

Primitive Male Urges Underlie Women Oppression

Michael Gurevitz

Department of Plant Molecular Biology and Ecology
George S. Wise Faculty of Life Sciences, Tel Aviv University
Ramat Aviv 69978, Tel Aviv, Israel

The self-esteem of human beings is top of the evolutionary pyramid in the Animal kingdom as corroborated by the developed brain, cognitive abilities, worldwide population and high-tech life standards. Yet, a number of remnant traits associated with the so called 'animal behavior' still occupy a considerable portion of our life. One of them is the current unbearable women oppression by men. Men control over women is most likely based on a primitive trait arising from differences in physical abilities, muscular larger bodies, and testosterone-supported aggression. While these factors were highly important at early times of our development, the discrimination of women was substantiated during the last several millennia with the strict rules of religions. Further contemplation indicates that this oppression is prominent mostly in non-developed tribes or populations with extreme religious regulations (e.g., Muslims; orthodox Jews; some Christians), and less in Western more developed civilizations or non-religious people. In such a reality, we may expect an increasing struggle of women for equality and rights, but quite amazingly, most oppressed women, especially those considered property of their husbands, justify publicly this disparity, while only minorities in Western countries strive for a change. To better understand the basis of such oppression and why hasn't it dissipated along the development of human civilization, the past and present benefits of this situation to both genders should be considered.

Due to their physical buildup and strength, human males functioned in the past as hunters and warriors protecting their territories and tribes, whereas the females were 'collectors' (worked in the field, searched for wild fruits, raised the children and cooked). As civilizations have developed and societies been established, the main life frame of humans remained the family, where control over the spouse or other family members (sometimes using violence) strengthened weak male personalities, their manhood, and Ego. This situation was supported by religious traditions, which distinguished between men and women and perpetuated the general superiority of males. Consequently, the distinction in education (men learned and advanced while women were restricted), in religious customs and services, and in economic opportunities and earning capabilities, has been almost eternalized. The organized life with control over women based on religious rules may have attracted eminent 'stars', who probably approached a boring, frustrated stage in life, leading them to convert to Islam (e.g., Cassius Clay-Mohammad Ali; Mike Tyson-Malik Abdul Aziz; Lew Alcindor-Karim Abdul Jabbar) or to orthodoxic Judaism (Uri Zohar; Marilyn Monroe; Alizabeth Taylor; Sammy Davis Jr.), or to more orthodoxic Christianity (e.g., Jenifer Aniston; Tom Hanks; Jim Belushi). These stars might have reached a breakpoint that required a change to strengthen their spirit and reach some 'Enlightenment', which they expected to find under the 'religious wings'. The most surprising

fact in this scenario was the selection of some black superstars in Islam, while ignoring the history of their ancestors sold to slavery by Arabic merchants.

The benefits to oppressed women included protection from enemies, routine food supply by their husbands, ample time for raising the children and no need to initiate frightening activities or ambitions (just obey the religious rules and husband commands). However, as modern times approached, more and more women have sought equality in daily life, in the right to vote, to compete with men on academic and public positions, and even take apart the familial conservative frame by raising children as singles or marry other females. The main obstacle in this initiative has always been the religious rules. For example, as long as the 'Sharia' rules are enforced in the Islamic world (see Taliban rules) women are convicted to religious rules and cannot obtain equal rights and opportunities, indeed a very sad primitive reality.

In contrast to the situation among humans, nature demonstrates other alternatives. One example is some mammalian herds that are led by an alpha couple (male and female; e.g., wolves, wild dogs). Only this couple mates and establishes the next generations, thus maintaining the best traits of strength, hunting and survival abilities. Another example is herds led by females (e.g., hyena and elephants), where body weight and power are not necessarily the most important factor, but the wisdom and experience. So, if we may ask why *homo sapiens*, the most developed mammalian species, maintains and often encourages the distinction between the genders while oppressing women rights, the best explanation would probably be that this primitive remnant trait enables even weak male personalities rule their family, while treating their spouses as property. Such relationship may increase their manhood and Ego, a far memory of their ancient times as hunters.

This upsetting reality raises movements (e.g., MeeToo) seeking a change in the present situation. Although success is still limited, the hope to increase the future influence of women over human life still persists, and may now be associated with a few challenging questions: Can women lead humanity rather than men? May we expect a better world, less aggressive, more peaceful under the international control of women? Can women deal better with human-made risks to planet Earth? Although these questions are still at the 'wishful thinking' zone, their accomplishment may improve the present unbearable situation. The first step towards such *Utopia* requires unification of women, at first nationally to take over and establish female-controlled governments, and then continue internationally with better rules, peaceful treaties, and new world order.