

## POSTMODERNISM AND THE EVOLUTION OF MORALITY

I trust that all of you are old enough to be familiar with Charlie Chaplin's famous satire, "Modern Times," which portrayed the mindlessness of the assembly line and which, to my mind, portrayed the best and worst of the modern age as we have known it. Well, times do change, and we are now encroaching into what is known as the post-modern era. Let me draw the distinction for you.

The Pre-Modern Era refers to the time before the rise of science, when science had not yet separated itself from religion, and the only competition for men's minds was from amongst the various philosophies and religions. Quoting from a theologian by the name of Miller:

"By the time of the appearance of the Christian church, the philosophies of Plato and Aristotle had come to dominate Greek thought. Following the fall of the Roman Empire and the cultural fragmentation which occurred in its aftermath, there was a recovery of classical Greek thought in the Christian West *in the eleventh and twelfth centuries* [and] the forging of a firm bond between Aristotelian philosophy (natural and otherwise) and Christian theology, ...[encompassing, as it did,] reliance upon tradition as a source of authoritative knowledge [and] a view of humanity as standing at the centre of the cosmos.

By the eve of the birth of modern culture, the relation between Aristotelian science (including the geocentric cosmological model developed by the second-century astronomer Ptolemy) and Christian theology had become so integral that it was virtually impossible to determine where one stopped and the other began. As a consequence, it was difficult to see how a philosophical or cosmological challenge to the system of Aristotelian natural philosophy could be anything less than a challenge to theological orthodoxy as well. Thus, the stage was set for the Copernican-Galilean controversy out of which modern culture emerged and in

which natural science as a discipline became independent of the intellectual or theological authority of the Christian church" (Miller, p. 2);

and in which, I might add, Aristotelian logic came to be recognized as only one of several systems of logic that could be employed in attempting to understand the world. Perhaps I could say just a bit about that.

In 1933, a displaced Polish scholar by the name of Alfred Korzybski published the first edition of a book called *Science and Sanity*, in which he introduced the general public to the term "General Semantics" and the non-Aristotelian system of logic underlying it. As you may know, newborn infants appear to be in what has been called an objectless state, in which they make no distinction between themselves and the rest of the world. In fact, it is only through the mother's interactions with her infant, in her "mothering" of it, that there is established in the infant an awareness, first of all, of its own body as a reality separate and distinct from the rest of the world. This differentiation of self from the rest of the world occurs mainly between the second and eight months of life, a stage of development which is known as normal symbiosis. The term symbiosis in this context, of course, is a metaphor. Unlike the biological concept of symbiosis, it does not describe what actually happens in a mutually beneficial relationship between two separate individuals of different species. Rather, it describes a stage in which the infant is *becoming* increasingly aware of the existence of his mother, but has not yet had enough experience with the world to be able to differentiate himself from her, and the infant behaves and functions as though he and his mother were a single entity with one common boundary.

Within this so-called symbiotic context, the child is developing memories of "good" or pleasurable experiences, first of all with the mother's breast (and later with an ever-widening world of experience), and memories of "bad" or unpleasant experiences such as being hungry or cold or wet. And by establishing memories of these interactions with his mother, he is taking into himself those good and bad experiences which form the basis of his perception of the world. At first, he doesn't realize that there is a mother out

there who is separate from himself; his experiences are global, and primitive, and relatively undifferentiated. But gradually, the mothering that goes on -- not only the feeding at the breast, but the cuddling and holding and rocking and the talking to and looking at -- defines the mother for her baby and stimulates in him the sensations which allow to become aware of his own existence as an entity separate and apart from her (Des Lauriers, 1962),

This process, which is sometimes referred to as "hatching," starts with the infant's memories of his experiences with his mother. So that where he has previously had good and bad global experiences, he comes to have good experiences that he perceives as being associated with something *outside of* himself, good experiences that he perceives as originating *within* himself, bad experiences that he perceives as being associated with something *outside of* himself and, somewhat later, bad experiences that he perceives as originating *within* himself. In this way, the developing infant learns to classify some of his experiences as "good" and some as "bad," to think of one of the adults in his environment as "mother" and another one as "father;" to drink "milk" or "water;" to eat "breakfast" or "lunch" or "supper." He learns that he lies on a "bed" and sits on a "chair," and so on; and in this way he is able to make at least a limited amount of sense of what William James called "the blooming, buzzing confusion" into which he was born.

The child's ability to form these concepts -- Korzybski calls it "time binding" -- gives him an advantage over the rest of Nature in that it facilitates his adaptation to changes in his environment, giving him first intellectual and then physical control over the things that go on around him. In effect, it enables him to break Newton's second law of physics, the progression of the universe towards greater entropy. This inborn tendency of mankind to try to bring organization out of chaos is a very powerful one. However, the particular way in which Western society assists the child to organize his experiences is based on the Aristotelian system of logic which characterizes most of the thinking of the English-speaking nations. In Aristotelian logic, it is taken for granted that all judgements about what goes on in the world can be broken up into simple statements in which something (a predicate) is asserted about

something else (a subject). Examples are "water is wet," "grass is orange," and so on. It is assumed that such statements are either "true" or "false": water is wet is a true proposition; grass is orange is (usually) a false one. In this system of viewing the world, things are either good or bad, black or white, "blacks" or "whites," people or not people, and so on. And I might mention that this way of thinking was accepted without comment and taught to each succeeding generation in our schools and universities from the time of Aristotle until the mid-nineteenth century, and in some areas of our lives right up until the present. During the last hundred years, however, there has been such a profound revolution in the way in which both science and philosophy have come to view the world that we can no longer afford to remain ignorant of the meaning which these recent changes may have for our understanding and experience of reality. The essence of these recent discoveries is that whether it is describing chemical changes or biological forms, nuclear structures or human behaviour, the language system employed is more productive if it is concerned with changing patterns of relationship rather than with separate acting entities.

Now, it may seem, at first, that it is an affront to common sense to describe the world as patterns of relationship without needing to ask what "stuff" these patterns are "made of." But postmodern science affirms that the sensation of stuff arises only when we are confronted with patterns so confused or so closely knit that we cannot make them out. Take an orange, for example. It appears solid enough, but if you were to expand that orange to the size of the whole Earth, the atoms in that orange would still be only the size of grapes. And if you were then to expand those grape-sized atoms to the size of the Toronto's skydome, the nucleus would still be no larger than a grain of salt. And all the rest of that space would be filled with nothing more than the probability of occurrence of an electrical charge, from time to time. Our classification system, however, seems to require a *division* of the world. As soon as there is a class, there has to be what is inside of it and what is outside it. And the separation, the difference, is what we notice, at least partly because it fits into our language system. We tend to ignore, on the other hand, and therefore to be ignorant about, aspects of our world which do not

fit nicely into the way in which we ordinarily think and talk. Our language encourages us to think in terms of subject and predicate, actor and action, and it encourages us to read into nature fictional acting entities, simply because our verbs have to have some object in front of them. We have to say, for example, "it flashed," or "a light flashed," setting up an actor (a light) to perform what we call an action (to flash) because that is the way our language is constructed. But this way of thinking about things has many disadvantages. As previously stated, for example, postmodern physics, chemistry, and biology have had to discard our language in favour of the language of mathematics in order to continue to develop their ideas about the world, and we cannot even understand the world as they see it because we do not even speak the same language. This is not true of all world languages. The Hopi Indian, for example, is a better physicist than we are when he says "flash" -- one word for the whole performance, no subject, no predicate, no time element -- than we are when we say "the light flashed." And the same is true of other languages such as Apache, Mayan, and Chinese. Perhaps an even greater disadvantage, however, is that we literally come to be at the mercy of the language which is the medium of expression in our particular society (Whorf, 1956). For example, around the storage of what are called "gasoline drums," behaviour will tend to be of a certain type. That is, great care will be exercised. While around the storage of what are called "empty gasoline drums," it will tend to be different: careless, with little repression of smoking or of tossing cigarette butts about. Yet the "empty drums" are actually more dangerous since they contain explosive gasoline vapour. Physically, the situation is hazardous, but the descriptions which we use must employ the word "empty" which inevitably suggest lack of hazard. Here is another example provided by Benjamin Whorf, an insurance adjuster and part-time linguist: In a wood distillation plant, the metal stills were insulated with a composition prepared from limestone and called at the plant "spun limestone." No attempt was made to protect this covering from excessive heat or from contact with flames. After a period of years, the fire below one of the stills spread to the "spun limestone," which to everyone's great surprise burned vigorously. Exposure to acetic acid fumes from the still

had converted part of the limestone (calcium carbonate) to calcium acetate. This, when heated in a fire, decomposed, forming flammable acetone. Yet the behaviour that tolerated fire close to the covering was induced by the use of the term "limestone" which, because it ends in "stone," implies that it won't burn.

Well, Modern Times encompasses the rise of science; and the Postmodern era is associated with its decline. When Copernicus suggested, in 1543 A.D., that the Earth was not the centre of the universe, it didn't really cause too much of a stir; but a century later, when Galileo developed a telescope with which he was actually able to *demonstrate* that the planets revolved around the Sun, the Inquisition forced him to recant. But, obviously, that didn't do much to halt the rise of science; and where, in olden times, the Universal Church militant had decreed that it controlled the only route to God, and that its doctrine offered the only hope of salvation, it wasn't long before science was being touted as saviour, and religion was in decline. Now, with the rise of the post-modern era, all that has changed again. It is not really that science is ready to be discarded but, rather, that people seem to be becoming -- at one and the same time -- both more sophisticated about just what science can and cannot do for us and, in response to the increasing pressures within society, more superstitious where their belief systems are concerned. More importantly, people are, in effect, beginning to realize that the reign of reason has really been the reign of rationalization (in the Freudian sense of the term), and not necessarily the best guide to moral action.

In an article entitled "Who said women are all bad? Almost everybody," Landsberg (1983) reported the opinions of women expressed by a number of Titans of Western Thought. Socrates is quoted as saying that "Woman is the source of all evil. Her love is to be dreaded more than the hatred of a man." Plato believed that "Those of the men ... who led a life of cowardice and injustice were suitably reborn as women." Pythagoras avowed that "There is a good principle which created order, light and man, and an evil principle which created chaos, darkness and women." And Martin Luther observed that "God created Adam Lord of All Living Creatures, but Eve spoiled it all." --

sentiments not out of keeping with the Genesis story of Adam and Eve:

"And I, the Lord God, called unto Adam, and said unto him, Where goest thou? And he said, I heard thy voice, in the garden, and I was afraid, because I beheld that I was naked, and I hid myself.

And I, the Lord God, said unto Adam, Who told thee that thou wast naked? Hast thou eaten of the tree whereof I commanded thee that thou shouldst not eat, if so thou shouldst surely die?

And the man said, The woman whom thou gavest me, and commanded that she should remain with me, she gave me of the fruit of the tree, and I did eat....

Unto the woman, I, the Lord God, said, I will greatly multiply thy sorrow, and thy conception; in sorrow thou shalt bring forth children, and thy desire shall be to thy husband, and he shall rule over thee.

And unto Adam, I, the Lord God, said, Because thou hast hearkened unto the voice of thy wife, and hast eaten of the fruit of the tree, of which I commanded thee, saying, Thou shalt not eat of it, cursed shall be the ground for thy sake; in sorrow shalt thou eat of it all the days of thy life;

Thorns also and thistles shall it bring forth to thee; and thou shalt eat the herb of the field;

By the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread, until thou shalt return unto the ground, for thou shalt surely die; for out of it wast thou taken, for dust thou wast, and unto dust shalt thou return." [Gen 3:15-19, 22-25]

In "Rescuing the Bible from Fundamentalism," Spong makes the point that quotations such as this from the Bible have been used many fundamentalists to justify all kinds of prejudice and suppression, including prejudice against and suppression of women. All that is changing, however, due largely to a combination of the feminist movement and, I hope and choose to believe, the

continuing maturing of the human race. Feminism (speaking metaphorically, of course) says that women are *not* inferior to men, and that the patriarchal logic which has cast them in an inferior role needs to be replaced with a different understanding of humanity, one which is able to accommodate the legitimate needs and aspirations of women and benefit from the contribution which their special perspective can bring to life. Perhaps I can illustrate with a quotation from Carter Hayward's introduction to her book, "When Boundaries Betray Us." She writes:

"...the book is about a difficult personal passage beyond the psychospiritual violence set in place by patriarchal logic. This may sound like a technical philosophical term -- *patriarchal logic* -- but that is not my intention. I use the term from time to time in these pages as a kind of shorthand for the ways in which our lives are organized, ways we for the most part take for granted and do not even notice -- ways in which our psyches, spiritualities, work, relationships, and cultural and professional traditions are organized. The whole of our lives and our life together functions to hold in place the economic and social power of priveleged white men.

In this book, patriarchal logic refers to the systemic, pervasive ordering of our bodies/minds/souls/selves in relation to one another through a hierarchical construction of unchanging power-relations. In this man-made world, certain people -- "the fathers" -- are ordained by birth, race, class, religion, education, profession, custom, accumulation of wealth, or simply by their gendered genital structure, to hold and use power over others in a way that is benign, ethical, "logical"; that is, both to "help others" and to secure their own power so that it does not change hands...." (p. 4), and note that all of these characteristics are good in and of themselves and only "bad" in relation to "the better."

Whether or not that, in itself, would be enough to justify our re-examination of



the patriarchal nature of society, in my opinion, the impact of this kind of consciousness-raising, while *incredibly* important, pales in comparison to some research published by Carol Gilligan on the differences between men and women in their understanding of right and wrong, and this is the crux of my argument:

According to Jean Piaget, one of the foremost psychologists of our time, the child's cognitive development progresses through a series of four stages -- which he calls (1) Sensorimotor, (2) Preoperational, (3) Concrete Operational, and (4) Formal Operational -- corresponding roughly to the ages from (1) birth to two years, (2) two to seven years, (3) 7 years to eleven years, and (4) eleven years and above. Growth needs to progress through these four stages in the order given, since the acquisition of each stage depends on mastery of the preceding stages. In line with this general theory of cognitive development, Piaget suggested that moral development also proceeds on a stage by stage basis. Judgements concerning right and wrong -- judgements concerning what ought to be done, and why -- are limited by cognitive development in general. That is, the child cannot reason morally at a level beyond his ability to reason in general, moral judgements develop through a series of invariate stages, and morality is not so much a function of what is done but of the reasoning that underlies the choice.

Elaborating on Piaget's theory of moral development, Kohlberg postulated a series of six stages in the development of moral reasoning, grouped into three moral levels, as follows:

Level 1: Pre-Moral Level

Stage 1: Punishment and obedience

(Action is motivated by fear of punishment)

Stage 2: Naive instrumental hedonism

(Action is motivated by hoped-for reward: the morality of the marketplace)

Level 2: Conventional Morality

Stage 3: Good-Boy/Good-Girl morality

(Action is motivated by desire for approval, avoidance of disapproval)

Stage 4: Law and Order morality

(Action is motivated by loyalty to authority, anticipation of honour/dishonour)

Stage 4a: A transition period between Stages 4 and 5, characterized by rebellion against the rigidity of the Law and Order morality of Stage 4

Level 3: Principled Morality

Stage 5: Morality of contract and democratically accepted law

(Action is motivated by concern for community consensus; and values are relative)

Stage 6: Morality of individual moral principles

(Action is motivated by personal integrity, self-respect, universal values)

The interesting thing about all this is that *this entire conceptual scheme was derived from research on males* -- and just imagine the implications of *that!* Furthermore, when it is applied to females, they seem, on the average, not to progress much beyond Level 3 on Kohlberg's six level scale of moral development. That is, they seem overly-concerned about what other people think. This prompted a Harvard professor by the name of Carol Gilligan to attempt to tease out the meaning of such apparently stunted moral development on the part of women; and her subsequent research showed that there is indeed a fundamental difference in the way in which boys and girls, men and women, approach the problem of attempting to resolve life's inevitable moral dilemmas. According to Gilligan, this difference stems from the different developmental paths followed by males and females: In order to be male, the young boy must separate from his mother in a way that the young girl does not. Thus, males develop within the context of separation from their mothers, while females develop within the context of continuing attachment. As a result, males, *on average*, appear to be operating out of a "developing-understanding-of-justice-among-separate-entities" model of moral

reasoning; whereas females, *on average*, appear to be operating out of a world-view characterized by "caring for and about those to whom one is inseparably related."

When knowledge about human development is based only on the study of males, however, the contribution that could be made by the study of female development is lost. In the process, morality comes to be dominated by justice-oriented "logical" conceptual schemes; and what we would think of as the more "human" side of humanity tends to be devalued and ignored. Thus, according to Gilligan, the fact that women score lower on Kohlberg's scale of moral development reflects not a lower level of moral development *per se* but, rather, a greater awareness of and emphasis on the interrelatedness of all people. And the inclusion of women's voices in human affairs -- the oriental idea of the inseparability of yin and yang -- adds a new *empathic* dimension to understanding that is not present in the patriarchal logic which Hayward decries. And as patriarchal logic is *supplemented* by its feminine counterpart, we will enter into a new era, one in which humanity comes more fully into its own.

Of course, that would inevitably change our understanding of the universe. For example, we might come to see that the separateness which is reflected in patriarchal logic -- based as it has been on a combination of masculine thinking and Aristotelian logic, with their emphases on separation and differences -- is no more valid than the inclusiveness that Gilligan writes about. Be that as it may, the real threat to current "modern" conceptualizations of morality lies in even admitting that our understanding of the universe -- the stories that we have been telling ourselves -- could, in fact, have been wrong, in the sense of being a more limited understanding than that which we are capable of attaining. Because, if we were to make that admission, then we could easily find ourselves in a position very similar to that already faced by the rest of the scientific world: (1) where ideas are recognized to be nothing more than ideas, i.e., concepts are recognized to be (no more than) constructs, (2) where there can be no truth independent of the person who constructed it, (3) where everything that we tell ourselves is to be

treated as a hypothesis, and the telling of it a story, and (4) where such stories are never either true or false, but only more or less useful. Does that mean that nothing that we have been telling ourselves about right and wrong has any validity. No, of course not. It is a bit like the story of *Prince Wen Hui's Cook*:

Prince Wen Hui's cook was cutting up an ox. Out went a hand, down went a shoulder. He planted a foot, he presses with a knee, the ox fell apart with a whisper. The bright cleaver murmured like a gentle wind. Rhythm! Timing! Like a sacred dance, like "The Mulberry Grove," like ancient harmonies!

"Good work!" the Prince exclaimed, "Your method is faultless!" "Method?" said the cook, laying aside his cleaver. "What I follow is the [Way] *beyond* all methods! When I first began to cut up oxen, I would see before me the whole ox, all in one mass. After three years, I no longer saw this mass, I saw the distinctions. But now, I see nothing with the eye. My whole being apprehends. My senses are idle. The spirit, free to work without plan, follows its own instinct. Guided by natural line, by the secret opening, the hidden space, my cleaver finds its own way. I cut through no joint, chop no bone. There are spaces in the joints; the blade is thin and keen; when this thinness finds that space, there is all the room you need! It goes like a breeze! Hence, I have this cleaver nineteen years as if newly sharpened! True, there are sometimes tough joints. I feel them coming; I slow down; I watch closely, hold back, barely move the blade; and whump! the part falls away, landing like a clod of earth. Then I withdraw the blade. I stand still and let the joy of the work sink in. I clean the blade and put it away."

To which Prince Wen Hui responded, "This is it! My cook has shown me how I ought to live my own life!" (Chuang Tzu, 3rd Century. Quoted in Kabat-Zinn, 1994, Wherever you go, there you are. New York: Hyperion).

In fact, the closer our understanding of reality (as reflected in the stories that we tell ourselves about how things are) approximates the real thing, the better our understanding will be as a guide to life.

Of course, not everyone is going to accept such a getting-back-to-basics. There is a story, for example, about an encounter between Jesus and the Grand Inquisitor:

Apparently, Jesus returned to earth sometime near the beginning of the Spanish Inquisition; but as soon as the Church of that day found out about it, he was arrested and thrown into prison, where he was confronted by the Grand Inquisitor and informed in no uncertain terms that he could not be allowed to interfere with the Church's policies and programs. "You should have known that the nonsense you taught -- tolerance for sinners and a kingdom based on love -- was no basis on which to build a religion. We have had to work hard to mould your doctrine into something that can be sustained, and we are not going to let you ruin it all now." Whereupon, Jesus kissed the Grand Inquisitor and departed, as if by magic, from out of the prison. And from then on, the Church's ideas about salvation were promulgated with vigor throughout the land.

Well, as it turned out, not only did the Inquisition continue, but the Christian church's doctrines also contributed significantly to the Holocaust which was to follow. And, as someone has remarked, no religion can be considered valid that doesn't take into account burning children.

But suppose *we* were to accept that *much* of what we have been telling ourselves about right and wrong has been limited, not only by the time and cultural limitations inherent in our nineteenth century (and to some extent twentieth century) North American origins, but by an almost exclusively male perspective as well. Suppose we were to admit that an infinite universe is beyond the comprehension of our little minds, and that the ideas of which we are at any time so enamoured are (at least partly) a fantasy. In fact, let us

acknowledge that our only contact with reality is mediated by the way in which our brains structure the limited range of energy to which our sense organs are sensitive. The reality that we live in, on a day-to-day basis, is the reality that we construct in our own minds, from the pictures and sounds and tastes and smells and feelings that are formed in our brains from the (sensory) information which we receive through our various senses, plus the language that we use to structure those sensory experiences. We exist, for all time, in a subjective reality -- that we can only hope approximates an objective reality out there somewhere in space-time -- and our understanding is limited accordingly.

Then, with that knowledge and admission as foundation, we could begin to tear down or "deconstruct" the patriarchal logic which has supported society's historic suppression of women and antagonism towards peoples of other cultures, races, faiths, and so on -- in fact, towards anyone other than our society's supposedly-heterosexual white male oligarchy -- perhaps to the point where the quest for peace among people is no longer hampered by an inherent hostility based on differences.

When I was young, some fifty years ago, the members of the church to which I belonged were very proud of being different. I knew that that church was the right one, that all the others were wrong, and that the Catholic church, in particular, was evil. At the time, the members of those other churches knew essentially the same thing, of course, except that they knew that *they* were the ones who were right while we were among those others groups that were wrong. All of this was in keeping with a very fundamental law of human nature, well known in Social Psychology, which has to do with the "In Group" and the "Out Group. " Essentially, my group is right, and everyone else is wrong.

Life was relatively straightforward in those good old days, because we knew very little about anyone else; and it is always easy to be critical of others when you don't know very much about them. But then the world began to shrink, and groups with whom we would have had no contact in the past began to become our neighbours in our "global village." In the future, as we begin to

learn more and more about these new neighbours of ours, it will become less and less easy to maintain holier-than-thou attitudes towards them. People will continue to be valued for their similarity to us, of course, but they will be valued for their diversity as well. And tolerance for and acceptance of all people will continue to increase, regardless of their differences from us.

In the future, prejudice based on differences is going to be more and more difficult to maintain, as we learn to value, rather than disparage, the differences that we find in these other groups to which we are inseparably related. Then, as we move towards a more inclusive view of humanity, we are all going to be neighbours, not only in our global village, but in the Good Samaritan sense of the term as well. Then, perhaps, we can get on with the task of telling our various stories, and perhaps even listening to the stories told by others.

When Boundaries Betray Us, by Carter Hayward

Gangestad, S. and Snyder, M. To carve nature at its joints: On the existence of discrete classes in personality. Psychological Review, 1985, Vol 92, No. 3, 317-349.

"One may, of course, conjecture a class model of any ... construct one chooses. Nevertheless, one should have at least some minimal theoretical or empirical reasons to conjecture a class model before proceeding to test one." (p. 322)

"How does one distinguish variables that entail classes that are discrete, nonarbitrary, and real in nature from continuous quantitative variables? Generally, if a class variable exerts strong influence on some domain of observable events, then these events are discontinuously distributed in the multidimensional hyperspace that they define. To the extent that unusual densification (or, in extreme cases, multimodality) can be detected, there exists empirical evidence consistent with a class model.

Unfortunately, however, precise mathematical criteria for determining whether a class variable exists cannot be specified without arbitrariness." (P. 324)

"Hempel (1965) asserted that class concepts must be given systematic import -- that is, demonstrated to fulfill an explanatory or predictive function -- to be construed as natural classifications that 'carve nature at its joints.'" (p. 324)

A similar point was made earlier by Mary Daly in her book "Beyond God the Father":

The history of antifeminism in the Judeo-Christian heritage already has been exposed. The infamous passages of the Old and New Testaments are well known. I need not allude to the misogyny of the



church Fathers.... Perhaps, however, we should take just a cursory glance at more recent history.... In 1972, Pope Paul VI assumed his place as champion of 'true women's liberation,' asserting that this does not lie in 'formalistic or materialistic equality with the other sex, but in the recognition of that specific thing in the feminine personality -- the vocation of a woman to become a mother.' [It is, perhaps, superfluous to say that most feminists did not think much of the position espoused by this so-called "champion."]