even more for single mothers. Consider, for example, Mother Goose—not the nursery rhyme but Parent-Child Mother Goose, a program for poor, pre-school-age children in Toronto. The program assists low-income mothers in their parenting by teaching them story telling, children’s songs, nursery rhymes and lullabies. These young women also gain the opportunity to socialize with each other and with experienced older mothers who act as counsellors. In the long times of hunter-gatherer and then village life, new mothers could expect as a matter of course to be surrounded by peers and older, wiser women to offer assistance and advice, but today single mothers particularly are often abandoned to their own devices. One woman, now a teacher at Mother Goose, admitted that prior to entering the program, she habitually struck her children.

She was a young, single, welfare mother at the time, and had been an abused child herself. She says, “The program gave me a way to deal with anger through rhymes and stories. I didn’t enjoy Jerome [her son] as a baby until I started doing rhymes with him. It calmed me down and calmed him down.” The shift from dictatorial to participative parenting is striking. Jerome will almost certainly be a more confident, open, caring individual, a more feminine man, as a result.

The Hincks Centre for Children’s Mental Health, along with the City of Toronto’s public health department, runs a program that provides home visits, parenting classes and social clubs for the densely populated, low-income and immigrant St. James Town community. Former Hincks executive-director Freda Martin says, “Young single parents living in a high-rise without a social-support network is a toxic situation. It was never meant that one woman should bring up a child on her own.” A number of North American cities now have similar programs.

A leading example of home visit programs is Hawaii’s Healthy Start. Healthy Start provides young, at-risk mothers weekly visits from an older, experienced woman. The visits bring the mother “a reassuring presence to lessen her anxieties, a break from her isolation and ideas on how to play with [her child]” as well as “an experienced eye to monitor the child’s development and refer her for expert assessment if she isn’t meeting normal milestones.” The program has a 99 per cent success rate in preventing child abuse and neglect. A study by the Center on Child Abuse Prevention Research confirmed “great success in improving child development, much stronger parent-child relationships, less punitive discipline used, virtually no abuse and imminent abuse was quickly spotted and referred to [the] child-protection system, so intervention happened before harm occurred.”

The Hawaii program points out one of the major flaws in the nuclear family. Children are raised largely behind walls. If parenting is badly done, no one may know until the children are in their teens and exhibiting antisocial behaviour. By then the damage may be beyond repair. Furthermore, these children pass on the same bad traits to their children, and so on, and so on, a dreary legacy that we see all too often. The Hawaiian approach offers parents the experience and assistance of the group, allowing the cycle of dysfunction to be broken.

Of no small importance in an oft-materialistic world, Mother Goose and Healthy Start programs have advantages economic as well as social. Reduced social problems, including crime, and the

benefits that derive from the children becoming more productive citizens, more than pay for the programs. Metro Toronto's Task Force on Services to Young Children and Families reported that in neighbourhoods where social supports were available, disadvantaged children suffered far less from a host of social ills, including abuse, school absenteeism, teen-aged parenthood and attempted suicide. Michigan's Perry Preschool Project tracked a group of poor children who received high-quality education as preschoolers and found that by their late twenties they had been 50 per cent less involved in crime, had 42 per cent fewer teen-aged pregnancies, were three times more likely to own homes, half as likely to have been on welfare, and four times more likely to hold well-paying jobs than kids who had not received such intervention. The Invest in Kids Foundation reported, "Studies prove every dollar invested in early prevention programs saves a minimum of seven times that amount over the next 20 years."

Community Marches On

The communal role is gaining acceptance, not only for the care of children at risk but for all children. A study by the Canadian Policy Research Networks revealed that 85 per cent of families support a national child-care system with fees geared to incomes. The overwhelming consensus is that the system should be regulated and supervised by government. "In short," the study reported, "in today's social and economic context, families can't go it alone." Suzanne Peters, director of CPRN's Family Network and head of the research commented that, "People are saying ... governments have a role, employers have a role, communities have a role, and families have a role." It takes a village, etc., etc.

Governments are catching on with increasing commitments to funding for child care. The federal government is increasing the child tax credit to a maximum of \$6,765 for 2024. The federal and provincial governments are proceeding with a "national children's agenda" that includes items like prenatal nutrition programs, family-friendly workplaces, early screening and mentoring programs for students, support for parents including home visits and family-resource centres, community recreation programs for youth at risk of committing crimes, and a justice system that would support families through marital breakdowns. The goals are to ensure that children are emotionally and physically healthy, safe and secure, successful at learning, and socially engaged and responsible.

Ultimately, we might imagine an ideal system of incorporating child-caring into society as one where a stay-at-home parent, or parents if they choose to alternate, receives paid parental leave for two to three years, then a combination of subsidized high quality daycare and early childhood education, followed by school. Workplaces would be family-friendly with daycares where appropriate and schedules that allow at least one parent to be home when children return from school.

Once again, in answer to the dreary question "can we afford it?" we can answer with an unqualified yes. A University of Toronto cost-benefit analysis suggested that a public child-care program for all children aged two to five would provide a return of two dollars for every dollar invested through improved children's life prospects, higher women's incomes and greater tax revenues.

The fact that these programs survive cost-benefit analyses is good, but much better is that they lead the way to making child-rearing a responsibility of all society not just half of it. Society as a whole becomes a more matriarchal construct.

Seventeen: Forming the Feminine Citizen

Imitation and Indoctrination

AS THE OLD century rolled over into the new, Kansas boards of education heatedly debated whether or not to include evolution in the state's guidelines for science teaching, first banning it, then restoring it. Despite the impossibility of understanding life without understanding evolution, many board members, in their fundamentalist wisdom, were prepared to eliminate it from the recommended curriculum. However, before we assume that the Wizard of Oz momentarily took charge of education in Kansas, we might reflect on just what education has meant throughout history.

The Kansas debate involved an ancient tradition. For the great majority of children in the past, education was an informal affair. They learned what their parents did, and then they did the same. They learned what their elders believed, the magic and the myths, and then they believed the same, just as the fundamentalist elders of Kansas intended for their children. The idea that young minds should be challenged so that they are in turn able to challenge their society has become widespread only recently and is still deeply disturbing to many.

Formal Western education rose slowly out of the rubble of the Roman Empire. The first schools were established by the Christian church to give their adherents access to the sacred writings. With the growth of trade and cities as the Dark Ages receded, a need for administration arose and, therefore, a need for educated men. In the 11th and 12th centuries, universities appeared, first at Paris, Bologna and Oxford, and eventually in many towns and cities. Knowledge was largely the preserve of the church, so the universities tended initially to be highly clerical and within the purview of ecclesiastical authority. The educated remained a small minority, the great majority continuing to learn the life skills they needed at home.

Until the Industrial Revolution. The explosion of wealth in the late 18th and early 19th centuries brought by new technology not only allowed for education of the masses but eventually demanded it as an increasingly complex, high-tech society required ever-better trained and sophisticated citizens. Children could no longer absorb their futures at their mothers' and fathers' knees. Education became a separate part of life for everyone, an institution no longer reserved for the elite but the property and business of all.

Education did not, however, separate itself from its past. Rooted in Christianity and therefore in patriarchy, it maintained masculine models and behaviours. So masculine, in fact, that Oxford, one of the first universities, did not grant women degrees until 1920, over eight hundred years after it first turned out a graduate. Here were young Englishmen trained for generations to be leaders, to run an empire of peoples, while immersed in male supremacy. The first woman to graduate from a university in the British Empire was Grace Annie Lockhart, who graduated from Mount Allison University in New Brunswick in 1875.

Schools were from top to bottom a credit to patriarchal form—hierarchical and regimented. Children, who had in the long time of the hunter-gatherers evolved to learn informally, even playfully, and been cherished by all adults, were now to sit quietly in rows and, if contrary, subjected to the cane and the strap. Formal education was about keeping quiet, accepting the omniscience of the teacher, absorbing and not questioning. The message was almost not to be children, not to exhibit joy, nor spontaneity, nor even curiosity.

Steeped in obedience, they grew up expecting to submit to hierarchy. Order, duty, patriotism, concepts that have no value outside of context, could become ingrained mindlessly in such a system, even to the point of mass suicide and murder. In the First World War, millions of the most highly educated men in the world rushed off to die in a war dedicated to little but death itself.

Twenty years later, one of the most highly educated nations in the world set the slaughter off again in even more perverse forms. The most advanced education available did little to discourage, and much to sustain, the lunacies of tribalism.

Patriarchy has not had its way with education entirely, however. Toward the end of the 19th century, more liberal approaches to teaching softened the regimen, and as the century closed, education as a system of conformity, obedience and indoctrination in accepted facts was increasingly challenged. Names like Dewey and Montessori stand out in the struggle for change. Throughout the 20th century many approaches to education contested for attention, centred around the persistent conflict between a conservative/Christian distrust of human nature and a liberal optimism about human nature, the former convinced that the child must absorb from authority and the latter convinced that the child must be allowed to open up to the world, the former masculine, the latter feminine. Concepts variously described as “whole child,” holistic or child-centred have butted heads with more traditional, more patriarchal, approaches. The contest became particularly intense in the late 1960s and early 1970s when radical reformers attacked the education system as alienating, autocratic and hierarchal, and called for schools that involved parents, students and teachers in democratic decision-making. The patriarchs fight back, insisting on curriculum and teacher-centred structures. The struggle continues.

Breaking the Mould

Ignatius of Loyola, founder of the Jesuits, has been credited, perhaps apocryphally, with the maxim, “Give me your children before the age of nine and they will be mine forever.” Ignatius knew what he was talking about. He knew that the surest way to create a good Catholic was to indoctrinate the child at a very young age. If we want to create a citizen open to all ideas, able to think freely about his or her society, we, too, have to begin with the very young.

Indeed, if we are to ensure that all citizens are able to realize their full potential, we must start in the womb by ensuring that all mothers have healthy pregnancies. We must follow with programs to ensure that all children have healthy infancies. Here, in these very early years, children develop their curiosity and their empathy. Here is decided whether they will approach society in an open, curious and confident manner or in a suspicious, narrow and resentful fashion. Here is decided if males will be able to fully realize their feminine side as well as their masculine or, if they are badly nurtured, their feminine side will be crushed, dooming them to spending their lives proving their manhood through domination and even violence. When we have taken care of this business, we can then turn our attention to formal education.

Eventually, children must go on to learn the skills and absorb the attitudes necessary for success in a complex world, and much of this they will learn in the education system. Although the raw material that enters the system is already considerably formed, the system can still make a significant contribution. That contribution has, in the past, been much more masculine than feminine.

Designing a matriarchal education system does not mean emasculating little boys, as some patriarchs might fear. The idea is not to direct male children in an anti-masculine direction (although anti-macho would certainly be healthy) but rather in a pro-feminine direction, simply because only that will make the future promising, or even possible. In the past, societies have often been obsessed with bringing out boys’ masculine side, even to the point of segregating them from females entirely, leading them away from their feminine side, believing that it sapped them of proper masculine vigour. At the same time, societies have discouraged girls from their masculine side, even though it was masculine behaviour that brought influence and success. Opening up the feminine to boys without prejudice and the masculine to girls without restraint would be a major step in dismissing stereotypes and allowing boys and girls to realize their potentials. Boys can still be boys, but boys in the fullest sense, not just in an exaggerated masculine sense.

We cannot pretend the replication ethos don't exist. We cannot wish the difference away, nor do we want to. On average, men will be more aggressive, women more nurturing, education or not. Part of the stereotype is stamped in our genes. What we want to do is recognize the genetic imperative, then apply a cultural imperative that discourages the excesses of the macho, hones the constructive attributes of the masculine, and gives free rein to the nurturing aspects of the feminine. In the past, cultural imperative has tilted society toward patriarchy, now we want to tilt it toward matriarchy.

The purpose of education in an enlightened society is less a matter of stuffing material in little heads and more a matter of opening curious young minds to learning and to the world. It requires moving from a hierarchal, disciplining, imposed education to a co-operative, open, received education, from a patriarchal design to a matriarchal design. Sara Kreindler, a 16-year old who won two prestigious scholarships to the University of Manitoba, addressed the other award winners, their families and an assortment of dignitaries, concluding her speech by explaining what an education meant to her:

Education means knowing about the political and social forces operating in our society. Education means the skills to examine and assess the choices we're given, and to discern alternatives. Education means freedom of thought. Education means the preservation and transmission of culture. Education means a foundation for a vision of the world we'd like to create.

Sara's vision of education is rather more about discovery and growth, and rather less about discipline and high test scores.

Democratic Schools?

The function of the child is to live his own life—not the life that his anxious parents think he should live, nor a life according to the purpose of the educator who thinks he knows what is best.

Such was the philosophy of A. S. Neill who founded Summerhill, an English private school. Summerhill is unique in its commitment to democracy and equality. Its students, who range in age from five to 18, have equal votes with the staff in the organization of their community. They learn at their own pace and in their own direction. They are encouraged to attend lessons but decide for themselves whether to attend or to play. Arts, crafts and sports facilities are freely available. The picture of children learning almost casually at their own pace is highly reminiscent of the very natural way hunter-gatherer children learned for eons.

The Blair government attempted to shut Summerhill down, claiming that “allowing pupils discretion to learn was interfering with their progress.” An inquiry found that it met standards just fine and a court awarded the school the legal costs incurred in fighting the case.

Similar to Summerhill is the Sudbury Valley School in Framingham, Massachusetts. Sudbury Valley's catalogue reads, “Students initiate all their own activities and create their own environments. The physical plant, the staff, and the equipment are there for the students to use as the need arises.” The School Meeting, a one-member/one-vote collective of staff and students, sets rules, prepares an annual budget, hires and fires staff, and liaises with the School Assembly, an advisory body that includes parents and has the final say on the budget and on staff salaries. According to the school's website, “An education at Sudbury Valley is also an education in hands-on democracy.” Sudbury Valley's graduates routinely do well.

Democratic schools like Summerhill and Sudbury Valley are found in a number of countries including Australia, Belgium, France, Germany, Japan, Switzerland, Canada, Denmark, Israel, the United Kingdom and the United States.

A progressive vision of education centres around democracy. If we are to prepare our youth for a society of consensus and equality, schools must play a major part. Next to the family, they are the most important institution in developing a democratic consciousness in young citizens. Schools like Summerhill and Sudbury Valley are almost certainly much too rich for the blood of most parents, but greater democracy should not be. Even if curricula must be set by departments of education to maintain broad standards, and if budgets must be set by school boards to maintain accountability, ample room remains within these constraints for students to be involved in the management of their institutions.

Rays of Light

Public education has long included democracy in the curriculum, usually under the aegis of social studies. The curricula are often well designed to lead students up the ladder of democratic theory, but the practice has been spotty, depending very much on the teachers and the school. Many schools hold model parliaments or model United Nations; however, models are after all just models, useful for students who enjoy formal debating and who may see careers for themselves in politics, but of limited use to the great majority.

In some public school systems, students have become key players in the traditional parent-teacher interviews. Instead of a two-way huddle, the students participate in a three-way conference. Typically, students invite their parents to the conference, conduct them around the school when they arrive, show them some of their work, do some work with them, and then meet with the teacher to discuss the work and other concerns. This is a lot less than governance; nonetheless, it is a great deal more than passive observance of the forces that affect one's life and is a step on the road to self-governance.

High schools commonly have student councils, elected by the students or, sometimes more patronizingly, chosen by the teachers. Councils offer limited scope for decision-making, generally being confined to items such as school dances, intramural sports, etc. High school student representatives also sometimes sit with parents and teachers on school or parent councils.

Students in some public schools are becoming more involved in setting the rules members of their institutions must abide by. At Sir Winston Churchill High School in Calgary, the students along with teachers and parents developed their own set of behavioural guidelines. These included statements like "Guidelines should be applied fairly and consistently to each community member...", "All concerns must be addressed and conflicts resolved through reasoned discussion of issues," and "Each of us should be involved continuously in the decision-making processes." All students are involved in creating the guidelines and they apply equally to students and teachers.

An example of a fully democratic school is Calgary's Alternative High School. Although decision-making is constrained by the curricula set by the Alberta Department of Education and, because AHS is publicly funded, by the regulations of the Calgary Board of Education, all school decisions that can be made in-house are made at a weekly assembly of staff and students. All members of the school community, students and teachers, are equal—one member, one vote. The students prepare for assemblies by discussing the agenda items, which can be suggested by staff or students, in small groups with mentors beforehand. The assemblies, run by students, decide on everything from school rules to spending of the budget. An egalitarian ethos pervades the school with students encouraged to call teachers by their first names.

Students are required to attend 22 hours per week and report absences; otherwise, they have considerable autonomy in setting their own timetables. In the full spirit of democratic life, they are encouraged to participate in community: they recycle, clean local parks, collect money for the food bank, even run candidates in local school board elections.

The size of AHS, only 120 students, makes direct democracy possible—all students and staff are expected to attend the assemblies. Representative democracy could extend the model to larger schools, or citizen assemblies could be created through random selection of participants from the student and faculty bodies.

Another important element in the success of assemblies at AHS is the pre-assembly meetings of students with their mentors. The small size of the meetings (about 12 students per mentor) provides an intimacy that allows for easy give-and-take. Students can develop a comfort with, an understanding of, and an interest in the agenda issues that would be difficult if they attended the larger assembly without preparation.

In a larger school, elected representatives could have pre-assembly meetings with their constituents. The reps could, in preparation for the meetings with their constituents or for the assembly, meet in small groups with faculty mentors. Perhaps here is yet another argument for smaller student/teacher ratios.

Full involvement in their communities provides an outlet for the surging energies of adolescents, particularly important for the testosterone-charged, often reckless, impulses of young males. They are allowed the manhood they desperately long for.

Democratic schools are rare, but enough exist to prompt an international conference, the annual International Democratic Education Conference.

Des Dixon, teacher/education analyst and Fellow of the Ontario Teachers' Federation, suggested a democratic method of choosing principals, the ultimate power figures in schools. He proposed replacing the principal with a nine-member body consisting of five teachers elected by the faculty, two students elected by the student body, and two adults elected by the immediate school community, one a parent and one not. Three of the teachers would serve as an executive, one of which would serve as president (in effect, the principal), the others as vice-presidents. This structure would not usurp the rights of the citizenry at large. The principal is obliged to implement the broader community's budget and curricula policies as expressed through departments of education and school boards, so there would seem to be no reason not to include him or her within the democratic envelope.

Skill Sets

Grounding young citizens in a democratic ethos means first of all equipping them with certain packets of skills.

First among these is the packet that makes for an effective communicator, starting with a solid command of oral and written language. Young democrats need to develop the art of conversation, of oral presentation, and of written communications, and they need, too, to study the mass media. Understanding the media is not only prerequisite to understanding how we communicate in a modern democracy but to understanding the effects on society of media itself, of the effects of advertising and corporate ownership.

A second packet involves a thorough grasp of the civic arts. By this I mean knowledge of the skills of discourse and debate (although debate might well be subordinated to other less combative, less competitive, more sharing forms of exchanging views), of the rights and responsibilities of democratic citizens, of the organization and operation of democratic structures, and a sense of history and where their society stands comparatively in time and space—something more than mere civics. This includes a thorough introduction to evolutionary biology and neuroscience, those fields of knowledge that reveal what we are as a species and without which we cannot fully understand ourselves.

Also essential to the democratic citizen, at least in a feminine democracy, are the skills of mediation, of resolving differences non-violently, and techniques of non-competitive democracy, such as rotating or consensual leadership in small groups and citizen assemblies in large groups, techniques that emphasize co-operative, rational discussion rather than power struggles. Students need to know, too, about democratic methods of dissent and their appropriate use.

And they need to develop respect for the process of deliberation—thorough, informed, fair consideration of issues. Closely associated is critical thinking, as Sara Kreindler put it, “the skills to examine and assess the choices we’re given, and to discern alternatives.” In themselves, these attitudes and skills are masculine as much as they are feminine; they contribute to patriarchy when they are masculine balanced by the feminine rather than exaggerated by the macho.

Most importantly, students need practice, lots and lots of practice. They need real involvement in democratic governance, not just in exercises. We need more than democracy taught in schools, we need democratic schools. People learn best what they use.

The Young Democrat

A fundamental question is when does the practice start, at what age are young citizens ready to join in their own governance. How deep down into the grade system can democracy reasonably go? Senior high students are certainly capable of full involvement in the governing of their schools, but what about junior high or elementary students? It’s difficult to say because it’s so rarely even tried.

Nonetheless, we have models, like Summerhill and Sudbury Valley, and the movement toward democratic schools is growing. As experience is gained, the soundest route from apprentice democrat to full democrat will become established. At Summerhill, students of all ages have an equal say. The weekly meeting of staff and students, the heart of the democratic system, elects an ombudsman “who helps and protects the younger children and speaks for them in the meeting if they feel they cannot speak for themselves.” Even if issues raised by children seem trivial to adults, they are taken seriously at the meetings, as indeed they ought to be. Even a very young child can be involved in, for example, the design of a playground or a discussion of rules. In response to the question, “Can a young child understand the meaning of democracy?” Yaakov Hecht of the Democratic School of Hadera in Israel replied:

Most can’t, particularly not the abstract idea of democracy. But in a democratic school a child lives and develops in a democratic environment; he knows that what is permitted and what is forbidden is not determined by teachers but by a body called the parliament, and that he has the right to participate and vote on laws with a vote equal to that of any person in the school. The child grows in an environment which respects his wishes and thoughts, and demands of him to respect others. The premise in a democratic school is that if a person lives in an environment which respects him, he will respect others.

The living and developing in a democratic environment is what is important here—the development of a democratic consciousness. Involving children in the design of a playground, for example, instills in them the sense that technology is supposed to be humankind’s servant, not its dictator—the rudiments of not only a knowledge of technology, but of what is more important, the politics of technology.

Democratic schools provide, in John Dewey’s words, “a type of education which gives individuals a personal interest in social relationships and control, and the habits of mind which secure social changes without introducing disorder.” By the time children reach high school, they will be fully capable of making decisions equally with staff and parents. By the time they leave school, they will have been so thoroughly immersed in democratic process they will expect as a matter of course to find it practiced everywhere: in government, in their workplace, at university or trade school—everywhere. Where they don’t encounter it, they will possess the will to impose it, and have been so

well trained in practice and theory that they will have the skills to do so with confidence. They will have no time for patriarchy.

Higher Ed

If students are to expect to find democracy in the institutions they encounter upon graduation, they might expect to find it above all in institutions of higher learning. And they will indeed be less disappointed here than in most other institutions.

Universities, their governance rooted in the communal traditions of monasteries, have long pursued a form of governance called collegiality, a form in which all members of the community are equals and choose their leaders from among themselves. Hierarchy has never been much in vogue among scholars, thus within their departments, collegiality reigns. A modern university, however, is a large institution with many departments requiring overall administration under the direction of a board of governors. The board typically includes members of faculty, but will consist mostly of people appointed by governments answerable to taxpayers, the chief funders of institutions of higher learning. Partly in answer to this overlay of power, faculty in universities, colleges and technical schools have enhanced their leverage by forming faculty associations, labour unions in all but name, to deal with their institutions on issues involving working conditions.

Nor are students omitted from the power structure. They are represented on various bodies in their institutions, including the boards of governors and they, too, have unions.

Despite their collegiality, universities have remained throughout most of their history male preserves. Not until well into the 20th century did women appear in significant numbers. Today, they make up a majority of students, a powerful majority in areas like psychology, social work and education, but still a minority in areas traditionally considered masculine like mathematics, physics and economics.

Despite the presence of a majority of women, a masculine ethos still prevails when it comes to learning, partly perhaps because women remain as poorly represented on faculties as they are well-represented in student bodies. The emphasis is on individuality and competition. Progress is measured by exams, students are ranked by marks and judged in isolation. Participation is all too often in the form of aggressiveness in class and exercises like debates—verbal warfare—rather than by round-table discussions, collaborative projects and other feminine approaches. Opinions are coerced into competition rather than harmonized into co-operation and compromise. The concept of truth through opposition may go back to Socrates but it is, as it has always been, more amenable to the aggressive than to the wise.

A Matriarchal Model

It doesn't have to be this way. McMaster University's medical school serves as an example of a more collegial approach.

The school has abandoned traditional examinations in favour of "progress tests" in which student performance is judged as satisfactory or unsatisfactory in actual clinical settings. The school, which emphasizes teamwork, communication skills and humanitarian treatment, rejects marks as contributing more to competition than compassion. McMaster's teaching methods include problem-based learning, an approach that has students working in small groups on actual patient cases from early on in their schooling. They are supervised by faculty members, who treat them as future colleagues, and they consult as a team. Former university president Peter George stated, "It is the antithesis of the large lecture hall where the professor who knows everything tells the students who know nothing." And, Mr. George may have added, the antithesis of patriarchy. The school accepts

about 200 students per year, interviewed by a team that includes a student, a faculty member and a representative from the community.

The school's focus on interdisciplinary learning considers not only the scientific aspects of medicine but the psychological, social, ethical and humanitarian aspects as well. Its methods have been adopted by other major medical schools across North America.

McMaster's medical school provides an egalitarian, holistic guide for advanced education in all areas. And in various ways. Its expansive nature, bringing students into equality with their instructors, defeats hierarchy. As does including them in such managerial functions as selecting candidates. Inclusive democracy is served as well by bringing the community into the selection process. The broad interdisciplinary approach adds further to inclusion while defying a narrow masculine commitment to technological medicine alone. There is a lesson for all institutions of higher learning, and all disciplines, here.

As intellectual leaders, universities have a primary responsibility to lead the way to a sustainable future. They must be among the first to turn from a patriarchal to a matriarchal model. McMaster, with its emphasis on a community of care rather than on individual achievement, serves to illustrate.

Concern exists today about a lack of values, in schools as well as in society generally. Neil Postman, former chair of the Department of Culture and Communication at New York University, suggested that secular schools are failing because they have no "moral, social or intellectual centre." Why not make the centre those values essential to the future of our species—feminine values? Postman also writes, "Public education does not serve a public. It creates a public." Our job is to create a public with a matriarchal consciousness.

Eighteen: Making a Matriarchal Future

Male Excess and the Future

GREAT PROGRESS TO the contrary, the male replication ethos still rules. Society is still very much about competition for resources and status. Aggressive males dominate government and the economy; science and technology all too often serve masculine endeavour; religion remains a bastion of patriarchal leadership, even to the point of misogyny; macho aggression frequently translates into war; our educational institutions inadequately mitigate all this while our media thrive on it.

And the growth syndrome persists, insatiably devouring anything in its path. Everything must get bigger: buildings, cities, populations, corporations, market shares, all to feed the masculine libido.

Women and feminine men are often compelled to adopt the methods of the masculine ethos in order to succeed amidst patriarchy. They are forced to emphasize their masculine side and suppress their feminine side in order to compete in arenas operating under macho rules within macho structures. Patriarchy interferes with essential progress, and when progress is made it lashes back, in politics and in the media.

If this is to be our future it is a dark one. Matonabee and his Chipewyan could afford to exercise their macho excesses. We cannot. We have the technological means to destroy ourselves and our planet, and a gender-bias toward competition and aggression is leading us to use it. We drive thousands of our fellow species to extinction and look out into the universe for new worlds to conquer. Only through the preeminence of the feminine ethos can we ensure co-operation among our species and co-operation with all other species, only this offers us any future at all.

Are Men Obsolete?

Observing the persistent mischief of patriarchy, we are inclined to ask if men haven't simply become obsolete. Is the most masculinized gender unfit for the third millennium?

Should we put the new biotechnology to good use and reproduce our species by cloning women and simply letting men, the main carriers of the macho virus, die out as a gender? Should we at least use drugs or genetic manipulation to enhance feminine traits and suppress masculine ones?

Let us restrain our own macho instincts here and answer with a qualified no. We need neither eliminate men nor turn them into mice. Men contain the feminine ethos, too, and many are strongly feminine, so best we avoid indiscriminate fantasies.

The masculine ethos is, after all, not all bad. It has done and continues to do good service for us. As long as we are threatened by thugs, by warlords, by capitalists, by megalomaniacs of one kind or another, we will need a certain potential for violence to shield ourselves. This is a tiresomely circular and self-justifying argument, of course, the male ethos defending us against its own excesses; nonetheless, it remains the reality and therefore, at this point in our history at least, inescapable.

Masculine individualism and aggression allow us to challenge conformity or change, as the case may be, and to challenge authority when necessary. When done thoughtfully and compassionately, this turns us toward a more sensible and humane path. The male ethos provides leadership and direction to democracy and other co-operative enterprises. While masculine individualism and willingness to take risks has brought great tragedy, it has also brought great art and science and social innovation, and enriched us all as a result. After all, masculine endeavour in science,

technology, economics and politics has been instrumental in bringing about the decline of patriarchy—sowing the seeds of destruction of its own hegemony. And masculine self-reliance can be of considerable value in a large, complex society where a degree of independence for individuals and smaller groups is healthy both for them and for the larger society. The aggressive nature of men can be enjoyable for both men and women, and beneficial to society when used constructively, particularly toward feminine ends. The Enlightenment was, after all, achieved overwhelmingly by men.

We want to eliminate the recklessness, aggression, individualism, tribalism, and urge for status that runs into greed, violence, domination and patriarchy, but we want to retain the masculine in service to feminine principles.

We want also to end patriarchy's hoarding of the constructive exercise of the male ethos for the use of men only. We want to ensure that women, too, have a full opportunity to contribute from their masculine side, to exercise their individualism and risk-taking in the service of art, science, the economy and healthy social change.

Civilizing Men

How, then, do we moderate a testosterone-charged world and insinuate into it the forces of the feminine?

We began our story with a horrific act of violence on the Coppermine River in 1771. Lest such acts sink us too deeply into despondency, however, let us keep in mind that the Chipewyan men who committed that act spent the great part of their time engaged in the business of life, not of death: providing food and shelter for their families, making love to their wives, playing with their children, gossiping and telling stories. If they were good at killing, they were very good at living. Men are no less so today. They continue to hold promise. The difference is that today we can no longer afford their brutal follies; we must fully civilize them.

First, we must meet the challenge of recognizing and accepting what we are. Throughout most of our history we didn't really know, except in an empirical way. We invented a host of theories, some based on a world of mysteries and spirits, some based on the omnipotence of one god or another, some based simply on what was convenient for whichever group that happened to be in power.

In the last century and a half, and particularly recently, we have come to recognize that we are an animal in a long line of animals and can be studied and understood as such. By studying our evolution, by studying our species in the most natural environment in which we find it, by studying the functioning of our brains and the functioning of our genes, the prime movers of our behaviour, we are developing an increasingly thorough understanding of ourselves, including the male and female replication ethos.

Knowing what we are, we can separate what is biological from what is cultural. We can understand what parts of our behaviour are most difficult to modify because they are nature and what are easiest because they are nurture. We can get a sense of how to create a post-patriarchal society that is at the same time the sanest for the age and the most "natural," that is most in tune with the core of our evolved selves. We can accept the genetic imperative for what it is while gently manipulating it into matriarchal culture.

We can contemplate how to create societies without arousing the passions of tribalism. We can rid ourselves of old generalizations, religious ones and lay ones, generalizations like that of capitalism which insists that we are all individualistic and competitive, and communism which insists that we are all uniformly communal and co-operative. We can replace ideology with knowledge, reason and compassion. We are now in a position to understand the raw materials of Homo sapiens. We have the knowledge to free cultural evolution from both the biological imperative and the grip of

patriarchs and subject it to rational analysis in the service of broad humanitarian and environmental goals.

We must also civilize the male ethos, which means stripping out the macho. We must terminate the macho before it terminates us.

We have discussed the importance of healthy nurturing in developing open-minded, empathic children. This alone opens up the feminine to boys. It also eliminates the potential for psychopathic behaviour, that particular crippling of the mind that wreaks suffering wherever it appears. We can concentrate less on teaching boys to be men and more on allowing them to be complete human beings. Being male is good, and important; being fully human is a great deal more important.

Role models can be men or women and can serve both sexes. Women can be strong as well as nurturing, competent as well as compassionate, self-reliant as well as co-operative. So can men. We need to model character more and gender less. Macho models, whether they be goon athletes, ruthless businessmen, Rambo movie stars or demagogic politicians, we can do without. As Des Dixon suggests in *Future Schools*, we might raise boys to be “affectionate, gentle, co-operative, patient, communicative and empathic” rather than “unemotional, competitive, tough, aggressive, possessive, dominant and silent.” The emotional conditioning required for the stern realities of patriarchy is dangerous and obsolete. Part of the civilizing process is teaching boys that the feminine is not something to be demeaned, something to be used as a benchmark to set themselves above, but on the contrary is the reservoir of the highest human values and that it is their good fortune that it is very much a part of them. And it in no way detracts from being manly, from being strong and adventurous and sexy.

We can also give men some credit. The patriarchs among us seem to feel that all this change is just too much for their gender. The phenomenon of million-man marches, Promise Keeper rallies, and “wild men” retreats of men who seem to think feminists are sapping their vital bodily fluids, underestimates and insults men. It is a new version of the old patriarchal view that marriage was necessary to domesticate men, the only way to tame the savage brutes. Men are better than this. They may be the more fragile gender, they may need a little more nurturing, but they are quite capable of living consensually, co-operatively and caringly. They need to be loved, not babied.

Celebrating Feminine Men

On the 20th of June, 2000, the province of Alberta laid to rest a great Canadian. Grant MacEwan, farmer, scholar, teacher, politician, lieutenant-governor, author, Officer of the Order of Canada, and “plain everyday man,” was dead at the age of 97. He was accorded a state funeral.

Few people are more accomplished. Few have greater status. A farmer, he became dean of agriculture at the University of Manitoba. Moving to Alberta, he became a Calgary city councillor, a member of the provincial legislature, head of the Liberal Party, and eventually mayor of Calgary. He was appointed lieutenant-governor in 1966 and made an Officer of the Order of Canada in 1974. Over the years, he wrote 50 books. His accomplishments were personal as well as public. He became a vegetarian because he couldn't bear to eat his “friends.” His favourite mode of travel was the bus because it was kinder to the earth, about which he cared deeply.

Premier Ralph Klein told about the time he was waiting to receive Grant MacEwan's limo at an important function when to his very great surprise the eminent gentleman stepped off a city transit bus. His personal creed read, “I am prepared to stand before my Maker, the Ruler of the entire universe, with no other plea than that I have tried to leave things in His Vineyard better than I found them.”

Grant MacEwan sought status, as is the way with men, but he sought it with consideration and kindness. A role model he was, for girls and women no less than boys and men, a macho man he was not.

Even men much fuller of the masculine ethos than Grant MacEwan can be good servants of matriarchy. The French doctor Bernard Kouchner, for example. Described as combative and self-promoting and possessed of “hair-trigger enthusiasm,” Kouchner set up the humanitarian organization Doctors Without Borders, applying his aggressive nature to the service of refugees and victims of war, illustrating that wonderful combination of masculine energies directed toward feminine goals.

Grant MacEwan’s style isn’t going to fit everyone; nonetheless, entire societies have rejected macho status-seeking. Cultures such as the Navajo and Zuni Indians of the American Southwest granted status to men who did not try to dominate their societies. Status does not require hierarchy. This is perfectly in keeping with the egalitarian desire not to be ordered around that we saw in Matonabbee’s Chipewyan. Modern societies, particularly in Scandinavia, are on the same path, suggesting powerfully that thoroughly compassionate, equitable and democratic cultures are not pie-in-the-sky but rather an attainable matriarchal alternative.

To reject status-seeking would be to reject the male ethos, and that is unnecessary. Harnessing status-seeking to reciprocal altruism in positive ways brings out the best of the masculine. We can exploit these innate impulses to encourage boys toward aggression and violence or toward Grant MacEwan-type lives. Thus can the cultural imperative overlay the genetic imperative constructively rather than destructively. We can choose Matonabbee making peace with the Athapascans over Matonabbee making war on the Inuit.

Feminism Rising

Raising the status of the female ethos involves raising the status of women. Here we have made considerable progress. In Western society, the Battle of the Sexes may not be over but the feminists have won significant victories. Their triumph remains too much in theory and too little in practice—men still command the heights of most institutions—but the theory is well entrenched and the practice improving. Most men have accepted the victory graciously, even enthusiastically. They may still be reluctant to wash a dish, cook a meal or change a diaper, but they do all these things and lo and behold find that it doesn’t cause impotence. (Although it may reduce aggression. Apparently, males who help with housework, particularly the rearing of children, have lower testosterone levels. They are, in effect, gentled down.)

The decline of patriarchy can in large part be measured by the rise of feminism.

When the United States Constitution, a seminal document in the struggle for the equality of people, was signed, no one considered that it should apply to women as fully as men. The equality of “all men” was declared to be self-evident. The equality of all human beings wasn’t. Not until the 19th Amendment was passed in 1920, 130 years later, were women constitutionally allowed to vote in the United States. In Canada, the magic year federally was 1918 with the Province of Manitoba leading the way in 1916 and Quebec bringing up the rear in 1940.

Winning the franchise was the first great victory for the equality of women, for feminism. Yet it was a qualified victory. Two generations later, women were hardly equal, largely confined to housewifery in the economy and largely absent from politics and government. They were routinely excluded from certain places of business. They were even prevented, despite constitutional guarantees of freedom of speech, from obtaining information on birth control. Their inferiority in anything outside the home was taken for granted. They were considered too frail intellectually for serious thought and too frail physically for vigorous sport or labour. In the 1960s, they finally said enough. Feminism exploded into the popular consciousness. Works by Betty Friedan, Germaine

Greer, Gloria Steinem and others became intellectual focal points and their authors household names. Feminism has struggled to liberate half of humanity and been largely successful. The idea of female inferiority has been very nearly vanquished and women are slowly taking their place equally in all the venues of society.

And feminism has done a great deal more than create more equality for women. It is contributing to a more caring and consensual social philosophy. It is changing men. In the words of Jeannelle Savona, Professor Emerita at the University of Toronto, “Feminism has been a source of social, psychological and intellectual enrichment to many men who have now made feminist viewpoints an integral part of their daily lives.” To that, I can personally testify.

As a result, society is moving in a more moral direction. We mentioned earlier the banning of capital punishment, a more enlightened attitude generally toward treatment of criminals, stricter gun laws and the rejection of corporal punishment for children. A potpourri of statistics testify to a shift to feminine viewpoints in Canada: over two-thirds of Canadians consider unmarried people living together a family; 47 per cent believe organizations work better without a single leader; only 11 per cent would restrict immigration to whites; and so on. In the United States, where patriarchy is enjoying a resurgence, support for the notion that the man should be master of the house has recently risen to almost half of the population while in Canada it has declined to under 20 per cent. (Further evidence for the theory that Canada, exemplified by its caring, peacemaking foreign policy, is more of a feminine society, and the United States, exemplified by its self-interested, controlling foreign policy, more of a masculine one.)

Women, and the female ethos, will always have to struggle to achieve equality in what remain masculine structures. Equality will never be achieved until we change the structures built by patriarchy. Judith Jordan, director of women’s studies at Wellesly College and a psychologist at Harvard, observed, “Early feminism went in the direction of saying, ‘Give every girl assertiveness training so she can get in there and compete.’ ... Now we say, ‘Why are we accepting that as the norm, why not change the norm?’” Exactly. We must build a fully post-patriarchal society and we have a long way to go to do that.

Beyond Women’s Liberation

As laudable and as essential a goal as equality for women is, we must go further, to the equality of the female ethos. And on to its preeminence.

We might keep in mind first that women, too, can be masculine, even macho, in their pursuits, and this includes not only politicians and businesswomen but feminists as well. Andrea Dworkin, who considered marriage “a legal license to rape” and who declared that “sexual relations between a man and a woman are politically acceptable only when the man has a limp penis,” and Catharine MacKinnon, who stated “The major distinction between intercourse (normal) and rape (abnormal) is that the normal happens so often that one cannot get anyone to see anything wrong with it,” are, like Margaret Thatcher, more intellectually macho than most men. Marilyn French, who declared, “All men are rapists,” exhibited the intrinsic dogmatism of the macho. Feminists, too, have their Rambos, and as long as we labour within patriarchal structures, the male ethos will dominate and the macho will rise to the top.

Patriarchal structures are hierarchal and the male ethos will always dominate in a hierarchy. That is its nature. To achieve the preeminence of the feminine, we will have to take apart or greatly modify the structures built over the millennia by patriarchy and build new ones, feminine ones. Feminism has set the stage; now we need to complete the work and build a matriarchy—governance by feminine principles. The best of the male ethos, its constructive component, is welcome, too, as long as it functions within a feminine framework, serving a feminine agenda, a feminine direction.

Some components within our social framework are well along the way to matriarchy. Relationships between men and women have been largely liberated from ancient stereotypes and offer a new equality. Individuals are more able to be themselves rather than role-players serving some biological or cultural design. The definition of family is increasingly flexible and the care of children increasingly recognized as a community responsibility.

Politics and government, on the other hand, remain unnecessarily competitive and hostile. We are greatly in need of a more inclusive politics with less confrontation and more dialogue through institutions like citizen assemblies. We might, as Deborah Tannen suggested in her book *The Argument Culture*, stop positioning ourselves as enemies. And we need an economics founded in sharing with our fellow humans and our fellow species, founded in consensual, co-operative enterprise that shares wealth as successfully as it creates it. We need to rise above capitalism. We need a science and technology more human-valued and human-centred, and less profit-valued and male-centred, with more women in its practice and more democracy in its process. We need spiritual values and practices that are inclusive rather than exclusive, that express universal human values rather than dogma. We need to approach crime through prevention, community and restitution rather than through confrontation, division and retribution. We need to diminish the concept of the Other, rid ourselves of warrior-worship and develop global approaches to security against the macho and the psychopathic, emphasizing non-violent means of dealing with disputes, and emphasizing also security through the equitable distribution of wealth rather than the inequitable distribution of weapons. We must equip our children to build matriarchy, and we must develop a mass media, a public forum, committed to informing and discussing rather than dividing and outraging.

All of this will require a vastly greater involvement of women in all areas of leadership. Given the appeal of hierarchy to men, and the appeal of high-status men to women, this is nothing less than a challenge to overcome a genetic imperative, but it is a challenge that must be met.

Genes dispose us to behaviour but culture can have the final say. Richard Dawkins, a man very much involved in our new awareness of these things, has observed that our memes (bits of culture that replicate themselves) have much more potential lasting power than our genes (bits of biology that replicate themselves). “We alone on earth,” he writes, “can rebel against the tyranny of the selfish replicators.” We have used culture—an accumulation of memes—for thousands of years to suppress the female ethos and empower the male, and with great success. In its macho mode, it has swept us up into utter madness, into orgies of destruction, from that of the ancient Chipewyan on the Coppermine to that of the Holocaust in modern Europe.

Now that we are aware of the diabolical workings of patriarchal memes and their genetic roots, we can supplant them with matriarchal memes. By providing all children a healthy infancy; by immersing them in the values of co-operation, consensus and compassion; by establishing a politics, an economics, a science and technology, a spirituality and a mass communications that embody these values, we can create a matriarchy. It is a very long term goal, but if we don't do it, there may be no long term for us at all.

Epilogue

... A Personal Journey

Retreating from the heights of thousands of years of patriarchy is not easy. Faced with the increasingly obvious fact that much of the male replication ethos is now redundant or worse, that even much of what was once required for survival is now simply destructive, many men feel that their gender is being wound down. Many patriarchs are confused and angry, and this is sad, but it is hard to sympathize with people who have dominated the rest of us for so long.

I came of age in the 1950s, the height of a patriarchal surge, and I accepted the male/female roles imposed by patriarchy without question. Over time, however, I came to realize the arbitrariness and the inequality of the regime and rejected it. I had no trouble thinking of myself as a feminist. I admit, however, with my beliefs rooted in masculine and macho concepts of gender, that I had difficulty of thinking of myself as in any way feminine. It seemed to erode my very concept of myself as a man. Yet, eventually, I came to recognize that I was part feminine and in that femininity lay some of my finest and most defining characteristics—my passion for consensual governance, for example. Now if I am referred to as feminine, I take it as a complement. To refer to a man as “effeminate” is to comment on his sexuality alone; to refer to a man as “feminine” is to comment on his entire character, his behaviour and his philosophy, and in a world desperate for compassion, consensus and co-operation, it is to comment favourably.

My growth is not exceptional. Most men are adapting. They are coming to terms with a healthier balance of masculine and feminine. We are learning, and we are finding that although the new consciousness may be confusing at times, it can also be rewarding. After all, patriarchy in its hierarchal glory always benefits a few men over the majority. Men’s power over women may be solidified, but their power over themselves is diminished. And ultimately, domination tends to constrain and diminish the dominator just as it does the dominated—ending it frees both parties. To quote author Gail Sheehy, “Men who are open to gaining fresh insights can make a leap into 21st century manhood, combining the best of their biological instincts with a new psychological potency.” Male and female energies, Carl Jung’s Logos and Eros which he saw as eternally opposed, seem to be growing together.

We might keep in mind, too, that women are also coming to terms with great change, even if they make less fuss about it. They often have an even greater cross to bear. For the first time in history, most young women are on their own, independent of both fathers and husbands. Married women accept the responsibilities of the economy while often retaining most of the responsibilities of the home. We are struggling through this together, and it is a struggle. We are all wired for a simpler lifestyle. The patriarchs could help rather than hinder if they would just stop feeling sorry for themselves, stop whining, get their libidos under control and get on with the job. Men have always considered courage to be a prime virtue. The greatest act of courage they can undertake today is to face up to the fact that most of our problems are a result of patriarchy—and do something about it.

The dark cloud of patriarchy has long hung over our heads but now, through awareness, knowledge and matriarchy we can escape its long shadow.

Sources

Chapter 1: An Incident on the Coppermine River

- Samuel Hearne, *A Journey to the Northern Ocean* (Toronto: Macmillan, 1958) xiii., 222., 35, xvii., 74., 97–8, 99–100, 133, 134, 227, 224

Chapter 2: From Molecules to Monkeys

- Jane Goodall, *The Chimpanzees of Gombe* (Cambridge: The Belknap Press, 1986) 66
- Frans de Waal, *Chimpanzee Politics* (London: Jonathon Cape, 1982) 13
- Samuel Hearne, *A Journey to the Northern Ocean* (Toronto: Macmillan, 1958) 71, 105, 97

Chapter 3: Replication Ethos

- Dianne Hales, *Just Like a Woman* (Toronto: Bantam, 1999) 256, 271 260
- Matt Ridley, *The Red Queen* (Toronto: Maxwell Macmillan Canada, 1993) 258–9. Ridley’s source for men and women’s preferences was *Sex Differences* by K. B. Hoyenga and K. Hoyenga (Boston: Little Brown, 1980) and for conversational differences was *You Just don’t Understand* by Deborah Tannen (New York: William Morrow, 1990)

Chapter 4: Toward Matriarchy

- Samuel Hearne, *A Journey to the Northern Ocean* (Toronto: Macmillan, 1958) 66–7, 70, 66, 97–8
- Anthony Jay, ed., *The Oxford Dictionary of Political Quotations* (Oxford: Oxford UP, 1996) 361
- Hearne, 171
- Michael Kesterton, “Social Studies,” *The Globe and Mail* 11 February 1998: A24

Chapter 5: Patriarchal Politics

- Peter G. Tsouras, *Warriors’ Words* (London: Arms and Armour, 1992) 468
- Sarah Lyall, “‘Primitive’ antics stun women MPs,” *The Globe and Mail* 23 December 1997: A8
- Anthony Jay, ed., *The Oxford Dictionary of Political Quotations* (Oxford: Oxford UP, 1996) 214
- Lawrence Martin, “Aging politics catching up to Chrétien,” *The Globe and Mail* 24 October 2002: A21
- Jan Brown, “Mom Never Told Us House Work Would Be Like This,” *Alberta Views* Winter 1999: 23., 25
- Joycelin Elders, “Quote of the day,” *Calgary Herald* 24 June 1995: B7
- Michael Valpy, “Guardians of good government,” *The Globe and Mail* 28 March 1998: D9
- Steven Stark, “Gap Politics,” *The Atlantic Monthly* July 1996: 74
- Dorothy Dobbie, letter, *The Globe and Mail* 19 March 1997: A22

Chapter 6: ... and Matriarchal Possibilities

- Ian McLeod, *Under Siege* (Toronto: James Lorimer, 1994) 38
- Joseph Kinsey Howard, *Strange Empire* (New York: William Morrow, 1952) 495
- Daniel Leblanc, “Clark plans to rip Reform over its cherished planks,” *The Globe and Mail* 11 September 1999: A4

Chapter 7: Markets Free, Capitalist and Feminine

- “They said it,” *The Globe and Mail* 21 October 1997: B22
- Margaret Wentz, “Why I’ll never be CEO,” *The Globe and Mail* 25 October 1997: D7
- Vivian Smith, “A delicate balance for women,” *The Globe and Mail* 7 February 1998: D3

- Basil “Buzz” Hargrove, letter, *The Globe and Mail* 13 October 1999: A14
- “Fiscal Fundamentalism,” *Canadian Dimension* April 1996: 5
- Jacquie McNish, “Rambo Talk reflects brutish business world,” *The Globe and Mail* 10 February 1998: B18
- “Teary-eyed Chainsaw Al defends record at Sunbeam,” *The Globe and Mail* 10 July 1998: B8
- Michael Kesterton, “Social Studies,” *The Globe and Mail* 3 July 1998: A24
- James J. Mitchell, “Male execs have to think like women,” *Calgary Herald* 24 June 1995: E10
- Elizabeth Church, “Gender still matters to management expert,” *The Globe and Mail* 9 June 1999: M1
- Suzy Hagstrom, “Dolphins to displace sharks,” *Calgary Herald* 10 April 1996: F3
- Much of my information on co-operatives came from the Canadian Co-operatives Resource File, 1997 (Ottawa: Co-operatives Secretariat, Government of Canada, 1997)
- John Stackhouse, “Co-ops cream of India’s crop,” *The Globe and Mail* 3 March 1997: A10
- Clive Thompson, “The Linux gamble,” *Report on Business* March 2000: 70
- Paul Wilkinson and Jack Quarter, *Building a Community-Controlled Economy* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1996) 161
- The Guinness Book of Records, 1994, 63
- Jean Jacques Rousseau, *The Social Contract and Discourses* (London: J.M. Dent & Sons, 1973) 225

Chapter 8: A Woman’s Place

- Lesley Hughes, “Add Women and Stir ...,” *Canadian Dimension* May– June 1997: 19
- Madelaine Drohan, “Drohan,” *The Globe and Mail* 1 March 2000: B12
- Beth Milwid, *Working With Men*, as quoted in Cris Evatt’s *He & She* (Berkeley: Conari Press, 1992) 81
- “Women may make better managers,” *Calgary Herald* 19 September 1996: D1
- John Heinzl, “Succession plans,” *The Globe and Mail* 2 February 1998: B11
- Paula Brook, “Every mother is a working mother,” *The Globe and Mail* 25 October 1997: D3
- Edmund Andrews, “European court backs hiring women to ‘restore balance,’” *The Globe and Mail* 12 November 1997: A12
- Daryl Bean and Nycole Turmel, “Waiting for pay equity,” *The Globe and Mail* 21 July 1998: A21

Chapter 9: Science Fictions

- “Quotable,” *Calgary Herald* 24 April 1996: B9. Part of Bradbury’s reply in Playboy to the question of why most women don’t read science fiction
- Jane Jacobs, *The Death and Life of Great American Cities* (Toronto: Random House, 1961) 21
- Karen Unland, “The landmark that won’t stand still,” *The Globe and Mail* 16 September 1997: A2
- George M. Popper, letter, *The Globe and Mail* 27 January 1998: D7
- Robert Kaplan, “Travels into America’s Future,” *The Atlantic Monthly* July 1998: 64
- Linda Jean Shepherd, *Lifting the Veil* (Boston: Shambala, 1993) 20. Ibid., 19, 20
- Reuters News Agency, “Robots, genetics pose grave danger: scientist,” *The Globe and Mail* 14 March 2000: A9
- Richard E. Sclove, *Democracy and Technology* (New York: The Guilford Press, 1995) 219
- Ursula Franklin, “Letter to a Graduate Student,” *Bringing it Home*, Ed. Brenda Lea Brown (Vancouver: Arsenal Pulp Press, 1996) 127
- Elizabeth Renzetti, “The mighty legacy of The Pill remains battered but intact,” *The Globe and Mail* 29 July 1999: A15
- E. F. Schumacher, *Small is Beautiful* (New York: Harper & Row, 1989) xx.

Chapter 10. The Golden Rule

- Ralph L. Woods, ed., *The World Treasury of Religious Quotations* (New York: Hawthorn Books, 1966) 395

- *The Sectional New Testament*, (London: S. G. M. Publishing House) 1
- Barbara Ehrenreich, *Blood Rites* (New York: Metropolitan Books, 1997) 172
- Thomas H. Greer, *A Brief History of Western Man*, Third Edition (New York: Harcourt Brace-Jovanovich, 1977) 311
- “Catholicism only ‘proper’ church, Vatican dictates,” *The Globe and Mail* 6 September 2000: A12.

Chapter 11: Kinder, Gentler Religion

- Michael Peers, “We must start over,” *The Globe and Mail* 25 September 2000: A11
- Irshad Manji, “Veil is only partly lifted,” *The Globe and Mail* 2 May 1998: D17
- “This Dimension,” *Canadian Dimension* October/November 1995: inside back cover
- Gordon Legge, “Intellectual missionary calls for change,” *Calgary Herald* November 1995: E11
- *The Bible, Authorized King James Version* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997) 2

Chapter 12: Crime and Punishment

- Samuel Hearne, *A Journey to the Northern Ocean* (Toronto: Macmillan, 1958) 184
- Robert Wright, *The Moral Animal* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1994) 356
- Eric Schlosser, “Reefer Madness,” *The Atlantic Monthly* August 1994: 45-63, and “Marijuana and the Law,” *The Atlantic Monthly* September 1994: 84-94
- David Cayley, “Applause please, for the new tack on young lawbreakers,” *The Globe and Mail* 27 March 1999: D3
- Shyam Bhatia, “Hussein outlasts West’s expectations,” *The Globe and Mail* 14 February 1998: A7
- Erin Anderssen, “The family annihilators,” *The Globe and Mail* 28 August 1999: A1/7
- Patricia Pearson, *When She Was Bad* (Toronto: Random House, 1997) 29
- “Faith in justice system fading, minister says,” *The Globe and Mail* 16 October 1997: A8
- Carol Gilligan, *In a Different Voice* (Cambridge: Harvard University, 1982) 30
- Kirk Makin, “Canada urged to set up drug courts,” *The Globe and Mail* 22 September 2000: A7.

Chapter 13: Macho Triumphant

- Associated Press, “One-third of world embroiled in conflict,” *The Globe and Mail* 30 December 1999: A10
- Stephen Strauss, “The boys of war,” *The Globe and Mail* 10 October 1998: D5
- W. Smith, “Happiness is,” letter, *The Globe and Mail* 28 July 1999: A13
- Barbara Ehrenreich, *Blood Rites* (New York: Metropolitan Books, 1997), 227
- Mark Kingwell, “Just War: A Five-Point Non-Plan,” *Adbusters* Autumn 1999: 72
- Susan Delacourt, “Oh, say can you see a Canadian identity?” *The Globe and Mail* 4 July 1998: D2.

Chapter 14: Sporting Blood

- Allan Maki. “A ticking bomb explodes in the NHL’s face,” *The Globe and Mail* 23 February 2000: A1
- Stephen Strauss, “Mexicans had the first field of dreams,” *The Globe and Mail* 30 April 1998: A2
- Michael Kesterton, “Social Studies,” *The Globe and Mail* 4 June 1998: A24
- Gilda Berger, *Violence and Sports* (New York: Franklin Watts, 1990) 64– 5, 7, 12
- Varda Burstyn, *The Rites of Men* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1999), 170, 255, 26, 103
- John Robert Colombo, ed., *Colombo’s Canadian Quotations* (Edmonton: Hurtig, 1974) 555
- Michael Kesterton, “Social Studies,” *The Globe and Mail* 20 June 2000: A8
- Les Sillars, “How to make men into mice,” *Alberta Report* 8 September 1997: 30
- Sean Fine, “So are they all, all honourable men,” *The Globe and Mail* 17 January 1998: A8
- Henry Hess, “Eagleson’s early release approved,” *The Globe and Mail* 26 June 1998: A3
- Douglas Bell, “Inside Planet Football,” *The Globe and Mail* 13 June 1998: D18
- Michael Kesterton, “Social Studies,” *The Globe and Mail* 10 September 1998: A26

- Robert Matas, “Sports-funding beef goes to rights body,” *The Globe and Mail* 9 April 1998: A2
- Patricia Young, “McGwire got his muscle boost from andro, research finds,” *The Globe and Mail* 9 February 2000: S1/6
- “Girls’ games,” editorial, *The Globe and Mail* 10 July 1999: D6

Chapter 15: The Mating Game

- Cecily Ross, “Ready, set, mate,” *The Globe and Mail* 11 March 2000:R1
- Maureen Dowd, “Panting for power: Love that naughty Prez,” *The Globe and Mail* 9 July 1998: A24
- “If music be the feud of love,” *The Globe and Mail* 2 August 1997: D5
- Samuel Hearne, *A Journey to the Northern Ocean* (Toronto: Macmillan, 1958) 169
- Patricia Best, “The ultimate motherhood issue,” *The Globe and Mail* 22 February 1997: D12
- Veronica Lee, “Man an ‘optional extra’ for some women,” *Calgary Herald* 23 August 1996: A17
- Rick Groen, “A portrait of two girlfriends as flip sides of same coin,” *The Globe and Mail* 26 September 1997: A16.

Chapter 16: The Next Generation

- Margaret Philp, “No-dad families called recipe for trouble,” *The Globe and Mail* 10 May 1997: A5
- * Leah McLaren, “The kids (of divorce) are all right,” *The Globe and Mail* 11 September 1999: D6.
- Erin Anderssen, “Divorce, 21st-century style,” *The Globe and Mail* 7 December 2002: F6
- Thomas Gordon, *P.E.T. Parent Effectiveness Training* (Markham: Penguin Books Canada Limited, 1970) 190
- Sharon Adams, “Democratic family lauded,” *Calgary Herald* 7 May 1994, p. B9
- Michael Valpy, “The new, value-added Canadians,” *The Globe and Mail* 26 October 1996: D5
- “Med Watch,” *The Globe and Mail* 21 March 1999: A21
- Paula Brook, “Every mother is a working mother,” *The Globe and Mail* 25 October 1997: D110
- Andrew Payton Thomas, “The time bomb of day care,” *The Globe and Mail* 17 January 1998: D6
- Edward Zigler, “Views misrepresented,” *The Globe and Mail* 20 February 1998: A22
- “Quality daycare pays off,” *The Globe and Mail* 22 October 1999: A8
- Margaret Philp, “Poor already behind by time they reach school,” *The Globe and Mail* 29 April 1997: A1, A7
- Jane Gadd, “Paradise found for child welfare,” *The Globe and Mail* 18 October 1997: A10
- Margaret Philp, “Social supports key for children, report finds,” *The Globe and Mail* 29 May 1997: A4
- Brad Evenson, “Children tell all in national survey,” *Calgary Herald* 16 October 1996: A6
- Virginia Galt, “Act in early years to prevent crime, report advises,” *The Globe and Mail* 6 February 1997: A6
- Jane Gadd, “Child research will be available,” *The Globe and Mail* 20 November 1997: A8
- Margaret Philp, “Canadians favour child care: study,” *The Globe and Mail* 10 April 1998: A5.
- Margaret Philp, “Public day care pays off for whole society, study says,” *The Globe and Mail* 5 March 1998: A8.

Chapter 17: Forming the Feminine Citizen

- Sara Kreindler, “Education Means Freedom,” *Canadian Dimension* February-March 1996: 34
- Summerhill School information brochure
- Rick Salutin, “Old coots, squeegeists and students,” *The Globe and Mail* 31 March, 2000: A15
- Sudbury Valley School website, www.sudval.org, 7 September, 2000
- My information on Sir Winston Churchill came from teacher Frank McGeachy who initiated the guidelines process
- My information on Calgary’s Alternative High School came from a lengthy visit to the school, the student-prepared *A.H.S. 20th Anniversary History of A.H.S.*, 1994, and a follow-up phone

conversation with principal Jim Hoepfner. My visit, kindly arranged by teacher Colin James and his wife Shelagh McCormick, included attending a school assembly

- R. G. Des Dixon, *Future Schools* (Toronto: ECW Press, 1992) 403
- Yaakov Hecht, *The Democratic School*, Handout at the Fourth International Conference of Democratic Schools, April, 1996
- John Dewey, *Democracy and Education* (New York: Macmillan Publishing Co., Inc., 1916) 99
- Virginia Galt, "McMaster medical school saluted for its teaching methods," *The Globe and Mail* 4 March 1997: A7
- Neil Postman, *The End of Education* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1995) 18

Chapter 18: Making a Matriarchal Future

- R. G. Des Dixon, *Future Schools* (Toronto: ECW Press, 1992) 261
- Jill Mahoney, "Alberta lays to rest a very good friend," *The Globe and Mail* 21 June, 2000: A6
- "France's health chief will run Kosovo," *The Globe and Mail* 3 July 1999: A8
- Jeannelle Savona, "About that victory party for feminism ...," *The Globe and Mail* 2 August 1997: D7
- Michael Adams and Amy Langstaff, "You say paternal ... and I say relax," *The Globe and Mail* 3 July 2000: A13. (Michael Adams is president of Environics Research Group and Amy Langstaff is a research associate with the group.)
- Kirk Johnson, "Self-esteem loses its lustre," *The Globe and Mail* 16 May 1998: D9
- Donna Laframboise, "You've come a long way, baby ... And for what?" *The Globe and Mail* 26 July 1997: D3
- Lisa Carver, "Hysterical History," *The Globe and Mail* 23 October 1999: D16
- Michael Hutchison, *The Anatomy of Sex and Power* (New York: William Morrow, 1990) 238
- Deborah Tannen, Pamela Wallin, CBC Newsworld, 17 April 1998
- Richard Dawkins, *The Selfish Gene* (Oxford: Oxford UP, 1989), 201

Epilogue

- Gail Sheehy, "Hey, it's a guy thing," *The Globe and Mail* 30 May 1998: D9

About the Author



Now retired, Bill Longstaff has served diverse careers in construction, banking, land titles, oil and gas, commercial art, cartooning and education (communications). He has written and published technical papers, poetry, short stories, articles, non-fiction books, and a blog. His views stem from a life-long observation of society from the perspective of a democrat and copious reading.