



Photograph by Chuttersnap -- https://all-free-download.com/free-photos/download/couple_embracing_604723.html

THE HISTORICAL LOVE/RESPECT DYNAMIC

Tim Goldich



ABSTRACT

Within the traditional gender system, men are respected far more than they are loved, and women are loved far more than they're respected. Both sexes love women more than men, and both sexes respect men more than women. Both sexes have looked upon the other and felt rejected. It's time to put an end to this self-righteous gender-political contest for the coveted title of MVP (Most Victimized and Powerless). Starting over from the premise that It All Balances Out between Woman and Man (and it always has), it's time to replace both feminism and masculism with equalism. In so doing, we view gender reality in terms of Male-Female equal partnership, and we view gender issues in terms of shared responsibility.

Keywords: gender equalism, gender politics, love, man, respect, woman

Let's talk about Love and let's talk about Respect. What relevance do these concepts have with regard to female and male? How might these concepts relate to gender reality as it has played out over millennia? What follows is an excerpt from my upcoming book, *Equal Partners: The History of Gender Equality*.

It's difficult to define the word *love* without making use of the word *respect*, and difficult to define the word *respect* without using the word *love*. Love and Respect are related concepts that overlap somewhat. It's not always easy to cleanly distinguish one from another. Yet they are far from synonyms. When we are as rigorous as possible in distinguishing Love from Respect and Respect from Love, and we look at gender history armed with that insight, a Love/Respect Dynamic shows up clearly and offers enormous explanatory power. Most importantly, it helps make plain the essential gender balance that is otherwise easily obscured by gender bias.

Obviously both men and women are both loved and respected. Yet there is a deep dynamic, driven partly by role and partly by instinct and Eros, whereby humanity tends to invest its respect upon men and its love upon women. In the more polarized past, this L/R Dynamic showed up more dramatically than it does now, but it remains prominent to this day.

Because they are related concepts, it's easy to mistake one for the other. For example, masculism (the mirror-opposite of feminism) takes note of male chivalry in the form of a man removing his hat, bowing to a woman, offering her his seat, and concludes that women are and have always been *more* respected than men, not less.¹ Let's set the scene:

It's, oh, let's say, five hundred years ago. The sexes being far more highly polarized then than they are now, we may envision a brightly dressed woman entering a room filled with rather identically darkly dressed men all seated around a table. As accorded her sex, she takes a kind of societal sanctioned *ownership* of beauty, grace, goodness; home, family, parenting—all things along the Love-Axis (she has spent a lifetime cultivating those qualities). The men are blitzed by her feminine aura and eroticism. She so adept at the social graces, they feel rather woefully

1 Paul Elam (of A Voice for Men) once remarked, "Men are not and never have been respected. If anyone has been the beneficiary of more social respect, it is women."

inadequate, crude, ugly, clumsy in comparison. They do indeed all stand and bow and remove their hats. One man remains standing after he's offered her his seat. Another man solicitously takes her coat while another bows and kisses her hand.²

It's understandable if all these deferences will be taken for respect. These solicitous male behaviors do indeed resemble respect, but they derive from *adoration* (love), not respect. As compared with respect, this adoration is no *lesser* thing, but it is *different*. How can we know this? Because of what happens next.

Suddenly, a man bursts through the door screaming "There's a crack in the dam!" Now something important, something potentially catastrophic is happening. *Action* must be taken! And, just as suddenly, beauty, grace, goodness; home, family, and parenting are all rendered irrelevant. The woman who moments before had stolen focus, now disappears. What's needed *now* are qualities such as intellect, competence, prestige; toughness, strength, courage—all things along the Respect-Axis (males spend a lifetime cultivating those qualities).

First thing needed is a leader who can take charge (intellect, competence, prestige). And who will be *his* lieutenants? Now we must find the *expert*, the engineer, the architect, the mathematician, the man with skills and experience in these matters (intellect, competence). Finally, we need the men who will actually dive into those cold, deep waters and, at great peril, patch the dam. Even these men are respected (for their competence, toughness, strength, and courage). But, given their disposability, they are not much loved. The leaders and the experts aren't much loved either. If they succeed, they will be honored (respected), but, in the brutal past, if the *expert* fails, he may well be brutally punished, perhaps executed. If the leaders fail, they may be assassinated. Within the traditional gender system, men are respected far more than they are loved.

From the moment that man burst through the door, the woman is only considered to the

2 Both sexes feel both superior and inferior to their opposite sex. It is out of a deep feeling of inferiority to the sublime feminine that Man is inspired to perform, achieve, and succeed in an effort to become masterful enough to be worthy of she whom he worships. A cosmos of great art, philosophy, music, literature, architecture, mathematics, and science has resulted.

extent of getting her to the high ground where she'll be safe. She is loved; her life valued, her fears and feelings empathized with; her entitlement to an inner emotional life ensured. But in the traditional gender system, women are loved far more than they're respected. In seeking a leader, she is not considered (of course, when selecting for the perilous tasks, she's not considered for *that* either). In being imprecise with the words *love* and *respect*, many will mistake adoration (love) for respect.

Meanwhile, gazing into the mirror-opposite, people in general, and women and feminists in particular, mistake veneration for love. In mistaking respect for love, they may find it easy to believe that men are *more* loved, not less. It is a world of “misogyny” (hatred toward women) feminists say. How could women be more loved when women are more hated?³ Women observe other women throwing themselves at successful men, eager to bed and wed them. So many women fall in *love* with these men; *surely* men are loved. But, in being rigorous with the terms, we discern that it is not primarily *love* that these women fall into. It is not primarily lovable traits that women find so irresistible.

“Love is respect,” women are wont to say.⁴ And, for women, that phrase makes sense. Indeed, women tend to fall into a kind of sexualized-romanticized *respect* with a man—a man of intellect, competence, prestige; toughness, strength, and courage—a man possessing respectable qualities. But the thing is, love is *not* respect; respect is respect. The two words are not simply interchangeable.

Misogyny is forbidden; *misandry* is ignored. To feminists, *misogyny* is a lack of *both* respect *and* love toward women. Being strict with the terminology, we find that *misogyny* is more

3 Opposites lay on opposite ends of a wide continuum. To get from black to white, one must traverse the grey scale. To get from hot to cold, the temperature scale. But both love and hate are impassioned, and switching from one to the other can happen on a dime. Hate is the mirror reverse of love. I consider the true opposite of love (or hate) to be indifference because there is an extensive emotional journey to get from one to the other. Both sexes are hated, each in their own way. Where men suffer most is within a loveless indifference that may tolerate male suffering and death at virtually any levels.

4 I note that “Love is respect” has become a meme within the domestic violence industry. “You’ve heard it before — love is respect. But where can you go for support when a loving relationship has become a relationship without respect?” [<https://sova.pitt.edu/educateyourself-love-is-respect>] Women suffer lack of respect, but men suffer lack of love just as much. Where will a man go for support when a “loving” relationship is a relationship without love?

accurately understood as a lack of *respect* (the extreme of which is a sort of infantilization) toward women, while *misandry* (a word not found in my word processor's dictionary) is more accurately understood as a lack of *love* toward men. It is this *indifference* toward men that accounts for why we don't interest ourselves in hostility toward men even to the extent of knowing or making use of a derogatory label for it.

Historically, as women have observed men respecting each other more than women; appearing to have little practical need for women; excluding women from their inner circle and seeming more interested, active and connected with each other; so men have observed women loving each other more than men; appearing to have little emotional need for men; excluding men from their inner circle and seeming more interested, active and connected with each other. To the degree that women have suffered the pain of greatly respecting and venerating an opposite sex that does not so greatly respect and venerate them in return, so men have suffered the pain of greatly loving and desiring an opposite sex that does not so greatly love and desire them in return.

Both sexes love women more than men and both sexes respect men more than women. Both sexes have looked upon the other and felt rejected.

I submit that we humans *want* respect but we *need* love. The pain women feel for being less respected is terrible, but not so terrible that women and society are able to bring it to consciousness. By contrast, I suspect that being loved second-best is so painful, society in general and men in particular have felt the need to escape full cognizance of it through denial. Society knows full well that women are respected second best, but society has yet to come to grips with the true lack of love toward men.

Women fall in respect with men; men fall in love with women. One is not *less* than the other, but they are *different*. And to make clear that difference, it is helpful to look at the extremes. In drawing out the limit case on each side, the underlying principle is highlighted.

Men can truly be said to fall in *love* because, in general, the qualities in women that men fall in love with—beauty, innocence, nurturance, sweetness, sensitivity, dependence, softness, emotiveness, empathy, vulnerability—are *lovable* qualities. The uncomfortable truth is, one of the

characteristics found in many of the things we love most is the characteristic of being smaller and weaker than ourselves. It is the innocent child in Woman that Man falls so hard for. In extreme cases, women may feign weakness or even helplessness in an effort to be as cute, precious, adorable and *lovable* as a child (a baby doll) or small furry animal (a sex-kitten). While children and pets certainly command our *love*, do we *respect* them as equals?

Those who seem smaller, weaker, and less capable than us (be they female or male), are perceived as less threatening, less able to take care of themselves, more dependent, more innocent, more vulnerable, more endearing, cuter, and thus more lovable (picture the so-called dizzy blonde). If, however, one adopts such a maximally lovable persona and adopts behaviors that draw *everyone's* love, then one risks being someone *no one* respects.

For life to be maximally fulfilling, we all need *both* love and respect. One without the other is certainly incomplete and inadequate. But that doesn't mean one cannot exist, or that one is not real without the other. Love and respect can exist as quite *separate* entities.

"You can't fall in love with someone if you don't respect them," women will insist. Well, that's true, but only for those for whom *respect* lies at the core of falling in love. Which is why it's not so true for men. A man can fall head over heels in love with a wiggly, giggly, silly, innocent, childlike persona—think *Laugh-In's* Goldie Hawn (not the actress, the persona)—even though there is little in that persona to respect (no accountability, forthrightness, courage, competence, leadership . . . etc.). Despite his adoration for her, his lack of respect may show up as not listening, placating, condescending, or infantilizing her. Love without respect may well be incomplete, but it is *real*—real enough to take a bullet for her, real enough to have taken many a man all the way to the altar.

There are also *male* personae that everyone loves. Think, for example, of Stan Laurel (of Laurel and Hardy fame). Who among us can't love innocent, little, childlike, befuddled Stanley? The difference is that—removing Stan Laurel's comic genius charm and star power—what woman *really* wants to bed and wed a simpleton? What simpleton will make the list of the most eligible bachelors? A woman can love such a lovable persona, but she can't fall into a sexualized and romanticized *respect* with such a persona and therefore few women will sexually, romantically

desire such a persona. A woman *can* love him, but she cannot *fall* in love with him.

Women who adopt a maximally lovable persona reap the rewards, but only at a cost (lack of respect). To say that the cost women pay is a cost imposed upon them by patriarchy disrespects Woman's adult autonomy and choices. It misses the fact that such personae also reap rewards and that they are personae that women *choose*. Women who adopt such characteristics may be pleasing men, but they are also maximizing their powers to manipulate men. By feigning weakness, she pulls his strings and gets him to do what she doesn't want to do or is afraid to do herself.

Woman's greatest strength lies in her façade of weakness.

Gazing into the Mirror-Opposite (and there is *always* a mirror-opposite), we see that men who choose a maximally respected persona also reap the rewards, but only at a cost. Around the world, hidden away in prisons, veteran's hospitals, and halfway houses are men who, at work, at war, or at the corner bar, have paid a terrible cost for toughness, courage, tenacity, honor, and other characteristics of respected personae. For some, the costs may include the loss of limbs, eyes, face, mobility, perhaps even sanity.

One of the characteristics found in those whom we respect most is the bravery to place themselves between us and danger, even to the point of sacrificing themselves for us. Such men fare well in the eulogies spoken at their funerals; even so, they essentially render themselves disposable for the honor to have died a hero. The downsides of being a so-called sex-kitten are numerous to be sure, but at least they're not fatal. And the downsides inherent in lovable personae receive love (empathy) while the downsides (indifference to their fear and pain, indictment, disposability, assassination) inherent in maximally respected personae do not.

Again, looking at the extremes helps clarify. In extreme cases, a man may feign strength in the guise of brutal indifference to his own pain and the pain of others and do so in an effort to be as feared, obeyed, and *respected* as a warrior or a dictator. Such men can indeed be respected because they possess many respectable qualities: non-complaining, self-sufficient, skillful, disciplined, determined, accomplished, courageous, and so on. But I submit that in extreme cases

there may be next to *nothing* in such a man to *love*—no innocence, no vulnerability, no sweetness, no emotional reveal, no kindness—*nothing*. So, when a woman says that she has fallen in *love* with a stereotypical Green Beret, how can she be believed?

Yes, she's crazy about him, wants to bed and wed him. She tells all her friends she's in love. But, for her, love is secondary. For millennia, men have been falling in love with women they do not necessarily respect and women have been falling in love with men they do not necessarily love. Respect without love is real respect, but it is certainly incomplete and may well be judged inadequate.

The truth is, she does *not* love the Macho Man any more than he respects the Femisa Woman.⁵ She *admires* him for his self-contained stoicism and is *impressed* with his toughness and confidence, his commanding presence, his skills, accomplishments, and status. Heightened by the erotic, she may even revere him. She may sacrifice much within herself in order to bow to his leadership.⁶

Both sexes get weak in the knees, but love melts the heart; respect melts the mind. To admire and be impressed is to respect, not love. It's painful to think of women as unloving, even so, despite her reverence, her lack of love may show up in *many* ways. It may show up in a wife's relative intolerance of her husband's fears, incompetencies, vulnerabilities, and insecurities; her lack of empathy toward his inner little boy, his sense of victimhood, or both; sending him to face *alone* that which goes bump in the night; and being the one to threaten and initiate the vast majority of breakups.

We're exploring *Love* and *Respect* at the extremes where the dynamic is most clear cut. Dropping out of the extremes and into the ordinary, we note, obviously, that both sexes are both respected and loved. Romantically, it works something like this: For men: LOVE + respect + SEX = "falling in love." For women: RESPECT + love + Sex = "falling in love." Outside of the extremes, women are less respected only as a matter of degree; men are less loved only as a matter of degree.

5 Macho: immature or inauthentic masculine characterized by glib, invulnerable, obdurate, single-mindedness, and Male Ego. Femisa: immature or inauthentic feminine characterized by self-righteous vindictiveness, victim-mongering, and Female Pride.

6 Both sexes feel both superior and inferior to their opposite sex. It is out of a deep feeling of inferiority to the protean masculine that Woman is inspired to cultivate the sublime feminine, to become beautiful enough (inside and out) to be worthy of the whom she worships – this wheel of mutual inspiration underlies much in the spheres of human aspiration and achievement.

Just as feminine qualities may be rendered irrelevant within the world of men, so masculine qualities may be rendered irrelevant within the world of women. A man's persona, so functional on the job, may become quite dysfunctional at home. If you adopt the persona and behaviors that make *everyone* respect you, you risk *no one* loving you.

Man's greatest weakness lies in his façade of strength⁷.

The Love/Respect Dynamic tunnels all the way to the very core of gender reality. Its explanatory power is enormous. It is key to understanding how the gender system works.

Clearly, appearing weak and dizzy doesn't lend itself to being respected, nor does being feared and obeyed lend itself to being loved. *Love and respect tend to polarize the sexes because the qualities that beget them are in conflict.*⁸

Wisdom's task is to integrate them both. So, this is not to say that being loved and being respected are mutually exclusive. Integrating the two, however, does present certain contradictions and challenges not easily overcome. To be someone who is extremely lovable *and* extremely respectable means juggling qualities (worldly competence vs. childlike innocence) not readily contained in one persona. Generally speaking, the more one does whatever it takes to be universally loved, the less respected one is apt to be. The more one does whatever it takes to be universally respected, the less loved one is apt to be. For both sexes, life contains tradeoffs and compromise.

Men *could* choose maximally lovable personae, but for men, the rewards of such personae will be less and the costs higher. Such men will likely be disrespected by men and rejected by women. So, in boyhood, most males will tend instead to disown some lovable traits (innocence, silliness, helplessness, vulnerability), traits in conflict with gaining respect. For men, lovable traits

7 Warren Farrell begins the first chapter of *The Myth of Male Power: Why Men are The Disposable Sex*, with the following quotation from Lawrence Diggs, *Transitions*, Nov./ Dec. 1990, p. 10. "The weakness of men is the facade of strength: the strength of women is the facade of weakness" (qtd. in Farrell, 13).

8 Accountability--compassion, liberalism--conservatism, good--evil, order--chaos, love--truth . . . a prime characteristic of fundamental dualities is that the two ends of such dualities are in conflict—wisdom is about integrating them even so. The love-respect duality is similar; however, it is a duality superseded by the more fundamental love--truth duality. And so, in various subtleties and nuances, perhaps the dynamic between love and respect is even more complex.

have tended to be less rewarding and less effective (manipulation is a less effective *modus operandi* for men). There are downsides to the respected persona (achieved in part by suppressing lovable traits) but, owing to the adaptations of gender together with societal structuring, a man will tend to reap the rewards of respect more and suffer the liabilities less than his female equivalent would.

Women could do as men do and choose maximally respectable personae (The Margaret Thatcher and Hillary Clinton personae are far more respected than loved). But for women, the rewards of such personae will be less and the costs higher. Such women will likely be unloved by women and rejected by men. So, while girls, most women will tend instead to disown some respectable traits (rationality, invincibility, competitiveness), traits in conflict with being lovable. For women, respectable traits have tended to be less rewarding and less effective (domination is a less effective *modus operandi* for women). There are downsides to the lovable persona (achieved in part by suppressing respectable traits) but, owing to the adaptations of gender together with societal structuring, a woman will tend to reap the rewards of love more and suffer the liabilities less than her male equivalent would.

Both sexes have undergone millennia (nay, *eons*) of adaptation to their respective roles and personae. Which is why it's only natural that both sexes signed onto the gender deal. Despite the many downsides, overall, The Deal played well to each sex's relative strengths and weaknesses. For the majority of humans, The Deal was equitable, efficient, and the upsides outweighed the downsides, which is why the sexes were equal partners in creating and maintaining The Deal. Women in pursuit of love/lovability and men in pursuit of respect/respectability, the sexes polarized accordingly, and thus The Deal unfolded inevitably.

In coming to a deeper understanding of love and respect, and the conflict between the two, we come to a deeper understanding of gender reality, including gender polarity. We see how men prioritizing respect and respectability and women prioritizing love and lovability has sent men and women down divergent pathways in which each sex gained much but only by sacrificing much.

In sacrificing much, each sex *earned* what it got out of The Deal. Rather than blaming the opposite sex for what each sex chose to sacrifice, we might take a moment to focus instead on what each sex gained out of The Deal. Focusing on the gifts (rather than the burdens), each sex might afford some gratitude toward the other for enabling those gifts. Only in a world in which men handle the masculine tasks does space open up within which women can be feminine. Only in a world in which women handle the feminine tasks does space open up within which men can be masculine. Each sex makes the full flowering of the other's archetype possible. For both sexes, there is efficacy, there is choice, there is reward, there is inspiration, and there is compromise.

Toward men, the rule is accountability sans compassion which is ruthless. It is respecting men as autonomous adults responsible for their own actions or inactions, but it is not loving men as vulnerable beings worthy of empathy. If I were to claim that men are less loved because men are less lovable, I will expect no storm of protest or cries of the little-known word, *misandry*. Toward men, accountability sans compassion is a norm that will raise few eyebrows.

As a generalization, men may indeed be less lovable. But there are circumstances built into the role men play, societal expectations, differing obligations, outside forces, and double binds involved. Loving men enough to enter those factors into the equation would add fairness to the accusation of men less lovable. But, for men, there can be no excuses. And thus, the accusation that men are less lovable is plied ruthlessly. Even so, the accusation contains a kernel of truth, and holding men accountable for the part they play in the L/R Dynamic *does* confer respect upon men—even if that respect is not accompanied by love.

But what would happen if I had the temerity to suggest that women are less respected because women are less respectable? Now I can expect a *torrent* of protest along with cries of *misogyny*, *male chauvinism*, and *sexism*! In uttering such a blasphemy, there's hell to pay—social suicide, career sabotage. Toward women, the rule is compassion sans accountability, which is infantilizing (which is just as bad). We love (and fear) women too much to accuse them of lacking respectability. When it comes to *women*, circumstances, reasons, outside forces, far from being rejected, will tend to rise up and shove accountability off the table.

Sheltering women from the part they play in the L/R Dynamic *does* confer love upon women, even if that love is not accompanied by respect. Nevertheless, if there's a kernel of truth to one, there's a kernel of truth to both. In a world in which both sexes suffer, what is there to admire, revere and respect in Woman's insistence that her suffering is special and uniquely entitled to cultural attentions, empathy, reparations, and her own special *-ism*?

How ironic that, under *feminine-ism*, respecting women enough to hold them accountable as empowered, autonomous adults and equal partners in the human system will be reframed as misogyny. What primarily stands in the way of respecting women? The Sisterhood itself, of course. But this should come as no surprise. Each sex is often its own worst enemy primarily responsible for creating its own gender issues and predicaments.

Only in recent times have the world of men and the world of women largely merged. In the more polarized past, the Love/Respect Dynamic played out in a more obvious way because gender polarity was exaggerated and perceptions fell in line. Women have always contributed more to intellect, competence, prestige; toughness strength, and courage than credited for. Likewise, men have contributed to beauty, grace, goodness; home, family, and parenting. But the exaggeration given gender polarity doesn't cause the reality of it to vanish. Each sex contributed its part in accord with The Deal. In playing their roles and adopting their personae, women *earned* more love (at the sacrifice of respect) and men *earned* more respect (at the sacrifice of love).

Picture a woman, she rocks back and forth heels to toes, her hands behind her back; curly hair tied with a bow, pretty bonnet, dainty hanky, frilly dress, angel-painted face, perfumed, high heels, parasol in one hand, smelling salts in the other. Would you send that floaty little angel being onto a battlefield? Now look again, would you put that sweet innocent in charge? Would you assign her to architect a cathedral? Would you have that wiggly giggly persona perform surgery? By creating a look and persona maximally incongruent with the horrors of killing fields, hard or hazardous labor, homelessness and imprisonment, Woman bought a large measure of exemption from the horrors of the brutal past at the cost of her perceived intellectual credibility and competence. It was her choice, and being smaller and weaker and the bearer-nurturer of children that was the choice she made.

So, there's nothing to begrudge. All this gender negativity, rancor and resentment, victim-mongering and entitlement to vengeance is based on gender *politics*, not gender *reality*. Woman gained extra safety, charity, leniency, empathy, insulation, because she *earned* it. It derived from biology and it was built into the role she played. She played her role well and humanity benefited. She wasn't gifted with anything for free. In the brutal past, any measure of extra safety was a *golden* commodity and to procure it for herself, Woman paid *dearly*. When someone pays for something, they're morally and ethically entitled to take possession of it. So, there's no sense begrudging Woman her exemptions from battlefields, hard-hazardous labor, and imprisonment, nor for the extra adoration, coddling, innocence, and protection she enjoyed. They were written into her contract. She fulfilled her end of that metaphysical contract and *earned* the rewards.

Meanwhile, Man gained extra prestige, leadership, credit, accomplishment, because he *earned* it. It derived from biology and it was built into the role he played. He played his role well; humanity benefited. He wasn't gifted with anything for free. Especially in the brutal past the costs associated with owning toughness, strength, and courage were *staggering*. When someone pays for something, they're morally and ethically entitled to take possession of it. So, there's no sense begrudging Man his rewards and privileges, nor for the extra reverence, fame, status, and importance he enjoyed. They were written into his contract. At *great cost*, he fulfilled his end of that metaphysical contract and *earned* the rewards.

I've read history textbooks stating flat out that men ought to be ashamed for hogging the historical importance. But neither sex need look back at their respective rewards and feel the least bit guilty about them. In suffering the vast majority of the dark side of human nature, including human brutality, Man earned his patriarchal triumphs. In suffering the support role, Woman earned her Glass Floor.⁹

9 The mirror-opposite of the Glass Ceiling, the Glass Floor is a kind partial insulation between women and the dark side of the world and human nature together with most of life on earth's most deeply filthy, brutal, arduous, hazardous, and corrupting realities. The Glass Floor tends to safeguard women from sinking to the extreme bottom (of homelessness, mineshafts, foxholes, prison cells, etc.).

In focusing in on the Respect-Axis (as feminism does), we must conclude that Woman suffered all things. In focusing in on the Love-Axis (as masculism does), we must conclude that Man suffered all things. In taking in both the Love- and the Respect-Axes, we may reasonably conclude that It All Balanced Out. Given their politicized perspectives and their political agendas, both sides of the gender-political divide covet the Victim Crown, but neither side is entitled to it. While The Deal has always been unfair to certain individuals (of both sexes) who didn't fit the binary; overall, The Deal was co-created and equitable. It was efficient (a top priority in a brutal world where the goal was survival) and out of The Deal, each sex got what it wanted most.

It is a perversion of the current gender *politics* that we now, retroactively and anachronistically, look back and decide that The Deal wasn't fair to one sex or the other. In judging The Deal unfair to women, we're motivated to renege on The Deal, but *only* where men have benefited from it. Steven E. Rhoads astutely observes, "As a result, one widely used history text gives more attention to Maria Mitchell, a nineteenth-century astronomer who discovered a comet, than to Albert Einstein; another has three pictures of Civil War nurses but none of General Sherman or General Grant."¹⁰ Political correctness demands that we speak of the brave men and women who died in the Civil War. Over 600,000 men, but less than 100 women, died fighting that war. There is no justice in taking from the men of the past the prestige those men *earned*.

Both feminism and masculism falsely fan the flames of inter-sex rage, rancor, resentment, victim and vengeance motives.¹¹ The fallout of which can be seen in vast damage to the social fabric, including diminishment of heterosexual love, marriage, and parenting leading to a severe lack of father energy, leading to a rise in every social pathology that concerns us most in the world today.

Obviously, the human world is going to be at its most healthy, functional, joyful, and vibrant when the sexes are at their most harmonious, complementary, and mutually inspiring.

10 Rhoads, Steven E., *Taking Sex Differences Seriously* (San Francisco: Encounter Books, 2004) p.40

11 When understood in terms of give and take, the gender-political inter-sex resentment becomes rather absurd. It's as if a man goes to the store, spends hard-earned money on a toaster oven. An observer then sees him walking home with his shopping bag, and mutters bitterly: "How come he rates a toaster oven? I don't have a toaster oven; what a jip!" Why is this observer-victim deprived of a toaster oven? Because she chose to buy a blender instead; each sex got what it paid for.

Conversely, the human world will be at its most pathological, dysfunctional, depressed, and enervated when the sexes are at each other's throats. This essay has concerned itself with the past, the future is for us to decide.

It's time to put an end to this self-righteous gender-political contest for the coveted title of MVP (Most Victimized and Powerless). Starting over from the premise that It All Balances Out between Woman and Man (and it always has), it's time to replace both feminism and masculism with equalism. In so doing, we view gender reality in terms of Male-Female equal partnership, and we view gender issues in terms of shared responsibility. Only then can we transition from a politics of gender complaint to a politics of inter-gender negotiation, unity, fairness and forgiveness.

REFERENCES

- Farrell, Warren. (1994) *The Myth of Male Power: Why Men are the Disposable Sex*. London, UK: Fourth Estate Limited.
- Rapunzel. (Oct 5, 2016) "Love is Respect." *Supporting Our Valued Adolescents: A place to learn, share your strength, be positive, and grow*. <https://20.122.100.97/educateyourself-love-is-respect/>
- Rhoads, Steven E. (2004). *Taking Sex Differences Seriously*. San Francisco: Encounter Books.

AUTHOR PROFILE



Tim Goldich is the president of the Chicago chapter of the National Coalition for Men and an avid member of the ManKind Project, two organizations that variously support men politically and emotionally. He is also an educator and mentor to boys on their way to becoming men. Goldich facilitates the personal growth work of men on New Warrior Training Adventure weekends and of men and women on personal growth weekends called Path to Spirit. He is the author of four books, including [Loving Men, Respecting Women: The Future of Gender Politics](#).

Contact details: tagoldich@hotmail.com
