

Chapter 1 : Cultural Differences in Family Dynamics | Dimensions of Culture

Discussion of themes and motifs in John Cheever's The Country Husband. eNotes critical analyses help you gain a deeper understanding of The Country Husband so you can excel on your essay or test.

Until the s in the U. Marking a shift towards greater alignment of marriage with contractual principles of individualization, marriage law no longer imposes gender-specific obligations, it allows pre-nuptial property agreements, and it permits easier exit through no-fault divorce. But marriage remains at least in U. Proponents of the contractualization, or privatization, of marriage have argued that marriage should be brought further into line with the contractual paradigm. A default assumption for some liberals, as for libertarians, is that competent adults should be legally permitted to choose the terms of their interaction. In a society characterized by freedom of contract, restrictions on entry to or exit from marriage, or the content of its legal obligations, appear to be an illiberal anomaly. Full contractualization would imply that there should be no law of marriage at all—marriage officiation would be left to religions or private organizations, with the state enforcing whatever private contracts individuals make and otherwise not interfering Vanderheiden , Sunstein and Thaler , Chartier ; for a critique of contractualization, see Chambers The many legal implications of marriage for benefit entitlements, inheritance, taxation, and so on, can also be seen as a form of state interference in private choice. By conferring these benefits, as well as merely recognizing marriage as a legal status, the state encourages the relationships thereby formalized Waldron 89, In the absence of such justification, providing benefits through marriage may treat the unmarried unjustly, as their exclusion from such benefits would then be arbitrary Card Thus, there is an onus to provide a rationale justifying such resource allocations and legal discrimination on the basis of marriage, as well as for restricting marriage in ways that other contracts are not restricted. Before exploring some common rationales, it is worth noting that critics of the social contract model of the state and of freedom of contract have used the example of marriage against contractual principles. First, Marxists have argued that freedom of contract is compatible with exploitation and oppression—and Marxist feminists have taken marriage as a special example, arguing against contractualizing it on these grounds Pateman , Such points, as we will see, suggest the need for rules governing property division on divorce. Second, communitarians have argued that contractual relations are inferior to those characterized by trust and affection—again, using marriage as a special example Sandel , 3135, cf. This objection applies not only to contractualizing marriage, but more generally, to treating it as a case for application of principles of justice: The next section will examine gender restrictions on entry; this section will examine reasons for recognizing marriage in law at all, allocating resources to it, and constraining property division on divorce. A first reason for recognizing marriage should be set aside. This is that the monogamous heterosexual family unit is a natural, pre-political structure which the state must respect in the form in which it finds it Morse ; cf. But, whatever the natural reproductive unit may be, marriage law, as legislation, is constrained by principles of justice constraining legislation. Within most contemporary political philosophy, the naturalness of a given practice is irrelevant; indeed, in no area other than the family is it proposed that law should follow nature with the possible exception of laws regarding suicide. Finally, such objections must answer to feminist concerns that excluding the family unit from principles of justice, allowing natural affection to regulate it, has facilitated inequality and abuse within it see section 5. Let us then begin with the question of why marriage should be recognized in law at all. A second is that legal recognition is necessary to maintain and protect social support for the institution, a valuable form of life which would otherwise erode Raz , 3; Scruton , ; see discussion in Waldron But this prompts the question as to why this form of life is valuable. It is sometimes argued that traditions, having stood the test of time, have proved their value. Not only is marriage itself such a tradition, but through its child-rearing role it can pass on other traditions Sommers , Scruton , , cf. Devlin , Chapter 4. But many marital traditions—coverture, gender-structured legal duties, marital rape exemptions, inter-racial marriage bans—have been unjust. Tradition provides at best a prima facie reason for legislation which may be overridden by considerations of justice. Further, in a diverse society, there are many competing traditions, amongst which this rationale fails to

choose Garrett An account of the value of a particular form of marriage itself and not just qua tradition is needed. One thought is that monogamous marriage encourages the sexual self-control needed for health and happiness; another is that it encourages the goods of love and intimacy found in committed relationships. State support for monogamous marriage, by providing incentives to enter marital commitments, thus helps people lead better lives e. However, this approach faces objections. First, the explanation in terms of emotional goods underdetermines the institution to be supported: Second, claims about the value of sexual self-control are controversial; objectors might argue that polygamy, polyamory, or promiscuity are equally good options see 5. There is a further problem with this justification, which speaks to a division within liberal thought. Some liberals embrace neutrality, the view that the state should not base law on controversial judgments about what constitutes valuable living. To such neutral liberals, this class of rationales, which appeal to controversial value judgments about sex and love, must be excluded Rawls , Some theorists have sought to develop rationales consistent with political liberalism, arguing, for instance, that the intimate dyadic marital relationship protects autonomy Bennett , or that marriage could be justified by its role in protecting caring relationships Brake , caregivers and children Hartley and Watson ; see also May , Wedgwood It is widely accepted that the state should protect children. One benefit of two-parent families is economic: The second benefit is emotional: Moreover, some argue that gender complementarity in parenting benefits children; but empirical evidence does not seem to support this [Lee , Nussbaum ,]. One objection is that marriage is an ineffective child anti-poverty plan. For one thing, this account assumes that incentives to marry will lead a significant number of parents who would not otherwise have married to marry. But marriage and child-rearing have increasingly diverged despite incentives to marry. Second, this approach does not address the many children outside marriages and in poor two-parent families. Child poverty could be addressed more efficiently through direct anti-child-poverty programs rather than the indirect strategy of marriage Cave ; Vanderheiden ; Young Moreover, there is controversy over the psychological effects of single parenthood, particularly over the causality underlying certain correlations: Young Indeed, some authors have recently argued that children might be better protected by legally separating marriage from parenting: A related, but distinct, line of thought invokes the alleged psychological effects of two-parent families to argue that marriage benefits society by promoting good citizenship and state stability Galston , “ This depends on the empirical case as we have seen, a contested one that children of single parents face psychological and economic hurdles which threaten their capacity to acquire the virtues of citizenship. Finally, a rationale for restricting the terms of exit from marriage but not for supporting it as a form of life is the protection of women and children following divorce. Women in gender-structured marriages, particularly if they have children, tend to become economically vulnerable. Statistically, married women are more likely than their husbands to work in less well-paid part-time work, or to give up paid work entirely, especially to meet the demands of child-rearing. Thus, following divorce, women are likely to have a reduced standard of living, even to enter poverty. Because these patterns of choice within marriages lead to inequalities between men and women, property division on divorce is a matter of equality or equal opportunity, and so a just law of divorce is essential to gender justice Okin , Chapters 7 and 8; Rawls , “; Shanley , “30; Waldron , and see 5. However, it can still be asked why a law recognizing marriage as such should be necessary, as opposed to default rules governing property distribution when such gender-structured relationships end Sunstein and Thaler Indeed, placing these restrictions only on marriage, as opposed to enacting general default rules, may make marriage less attractive, especially to men, and hence be counter-productive, leaving women more vulnerable. The preceding two rationales are both weakened by the diminished social role of marriage; changing legal and social norms undermine its effectiveness as a policy tool. Moreover, cohabitation and child-rearing increasingly take place outside marriage. Given such significant changes, marriage is at best an indirect strategy for achieving goals such as protecting women or children Cave , Sunstein and Thaler , Vanderheiden Some theorists have argued, in the absence of a compelling rationale for marriage law, for abolishing marriage altogether, replacing it with civil unions or domestic partnerships. This line of thought will be taken up in 4. The compromise proposal grants some of the benefits of marriage without ceding the title or indeed, as usually proposed, all the benefits of marriage to same-sex couples. This position does not fully answer arguments for same-sex marriage. Many

arguments for same-sex marriage invoke liberal principles of justice such as equal treatment, equal opportunity, and neutrality. Same-sex relationships are relevantly similar to heterosexual relationships recognized as marriages, yet the state denies gays and lesbians access to the benefits of marriage, hence treating them unequally Mohr , Rajczi , Williams Further, arguments in support of such discrimination seem to depend on controversial moral claims regarding homosexuality of the sort excluded by neutrality Wellington , Schaff , Wedgwood To see why a two-tier solution fails to address these arguments, we must consider what benefits marriage provides. There are tangible benefits such as eligibility for health insurance and pensions, privacy rights, immigration eligibility, and hospital visiting rights see Mohr , Chapter 3. Crucially, however, there is also an important benefit of legal, and indirectly social, recognition of a relationship as marriage. The status of marriage itself confers legitimacy and invokes social support. The two-tier system does not provide equal treatment because it does not confer on same-sex relationships the status associated with marriage. Marriage is central to concepts of good citizenship, and so exclusion from it displaces gays and lesbians from full and equal citizenship: Stivers and Valls ; for a comprehensive survey of these issues, see Macedo However, if marriage is essentially heterosexual, excluding same-sex couples is not unequal treatment; same-sex relationships simply do not qualify as marriages. One case for the essential heterosexuality of marriage invokes linguistic definition: But this confuses meaning and reference. Past applications of a term need not yield necessary and sufficient criteria for applying it: As noted above, appeal to past definition begs the question of what the legal definition should be Stivers and Valls A normative argument for the essential heterosexuality of marriage appeals to its purpose: But marriage does not require that spouses be able to procreate naturally, or that they intend to do so at all. Nor do proponents of this objection to same-sex marriage generally suggest that entry to marriage should be restricted by excluding those unable to procreate without third-party assistance, or not intending to do so. Indeed, as the existence of intentionally childless married couples suggests, marriage has purposes other than child-rearing—namely, fostering a committed relationship Mohr , Wellington , Wedgwood This point suggests a second defense of same-sex marriage: As noted above, such rationales come into tension with liberal neutrality; further controversy regarding them will be discussed below 5. Some arguments against same-sex marriage invoke a precautionary principle urging that changes which might affect child welfare be made with extreme caution. But in light of the data available, Murphy argues that the precautionary principle has been met with regard to harm to children. On his view, parenting is a basic civil right, the restriction of which requires the threat of a certain amount of harm. But social science literature shows that children are neither typically nor catastrophically harmed by same-sex parenting. Even if two biological parents statistically provide the optimal parenting situation, optimality is too high a standard for permitting parenting. This can be seen if an optimality condition is imagined for other factors, such as education or wealth Murphy A third objection made to same-sex marriage is that its proponents have no principled reason to oppose legally recognizing polygamy e. Finnis ; see Corvino One response differentiates the two by citing harmful effects and unequal status for women found in male-headed polygyny, but not in same-sex marriage e. Wedgwood , Crookston , de Marneffe , Macedo

Chapter 2 : John Steinbeck's "The Chrysanthemums": A Woman Bound By Society

The Country Wife is a Restoration comedy, that is, an English theatrical comedy written during the period , when theatrical performances resumed in London following their year spell of illegality under the reign of the Puritan Commonwealth. As a genre, Restoration comedy is notable for.

Despite believing in Gods, Lucretius, like Epicurus , felt that religion was born of fear and ignorance, and that understanding the natural world would free people of its shackles. Voltaire complained about Jews killed by other Jews for worshiping a golden calf and similar actions, he also condemned how Christians killed other Christians over religious differences and how Christians killed Native Americans for not being baptised. Voltaire claimed the real reason for these killings was that Christians wanted to plunder the wealth of those killed. Voltaire was also critical of Muslim intolerance. Hume claimed that natural explanations for the order in the universe were reasonable, see design argument. Their books and articles have spawned debate in multiple fields of inquiry and are heavily quoted in popular media online forums, YouTube , television and popular philosophy. In *The End of Faith* , philosopher Sam Harris focuses on violence among other toxic qualities of religion. In *Breaking the Spell* , philosopher Daniel Dennett focuses on the question of "why we believe strange things". In *The God Delusion* , biologist Richard Dawkins covers almost every facet of religion injecting both snarky irony and humor. In *God Is Not Great* , journalist and polemicist Christopher Hitchens focused on how religious forces attacks human dignity and the corruption of religious organizations. In the *Oxford Handbook of Atheism*, according to Thomas Zenc the four books were published during a time of intense debate on political, religious and sociological questions. The works share many common themes yet notably differ in scope, style and content. While according to Zenc the beginnings of a broader narrative New Atheism seems to have emerged it does not, stand up to the full definition of a movement. Religion and Definition of religion Today, religion is broadly conceived as an abstraction which entails beliefs, doctrines and sacred places"even though the ancient and medieval cultures that produced religious texts , like the Bible or the Quran , did not have such conceptions or ideas in their languages, cultures, or histories. Religion as a modern Western concept developed from the 17th century onwards. Criticism of religious concepts[edit] See also: However, we feel that religion even in moderation provides a foundation for fanatical groups to thrive" [20] Some criticisms of monotheistic religions have been: Religion is wrong as it is in conflict with science i. Genesis creation myth [21] Conflicting claims about the one true faith also see argument from inconsistent revelations. Development of religion Dennett and Harris have asserted that theist religions and their scriptures are not divinely inspired, but man made to fulfill social , biological and political needs. Narratives to provide comfort and meaning[edit] David Hume argued that religion developed as a source of comfort in the face of the adversity, not as an honest grappling with verifiable truth. Religion is therefore an unsophisticated form of reasoning. As such, they may have served several important functions in ancient societies. Examples include the views many religions traditionally had towards solar and lunar eclipses and the appearance of comets forms of astrology. Religion is the sigh of the oppressed creature, the heart of a heartless world, and the soul of soulless conditions. It is the opium of the people. It is in the interest of the ruling classes to instill in the masses the religious conviction that their current suffering will lead to eventual happiness. In this perspective, Marx saw religion as escapism. Original sin, he argued, convinces people that the source of their misery lies in the inherent and unchangeable "sinfulness" of humanity rather than in the forms of social organization and institutions, which Marx argued can be changed through the application of collective social planning. They conclude that people with such disorders have had a monumental influence on civilization. Pickover found evidence suggesting that temporal lobe epilepsy may be linked to a variety of so-called spiritual or "other worldly" experiences, such as spiritual possession , originating from altered electrical activity in the brain. Science as a Candle in the Dark , presented his case for the miraculous sightings of religious figures and modern sightings of UFOs coming from the same mental disorder. Psilocybin from mushrooms affect regions of the brain including the serotonergic system, which generating a sense of strong religious meaning, unity and ecstasy. Certain physical rituals may generate similar feelings. Ridgway,

Philosopher Auguste Comte posited that many societal constructs pass through three stages and that religion corresponds to the two earlier, or more primitive stages by stating: The law is this: Exorcism and Faith healing

A detailed study in found instances of deaths of children due to religion-based medical neglect. Jerusalem syndrome Jerusalem has loaned its name to a unique psychological phenomenon where Jewish or Christian individuals who develop obsessive religious themed ideas or delusions sometimes believing themselves to be Jesus Christ or another prophet will feel compelled to travel to Jerusalem. Of these, were admitted to hospital. On average, such tourists have been seen annually, 40 of them requiring admission to hospital. About 2 million tourists visit Jerusalem each year. Kalian and Witztum note that as a proportion of the total numbers of tourists visiting the city, this is not significantly different from any other city. Honor killings and stoning Honor killings once well known in the Western are now extremely rare however they still occur in other parts of the world. An honor is when a person is killed by family for bringing dishonor or shame upon the family. As of September , stoning is a punishment that is included in the laws in some countries including Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Yemen, the United Arab Emirates, and some states in Nigeria [67] as punishment for zina al-mohsena "adultery of married persons". In , the Iranian judiciary officially placed a moratorium on stoning. Though no first tier religious texts prescribe the practice, some practitioners do believe there is religious support for it. While it is mostly found in Muslim countries it is also practiced by some Christian and Animist countries mostly in Africa. GFA is not widely practiced in some Muslim countries making it difficult to separate religion from culture. Some religious leaders promote it, some consider it irrelevant to religion, and others contribute to its elimination". The practice is illegal in all Western countries and it is also illegal to transport a girl to another country to carry out FGM. Multiple parents have been charged for committing this crime in the United Kingdom with those charged being exclusively from Muslim countries. As such, some have argued that failure to circumcise a baby boy may be unethical because it diminishes his right to good health. Surveys suggest a strong link between faith and altruism. A cross-national investigation on subjective well-being has noted that, globally, religious people are usually happier than nonreligious people, though nonreligious people also reach high levels of happiness. Despite honor killings occurring in multiple cultures and religions Islam is frequently blamed for their institution and persistence. Steven Weinberg , for example, states it takes religion to make good people do evil. Results can vary from mild discrimination to outright genocide. During the 19th century, the conflict thesis developed. According to this model, any interaction between religion and science must inevitably lead to open hostility, with religion usually taking the part of the aggressor against new scientific ideas. In addition, some historians contend that religious organizations figure prominently in the broader histories of many sciences, with many of the scientific minds until the professionalization of scientific enterprise in the 19th century being clergy and other religious thinkers. Recent examples of tensions have been the creation-evolution controversy , controversies over the use of birth control , opposition to research into embryonic stem cells , or theological objections to vaccination , anesthesia and blood transfusion.

Chapter 3 : Alexander Hamilton - HISTORY

The Country Husband Essay essays America, a nation distinguished by its prosperity and success, is filled with homes whose facades reflect these characteristics--houses composed of nicely trimmed lawns, the family Volkswagen parked on the driveway, friendly neighbors similar to every other family, an.

Translate this page from English Print Page Change Text Size: Critical Thinking Across the Disciplines, Winter, Some of the discussion is, in my view, superficial and misleading. In this paper, I shall focus on the problems inherent in the manner in which the idea of emotional intelligence is being conceptualized and presented. The main questions I am concerned with are: Does it make sense to speak of emotions as being intelligent or not? If so, is there such a thing as "emotional intelligence? I shall argue that it does make sense to speak of emotions as being, in some given context or other, "intelligent" or not, and, consequently, that it does make sense to speak of emotional intelligence. Once some preliminary distinctions are set out, I will focus on a conceptualization of the mind, its functions, and primary motivators, including a brief analysis of the relationship between thoughts, emotions and desires. I will then develop a critical analysis of the primary theoretical views of Goleman. Some Preliminary Distinctions What is intelligence? What is emotion or feeling? Given these understandings, how might "emotional intelligence" be provisionally conceptualized? Most simply, emotional intelligence can reasonably be conceived as a measure of the degree to which a person successfully or unsuccessfully applies sound judgment and reasoning to situations in the process of determining emotional or feeling responses to those situations. It would entail, then, the bringing of cognitive intelligence to bear upon emotions. It would encompass both positive and negative emotions. It would be a measure of the extent to which our affective responses were "rationally" based. A person with a high degree of emotional intelligence would be one who responded to situations with feeling states that "made good sense," given what was going on in those situations. Appropriately generated feeling states would serve as a motivation to pursue reasonable behavior or action. Emerging naturally out of "rational" emotions would be "rational" desires and "rational" behavior. Now let us consider how critical thinking fits into this picture. What is critical thinking and how might it relate to "the bringing of intelligence to bear on emotions? Therefore I am likely to attack or flee. More on this point later. I shall argue that critical thinking cannot successfully direct our beliefs and actions unless it continually assesses not simply our cognitive abilities, but also our feeling or emotion states, as well as our implicit and explicit drives and agendas. I shall argue, in other words, that critical thinking provides the crucial link between intelligence and emotions in the "emotionally intelligent" person. Critical thinking, I believe, is the only plausible vehicle by means of which we could bring intelligence to bear upon our emotional life. It is critical thinking I shall argue, and critical thinking alone, which enables us to take active command of not only our thoughts, but our feelings, emotions, and desires as well. It is critical thinking which provides us with the mental tools needed to explicitly understand how reasoning works, and how those tools can be used to take command of what we think, feel, desire, and do. Through critical thinking, as I understand it, we acquire a means of assessing and upgrading our ability to judge well. It enables us to go into virtually any situation and to figure out the logic of whatever is happening in that situation. It provides a way for us to learn from new experiences through the process of continual self-assessment. Critical thinking, then, enables us to form sound beliefs and judgments, and in doing so, provides us with a basis for a "rational and reasonable" emotional life. When searching for the ingredients necessary for a highly rational life, it is therefore crucial not to underestimate the role of the affective dimension of mind. To engage in high quality reasoning, one must have not only the cognitive ability to do so, but the drive to do so as well. One must feel the importance of doing so, and thus be driven to acquire command of the art of high quality reasoning. What is more, it is evident that to learn to solve problems effectively, one must have the desire to do so. One must be committed to it. Thus the affective dimension, comprised of feelings and volition, is a necessary condition and component of high quality reasoning and problem solving. Every "defect" in emotion and drive creates a "defect" in thought and reason. Intelligence on this view, then, presupposes and requires command of the affective dimension of mind. In short, the truly

intelligent person is not a disembodied intellect functioning in an emotional wasteland, but a deeply committed mindful person, full of passion and high values, engaged in effective reasoning, sound judgment, and wise conduct. A Practical Theory of Mind Given these foundational understandings, I will now provide a brief outline of my understanding of the mind and its functions. Before I do so, I want to point out that this theory of mind, as I conceive it, is an intellectual one, serving an intellectual agenda, and is not intended to compete with a psychological theory of mind serving a psychological agenda or with any other theory of mind serving some alternative agenda. I am ultimately concerned with developing a theory of mind that enables "ordinary" persons to effectively take charge of their thinking, intellectually speaking, and by that means to take charge of the quality of their lives. The human mind, as I understand it, is comprised, at minimum, of three basic functions: The cognitive component of the mind includes mental actions we traditionally link with "thinking" such as analyzing, comparing, assuming, inferring, questioning, contrasting, evaluating, etc. The cognitive function is concerned with conceptualizing, reasoning, and figuring things out. The feeling or emotional function is that part of the mind which is our internal monitor, which informs us of how we are doing in any given situation or set of circumstances. It is our gauge for telling us whether we are doing well or poorly. Because we are emotionally complex, humans experience a broad array of emotions from happiness to sadness, from enthusiasm to depression, from joy to sorrow, from satisfaction to frustration, and so on. The third function of the mind, our ultimate driving force, is the formation of volition or will. Within this function lie our agendas, purposes, goals, values, desires, drives, motivations and commitments. As our driving force, desires, volition, and play a key role in determining our behavior. These three basic mental functions, albeit theoretically distinct, operate in a dynamic relationship to each other, ever influencing one another in mutual and reciprocal ways. Thus, although they serve different roles, they are concomitant. They function so intimately in our experience that it is only theoretically that we can regard them distinctively. Wherever there is thinking, some related drive and feeling exist. Wherever there is feeling, some related thinking and drive can be found. Wherever there is drive, thinking and feeling are present in some form. Despite the fact that cognition, feeling and volition are equally important functions of the mind, it is cognition, or thinking, which is the key to the other two. If we want to change a feeling, we must identify the thinking that ultimately leads to the feeling. If we want to change a desire, again it is the thinking underlying the drive that must be identified and altered--if our behavior is to alter. It is our thinking that, in the last analysis, leads us toward or away from some action, and in the last analysis sets us up for some given emotional evaluation of the situation. For example, if I THINK that the class structure I have designed for my students will enable them to thoroughly grasp the key concepts in the course, I will then experience an emotional evaluation of some kind when I try the structure out on my students. Such motivation is based on my THINKING that classroom structures can always be improved and that to develop as a teacher involves continually reevaluating my class plans. Two Contrary Tendencies of the Human Mind While the human mind inherently includes cognition, feelings, and drives as basic inter-influencing functions, the triad itself can be under the sway of two contrary tendencies of the human mind, the tendency of the mind to gravitate toward egocentrism, or the tendency of the mind to take into account a more comprehensive, and more "rational" view. What do I mean by this? Every human being enters the world with an initial motivation to have its way and to get what it wants, and thus "naturally" sees the world as designed to cater to its desires. This fact is apparent when we observe the behavior of young children. These methods can be quite sophisticated, but are often still fundamentally egocentric or self-serving. Throughout our lives, our own desires and narrow interests are typically in the foreground of our thinking. As we mature, we learn multiple ways to manipulate others, to influence or control others to get what we want. We even learn how to deceive ourselves as to the egocentrism of our behavior. We have no difficulty coming to conceptualize ourselves as fair-minded, empathetic, kind, generous, thoughtful, and considerate, as concerned, in short, with other persons. We recognize that it is socially unacceptable to be blatantly egocentric. Nevertheless, that outward appearance of concern for others is often just that, an outward posture that enables us to think well of ourselves as we, in fact, pursue narrow selfish interests. Nevertheless, however egocentric we may in fact become, we have, in addition, a capacity to go beyond it. For example, we unfailingly recognize the destructiveness of the egocentrism of others when in their selfish pursuits they

violate our rights or needs. We can all therefore conceive of the considerate, the fair-minded, the "rational" person. We all approve of non-egocentric thinking in others. The result is a kind of dualism in us: These two sides each can have a role in influencing our thoughts, feelings, and desires. What is more, because we become facile self-deceivers, it is often not clear to us when we are acting in an egocentric manner. Think of the husband who controls his wife through threat of physical force, and who deceives himself into believing that such physical punishment is "for her own good. All of these are examples of egocentric thinking, thinking which is fundamentally driven by our selfish, self-validating desires. In the pursuit of self-preservation and self-interest, egocentric thinking has certain identifiable hallmarks. It is often marked by rigid, inflexible habits of thought. Moreover, seeing the world in a self-serving way, it routinely distorts information and ignores relevant information when working through a problem or issue. In other words it relates to the world according to an inherently self-validating structure, recognizing that which it wants to recognize and ignoring that which it finds "uncomfortable. Emotions that are commonly egocentric include defensiveness, irritability, arrogance, anger, apathy, indifference, alienation, resentment, and depression. Of course, to determine whether a particular emotion is irrational or rational, one must look closely at the thinking that ultimately drives that emotion, not at the emotion in-and-of itself.

Tendencies Toward Rationality Although we often approach the world through irrational, egocentric tendencies, we are also capable, as I have suggested, of developing a "higher" sense of identity. We are capable of becoming non-egocentric people, both intellectually and "morally. Moral concepts, in turn, exist, only because of the human capacity to conceive of responsibilities that by their very nature presuppose a transcendence of a narrow moral egocentrism. At a minimum, then, I envision the human mind as utilizing its three basic functions thought, feeling, and desire as tools of either egocentric or non-egocentric tendencies, both intellectually and morally. If I am correct, then, the human mind is easily "split" into contrary drives. However, the contrary drives that exist in people are not best understood as social stereotype often has it, between the "emotional" and the "intellectual.

Chapter 4 : Lamb to the Slaughter Summary & Analysis from LitCharts | The creators of SparkNotes

Marriage exists to bring a man and a woman together as husband and wife to be father and mother to any children their union produces.

Summary Analysis The scene is warm and cozy. There are two lamps, two chairs, and two glasses on the table, and drinks and fresh ice ready to be mixed. Mary Maloney is at home alone, sitting across from an empty chair and waiting for her husband to return from work. She is described in bodily terms “in terms of her body: Active Themes Related Quotes with Explanations When her husband arrives home, Mary greets him with a kiss and an endearment, hangs his coat up for him, and prepares drinks for them both, a strong one for him and a weaker one for herself, before returning to her sewing as he sits down with his whiskey. Mary fulfills the roles of caregiver and domestic servant through these loving gestures. The fact that Patrick does not reciprocate them highlights the power imbalance of their relationship, which also manifests in the way she prepares their drinks. The power imbalance between Mary and her husband is further skewed by her view of him as almost godlike. Contrary to their usual ritual, the husband downs half his glass in one swallow and goes to get more, ordering Mary to sit down when she tries to help him. When he returns, his glass has even more whiskey than before. Mary tries to sympathize with the difficulty of his job as a detective, but he ignores her. The husband reinforces his patriarchal power by giving Mary orders and refusing to acknowledge her efforts as his emotional caregiver. Active Themes Mary repeatedly asks her husband if he would like something to eat, offering suggestions and insisting that he eat. He refuses every time, telling her again to sit down when she gets up to fetch the food. While he stares down at his now empty glass, Mary waits nervously and scrutinizes him as he prepares to tell her something. Active Themes Related Quotes with Explanations Mary, shocked and unwilling to believe what her husband has told her, decides to act as if nothing has happened. Absently, she goes down to the cellar and grabs a frozen leg of lamb for dinner. When she returns, her husband tells her not to bother, as he is leaving. Her husband, however, rejects both her meal and her. Active Themes Without warning, Mary walks up to her husband and bashes the back of his head with the frozen leg of lamb, which the narrator notes is as effective as a steel club. Mary carries out her own sudden betrayal by killing her husband here. Active Themes Related Quotes with Explanations The noise brings Mary out of shock as she recognizes that her husband is dead. Unsure of the consequences for her baby, she resolves to cover up the crime. However, her resolution to survive suggests that her concern for her child exceeds her concern for herself and her marriage. Active Themes Related Quotes with Explanations To do so, Mary puts the murder weapon, the leg of lamb, into the oven and lets it cook. She then washes her hands, fixes her appearance, and practices speaking to and smiling at an imaginary Sam the local grocer, trying to appear as normal as possible. By cooking the leg of lamb for supper, Mary destroys the evidence of her crime. Unlike the murder, which she commits without fully realizing her actions, the cover-up is clearly premeditated. She also refers to her husband by name for the first time in the story. Still crying, Mary tells them that she went out to the grocer and came back to find him dead. More policemen, a doctor, a photographer, and a fingerprint expert arrive, asking Mary questions but also treating her kindly. One of the detectives goes out and confirms her story with Sam. Cleverly incorporating kernels of truth into her story, Mary is able to deceive the police, who fail to suspect her as the real culprit. Mary refuses, and the policemen allow her to stay while they search for more evidence. Whereas Mary had put so much energy into pleasing her husband, only to be rejected, now it is Mary who is refusing the efforts of the policemen who attempt to comfort her. He says that the murder weapon was probably a heavy piece of metal, and they are still searching for the weapon, which is crucial to catching the murderer: Noonan reinforces this gender stereotype by assuming that the murderer is a man. Active Themes Related Quotes with Explanations After nearly three hours of searching, the four remaining policemen have had no success finding the weapon. It is late, and they are now tired, frustrated, and hungry. Mary asks Sergeant Jack Noonan for a drink, and he complies, pouring her a glass of whiskey. The rest of the men are also persuaded to have a drink, and though they are uncomfortable, they try to console Mary. Whereas during her marriage, Mary had to fetch drinks for her husband, now the policemen fetch drinks for her.

Whereas Mary had attempted to provide emotional support for Patrick, with no success or reciprocation, now it is the policemen who attempt the same for her. Mary utilizes this new power by persuading the men to drink on the job, subtly undermining their credibility and objectivity. Active Themes Sergeant Noonan notices that the lamb is still in the oven and offers to turn it off for her. After some hesitation, the men agree and go into the kitchen to eat the lamb. Mary exercises her power by asking a favor of the men. However, contrary to her claims, the lamb is not a reward for their friendship with Patrick, but rather a betrayal of both Patrick and their profession, leading to the ironic twist of the story. By eating the lamb, the men destroy the evidence of the murder. Retrieved November 11,

Chapter 5 : FACT CHECK: Did Dianne Feinstein Get Her Husband's Company a USPS Contract?

The Country Wife Questions and Answers. The Question and Answer section for The Country Wife is a great resource to ask questions, find answers, and discuss the novel.

William Wycherley in *After* the year Puritan stage ban was lifted at the Restoration of the monarchy in 1660, the theatrical life of London recreated itself quickly and abundantly. Reflecting the atmosphere of the Court, these plays celebrate a lifestyle of sensual intrigue and conquest, especially conquest that served to humiliate the husbands of the London middle classes and to avenge, in the sensual arena, the marginalisation and exile suffered by royalists under Cromwell. Wycherley had no title or wealth, but had by already recommended himself by two well-received comedies and had been admitted to the inner circle, sharing the conversation and sometimes the mistresses of Charles, who "was extremely fond of him upon account of his wit". However, in contrast to the French, English audiences of the 1660s had no enthusiasm for structurally simple comedies or for the neoclassical unities of time, place, and action, but demanded fast pace, many complications, and above all "variety". To achieve the much denser texture and more complex plotting that pleased in London, Wycherley would combine several source plays to produce bustling action and clashing moods, ranging from farce through paradox to satire. A Restoration novelty of which Wycherley took advantage was the readiness of public opinion to accept women on stage, for the first time in British history. Audiences were fascinated to see real women reverse the cross-dressing of the Elizabethan boy actors and appear in tight-fitting male outfits in the popular breeches roles, and to hear them match or even outdo the rake heroes in repartee and double entendre. The separate plots are interlinked but distinct, each projecting a sharply different mood. The trick, to pretend impotence to be allowed where no complete man may go, is distantly based on the classic Roman comedy *Eunuchus* by Terence. The upper-class town rake Harry Horner begins a campaign for seducing as many respectable ladies as possible and thus cuckolding or "putting horns on" their husbands: He spreads a false rumour of his own impotence, to convince married men that he can safely be allowed to socialise with their wives. The rumour is also meant to assist his mass seduction campaign by helping him identify women who are secretly eager for extramarital sex, because those women will react to a supposedly impotent man with tell-tale horror and disgust. Three such ladies appear on stage, usually together: A final hair-raising threat of exposure comes in the last scene, through the well-meaning frankness of the young country wife Margery Pinchwife. Margery is indignant at the accusations of impotence directed at "poor dear Mr. Horner", which she knows from personal experience to be untrue, and is intent on saying so at the traditional end-of-the-play public gathering of the entire cast. In a final trickster masterpiece, Horner averts the danger, joining forces with his more sophisticated lovers to persuade the jealous Pinchwife to at least pretend to believe Horner impotent and his own wife still innocent. Horner never becomes a reformed character but is assumed to go on reaping the fruits of his planted misinformation, past the last act and beyond. Pinchwife is a middle-aged man who has married a naive country girl in the hope that she will not know to cuckold him. However, Horner teaches her, and Margery cuts a swath through the complexities of London upper-class marriage and seduction without even noticing them. Restoration comedies often contrast town and country for humorous effect, and this is one example of it. The courtship of Harcourt and Alithea is a conventional love story without any direct source. The delay mechanism of this story is that the upright Alithea holds fast virtuously to her engagement to Sparkish, even while his stupid and cynical character unfolds to her. It is only after Alithea has been caught in a misleadingly compromising situation with Horner, and Sparkish has doubted her virtue while Harcourt has not, that she finally admits her love for Harcourt. Wikiquote has quotations related to: *The Country Wife* Notorious scenes in the play include "the china scene", a sustained double entendre dialogue mostly heard from off stage, where Horner is purportedly discussing his china collection with two of his lady friends. The husband of Lady Fidget and the grandmother of Mrs. Squeamish are listening front stage and nodding in approval, failing to pick up the double meaning which is obvious to the audience. Lady Fidget has already explained to her husband that Horner "knows china very well, and has himself very good, but will not let me see it lest I should beg some. But I will find it out, and have what I came for yet" IV. Dialogue such as this

made "china" a dirty word in common conversation, Wycherley later claimed. But they quickly realise they have no choice but to keep the scandalous secret: Themes and analysis[edit] The dynamics of marriage[edit] People marry for the sake of outward appearances, for example Alithea feels that she has no choice but to marry Sparkish because her status in society expects her to. Wives are treated as property as made evident by Pinchwife who locks Margery in her room and forbids her from speaking to men. Furthermore, there is a struggle for dominance between men and women. Only the women are expected to remain faithful to their husbands. Horner seems to believe he is in a position of power over the women because their extramarital affair is with him, but his power wanes during the duration of the play. He shows his dominance over the men he cuckolds. This luxurious playhouse, designed by Christopher Wren and with room for 2, spectators, had opened only the year before. At the outset of his high-profile career as comedian and song-and-dance man, young Haines already had a reputation for eccentricity and dominant stage presence, suggesting that Sparkish is not merely a comic butt for the truewits Horner, Harcourt, and Dorilant to mock, but also a real threat to the romance of Harcourt and Alithea. Edward Kynaston played female roles in the s. Pinchwife was played by the elderly Michael Mohun , who was best known for playing menacing villains, such as Volpone and Iago. Pinchwife was Elizabeth Boutell or Bowtel, a young actress who had "a childish look. This casting suggests that Sir Jasper was played as a straightforwardly comic part, while Pinchwife would be "alarming as well as funny". The beautiful androgynous Kynaston, probably in his early thirties, was a different kind of hero. John Harold Wilson argues that the famously virile stage presence of Hart as Horner must be taken into account when interpreting the play. As personified by Hart, Horner will have won women not so much through clever trickery as "the old-fashioned way", by being "dangerously attractive", and it is only fools like Sir Jasper Fidget who really believe him harmless. The actresses associated with each hero must also have tended to make the Horner plot more striking on the stage than the true-love plot. By contrast, the choice of the bit-part actress Elizabeth James as Alithea would have de-emphasised the Harcourt-Alithea plot. The Country Wife did in fact survive the complaints to become a dependable repertory play from till the mids, but by then public taste had changed too much to put up with the sex jokes any longer. Its last eighteenth century performance in was followed by a hiatus of years, until the successful Phoenix Society production in at the Regent Theatre in London. This play was very popular, going through at least twenty editions, reaching the New York stage in , and surviving in both London and New York into the twentieth century. The movie Shampoo , with Warren Beatty as the Horner character, is a somewhat distant version of The Country Wife after exactly years, reportedly inspired by the Chichester Festival production of From its creation until the midth century, The Country Wife was subject to both aesthetic praise and moral outrage. Many critics through the centuries have acknowledged its linguistic energy and wit, including even Victorians such as Leigh Hunt , who praised its literary quality in a selection of Restoration plays that he published in itself a daring undertaking, for reputedly "obscene" plays that had been long out of print. It is safe, because it is too filthy to handle and too noisome even to approach. Leigh Hunt admired Wycherley. It was Macaulay, not Hunt, who set the keynote for the 19th century. The play was impossible equally to stage and to discuss, forgotten and obscure. Academic critics of the first half of the 20th century continued to approach The Country Wife gingerly, with frequent warnings about its "heartlessness", even as they praised its keen social observation. At this time nobody found it funny, and positive criticism tried to rescue it as satire and social criticism rather than as comedy. Pinchwife becomes in the 20th century a focus for moral concern: A competing milestone approach of the same generation is that of Rose Zimbardo , who discusses the play in generic and historical terms as a fierce social satire. Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick Both these types of reading have now fallen out of favour; there is little consensus about the meaning of The Country Wife, but its "notorious resistance to interpretation" [19] is having an invigorating rather than damping effect on academic interest. It was written by a courtier for a courtly and aristocratic audience, and Douglas Canfield has pointed to an unusual complication for a courtly play. The courtier code proposed by Wycherley is of a sexual game. Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick argued in Between Men that the game is played not between men and women, but between men by means of women, who are merely the "conduits" of homosocial desire between men. The hierarchy of wits meant that the wittiest and most virile man would win at the game. Thus Horner, as Canfield puts it, "represents not just class superiority, but that subset of class

represented by the Town wits, a privileged minority that

Chapter 6 : Marriage and Domestic Partnership (Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy)

You and your husband are just as bad as Obama and his smug wife telling us what to eat and what beauty standards are. I challenge you and your Alpha husband to better your children before it's too.

It is one of the few stories Kate Chopin sets before the war. He has been aware all along of what the letter at the end of the story says. When I looked up, I observed that many people in front of the sign were darker than many of those behind it. This is an amazing story. Do other people know about it? I was totally unprepared for the ending. Is this typical of Kate Chopin? Chopin handles closings as well as any writer. Should I have seen that ending coming? There are some suggestions that point to it. In most works of fiction, the answer to such a question depends upon what the author tells us. Perhaps he does remember her. We have to assume it is more than impulse, but if he really loved her, he most likely would not have turned her out. But this is fiction. Why is Armand burning things at the end of the story? Apparently he is trying to destroy memories of his wife and child to remove what he thinks of as the taint of their race. Are there clues in the story to show Armand might have known he was of African American descent? He is of mixed race, but he is not African American, if by that you mean someone who is a descendant of Africans brought to America as slaves. His mother was French. You may want to read her article. The story is set before the Civil War, at a time when a white slave owner often considered that because his female slaves were his property, he had a right to have sex with them. Kate Chopin would certainly have been aware of that. And you might consider this passage: The baby, half naked, lay asleep upon her own great mahogany bed, that was like a sumptuous throne, with its satin-lined half-canopy. She looked from her child to the boy who stood beside him, and back again; over and over. The blood turned like ice in her veins, and a clammy moisture gathered upon her face. I am thinking about this sentence: Social life on Southern plantations was similar to that among the country estates in England. The considerable distances among the plantations generally meant that visits involved stays for several days, even weeks. In areas near rivers the plantations tended to be closer to one another, like those along the Cane River in Louisiana, but even so these visits were most often planned around birthdays and holidays. The plantation class included extended family and friends. These visits were made outside the ordinary calendar of visits and likely arranged through correspondence. How did Kate Chopin know about slavery? Did she grow up with slaves in the house? Her family in St. Louis, like many families in the city, held slaves in the s. Does that mean that Chopin herself has African roots? When this story was written, would that expression have been considered offensive, as it is today? Three Chopin scholars discuss the expression: Also, house servants—those who did child care—were usually light-skinned, and were most likely the children of the master by his slaves. Mary Boykin Chesnut writes about that in her diary. My sense is that this would have been simply a descriptive term, that white folks and perhaps most blacks would not have thought to be offensive, especially in this context. In fact, I think that was true well into the twentieth century. The term as you both note refers to a very light skinned black person. Historically, it was used, as Barbara notes, without rancor more often by whites and blacks. Would doing that violate any of Ms. Since copyrights can be a tricky thing I thought that I would contact you and ask for your advice and help on this matter. Only a few stories—those first discovered and published in the—are not. Edited by Per Seyersted. Louisiana State UP, , Bayou Folk and A Night in Acadie. Edited by Bernard Koloski. Complete Novels and Stories. Edited by Sandra Gilbert. Library of America, A Review of General Semantics The Story of the Kate Chopin Revival. Louisiana State UP, Hearing Voices, Reading Stories. A Journal for Critical Debate 14 New Essays and a Comprehensive Bibliography Eds. Brown and Barbara C. Nischik and Barbara Korte. Kin of Another Kind: Transracial Adoption in American Literature. U of Michigan P, Louisiana State University Press, Kate Chopin in the Twenty-First Century: UP of America, Studies in Short Fiction New York: A Literary Life Basingstoke, England: Unveiling Kate Chopin Jackson: UP of Mississippi, Petry, Alice Hall ed. Beyond the Bayou Baton Rouge: Northwestern State UP, Verging on the Abyss: Elfenbein , Anna Shannon. Women on the Color Line: UP of Virginia, Kate Chopin New York: A Critical Biography Baton Rouge: U of Pennsylvania P,

Chapter 7 : The Country Husband Summary - blog.quintoapp.com

The country was recovering from the Great Depression, unions were developing, and child labor in manufacturing was terminated (Jones). The first female cabinet member in American history, Frances Perkins, was appointed the Secretary of Labor (Jones).

Her paternal grandfather was a successful master weaver who left a sizeable legacy, but her father, Edward John, mismanaged his share of the inheritance. He tried to establish himself as a gentleman farmer in Epping. Her published writings show her to have acquired a true command of the Bible and a good knowledge of the works of several of the most famous Ancient philosophers. The latter is partly explained through her personal acquaintance with Thomas Taylor, famed for his translations of Plato. Through her own writing for the Analytical Review she was to become widely read in the literature of her period. Initially, the nature and extent of her reading was partly owed to the friendship shown to her in her youth by a retired clergyman and his wife. Nevertheless, as a woman from an impecunious family, her prospects were very limited. In relatively rapid succession, she was to enter the most likely occupations for someone of her sex and circumstances: In , she was engaged as a companion to a Mrs Dawson and lived at Bath. She returned home to nurse her ailing mother in the latter part of In the winter of , Mary left them in order to attend to her sister Eliza and her newly born daughter. By February of that year, the two sisters had already been planning to establish a school with Fanny Blood. This was a crucial encounter for Mary. Several years later, she was to rise to his defence in a Vindication of the Rights of Men , and it was through her connections to members of this community that she was to gain an introduction to her future publisher, friend, and one might even say, patron, Joseph Johnson. In November , Wollstonecraft set off on a trip to Lisbon, where her friend Fanny, who had married that February, was expecting her first child. On board the ship, Mary met a man suffering from consumption; she nursed him for a fortnight, the length of the journey. This experience is related in her first novel, *Mary, a Fiction* She gained a very unfavourable opinion of Portuguese life and society, which seemed to her ruled by irrationality and superstitions. On her return to England, Wollstonecraft found her school in a dire state. Far from providing her with a reliable income and some stability, it was to be a source of endless worries and a financial drain. Following the collapse of her school, Wollstonecraft became a governess to the family of Lord Kingsborough for a brief and unsatisfactory period. The position took her to Ireland, where she completed *Mary, A Fiction*. On her return to London, Joseph Johnson came to the rescue once again by giving her some literary employment. In , she also began, but never completed, *The Cave of Fancy*. The same year, she wrote *Original Stories from Real Life*; with *Conversations, calculated to Regulate the Affections, and Form the Mind to Truth and Goodness* ; it appeared in two other London editions in her life time and , the last of which illustrated by William Blake. To understand the extent to which Wollstonecraft made up for the lack of a formal education, it is essential to appreciate fully that her talents were to extend to translating and reviewing, and that these two activities, quite apart from her own intellectual curiosity, acquainted her with a great many authors, including Leibniz and Kant. In each case, the texts she produced were almost as if her own, not just because she was in agreement with their original authors, but because she more or less re-wrote them. Throughout the period covered by these translations Wollstonecraft wrote for the Analytical Review, which her publisher, Joseph Johnson, together with Thomas Christie, started in May She was involved with this publication either as a reviewer or as editorial assistant for most of its relatively short life. Despite her own practice of the genre, her many reviews reveal the degree to which, she, like many other moralists in the eighteenth century, feared the moral consequences of reading novels. She believed that even those of a relatively superior quality encouraged vanity and selfishness. She was to concede, however, that reading such works might nonetheless be better than not reading at all. Until the end of , her articles were mostly of a moral and aesthetic nature. This address to the Revolution Society in commemoration of the events of partly prompted Burke to compose his very famous *Reflections on the Revolution in France, and on the Proceedings in Certain Societies in London Relative to that Event* Following the publication of her second *Vindication*, Wollstonecraft was introduced to the French statesman and diplomat, Charles Talleyrand, on his mission to

London on the part of the Constituent Assembly in February. She dedicated the second edition of the *A Vindication of the Rights of Woman* to him. Most of all, her love of Imlay brought Wollstonecraft to the realisation that the passions are not so easily brought to heel by reason. Wollstonecraft had a girl by Imlay. She broke with Imlay finally in March. In April of the same year, she renewed her acquaintance with William Godwin and they became lovers that summer. They were married at St Pancras church in March. It is stressed in her *Vindication of the Rights of Woman*. Self-mastery was thus the aim of education and it was the duty of parents to ensure that their children received it. That mind and body needed to be exercised and shaped so as to face the hardships of life is a running theme in much of her writings. She endorsed his view of liberty of conscience as a sacred right and wrote sympathetically about his plea for the repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts, which imposed civil disabilities on Dissenters. She also seemed to support his claim that the political Settlement of 1701 was wanting in that it did not make for full representation of the people and hence made only for partial liberty. Finally, Wollstonecraft reproduced the passage in which Price linked the American and French revolutions and clamoured for the end of despotism throughout Europe. Far from thinking that the events taking place in France gave grounds for rejoicing, Burke feared their consequences from the very start. Of the many disagreements between Price and Wollstonecraft, on the one hand, and Burke, on the other, one of the deepest was over their respective view of the nature of civil society and of political power in general. The two friends believed that government, the rule of law, and all human relations could be simplified, explicated, and rendered transparent, and both were convinced that this was the task ahead for all lovers of liberty. For Burke, on the contrary, civil society consisted of countless ineffable links between individuals. To sweep away established practices and institutions and think of politics as a mere matter of administering in accordance with a set of abstract rules or rights uninformed by the customs and culture, and hence the national character, of a people was, in his view, to demonstrate a crass disregard for the most obvious facts of human nature and history. The over-all effect he sought to achieve was to depict his opponent as theoretically confused, politically naive, generally misinformed, and, most damnable of all, his sermon on the *Love of our Country* with all its affirmation of feelings for humanity proved him to be unpatriotic. It consists mostly of a sustained attack on Burke rather than a defence of the rights of man. This is partly because Wollstonecraft took for granted a Lockean conception of God-given rights discoverable by reason, except when the latter was warped by self-love. Wollstonecraft further believed that God made all things right and that the cause of all evil was man. As she was to do in her next and more famous *Vindication*, Wollstonecraft did not simply clamour for rights, but emphasised that these entail duties; but she also insisted that none could be expected to perform duties whose natural rights were not respected. There was no question of blanket reverence for the past and its juridical legacy. As for civilization, she thought its progress very uneven and dismissed the culture of politeness and polish as nothing but a screen behind which hypocrisy, egotism and greed festered unchecked. Finally, opposing nature and reason to artifice and politeness, she made herself the true patriot and Burke the fickle Francophile. She was the clear-headed independent thinker, he the emotive creature of a system of patronage. She exhibited manly virtues, he effeminacy. In the midst of her tirade she turned, rather unexpectedly, to the subject of family life and the limits of parental authority, especially in relation to arranged marriages. She condemned marriages of convenience together with late marriages: Indeed, from her perspective, nearly every aspect of the prevailing culture had that consequence, for, in bringing girls up to be nothing but empty headed play-things, parents made for a morally bankrupt society. Such beings could never make dutiful mothers, as they took the horizon to be the eyes of the men they flirted with. The moral depravity of a society devoted to the acquisition of property and its conspicuous display rather than to the pursuit of reason and the protection of natural rights found the means of its reproduction in the family, she contended. Here her dispute was not just with Burke, but implicitly also with Price. In his sermon, he had deplored the sexual depravity of the times that he saw embodied even in those he considered patriots. But to seek only to vindicate the rights of men, as Price had done, was insufficient and misconceived, according to Wollstonecraft. If one sought a truly moral society, the family had to be changed and this, in turn, required a complete change in the nature of the relationship between men and women before, and within, marriage. Only a sound upbringing of both the sexes could secure that. This was the nub of her attack on political theorists

and educationalists alike. When Wollstonecraft came to write *The Vindication of the Rights of Woman*, which she did within a matter of months following the publication of her first overtly political work, the moral rejuvenation of society and the happiness of individual women were woven together. Women were ill-prepared for their duties as social beings and imprisoned in a web of false expectations that would inevitably make them miserable. She wanted women to be transformed into rational and independent beings whose sense of worth came, not from their appearance, but from their inner perception of self-command and knowledge. Women had to be educated; their minds and bodies had to be trained. This would make them good companions, wives, mothers and citizens. Above all it would make them fully human, that is, beings ruled by reason and characterised by self-command. It argues that women should be taught skills so as to be able to support themselves and their children in widowhood, and never have to marry or remarry out of financial necessity. It seeks to reclaim midwifery for women, against the encroachment of men into this profession, and contends that women could be physicians just as well as nurses. It urges women to extend their interests to encompass politics and the concerns of the whole of humanity. It also contains advice on how to make marriages last. Husbands and wives ought not, moreover, to be overly intimate and should maintain a degree of reserve towards each other. Wollstonecraft wanted women to aspire to full citizenship, to be worthy of it, and this necessitated the development of reason. Rational women would perceive their real duties. That she embraced the social and economic consequences of her vision of happy marriages, based on friendship and producing the next moral generation was spelled out further in her subsequent work, *An Historical and Moral View of the Origin and Progress of the French Revolution; and the Effect It Has Produced in Europe*. In that work, she endeavoured, amongst other things, to assess the merits and demerits of the progress of humanity and establish the causes of French despotism. Borrowing from Smith, whose *Theory of Moral Sentiments and Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations* she had drawn on previously, she sketched a possible future society in which the division of labour would be kept to a minimum and the sexes would be not only educated together but encouraged to work in family units. Single sex institutions and, for instance, all-male workshops encouraged lasciviousness in her view. She thus looked forward to a society in which small businesses and farms would provide basic, instead of superfluous, needs. Only the combination of her experience of her unrequited love for Imlay, the dictates of her own emotions, and the tribulations of a trip in Northern Europe led her to reconsider her views of reason. Indeed, she was to review her opinion of France, polite culture and manners, even Catholicism which she had abhorred, a loathing that her stay in Portugal had done much to strengthen. *The Letters Written During A Short Residence in Sweden, Norway and Denmark*, whose influence on travel literature as well as the Romantic movement was by no means negligible, show Wollstonecraft to have begun to espouse a more nuanced view of the world, and to have sought to develop a more fluid account of the relationship between reason and passion, as well as of modernity. Thus she grew a little closer to Burke in that she came to think that the tyranny of commercial wealth might be worse than that of rank and privilege. Whilst in France, she had already begun to write less critically of the English system of government. She had witnessed the Terror, fallen in love, born a child out of wedlock, been rejected, and attempted suicide. A second suicide attempt lay ahead. So did the prospect of happiness with William Godwin, a prospect cut short by her death in childbirth.

Chapter 8 : The Yellow Wallpaper : Gilman's Techniques for Portraying Oppression of Women

Criticism of religion is criticism of the ideas, the truth, or the practice of religion, including its political and social implications. [1] Historical records of criticism of religion goes back to at least 5th century BCE in ancient Greece, with Diagoras "the Atheist" of Melos.

Religion in Latin America Chapter 5: Social Attitudes Latin Americans tend to express traditional views about sexuality, marriage and social mores. For example, majorities in most Latin American countries are opposed to allowing gay and lesbian couples to marry legally. And solid majorities in almost all countries surveyed say abortion should be illegal in all or most circumstances. Across the region, Protestants are more likely than Catholics to say that abortion should be illegal in all or most circumstances and that same-sex couples should not be allowed to legally wed. Protestants also are consistently more likely than Catholics to view drinking alcohol, divorce, sex outside of marriage and using artificial means of birth control as immoral. And Protestants are more inclined than Catholics to say that wives should always obey their husbands. In general, Catholics who are more religiously observant express somewhat more conservative social views than do Catholics who are less observant. For example, Catholics who attend Mass weekly generally express lower levels of support for allowing same-sex marriage than do Catholics who attend Mass less often. Nevertheless, Protestants tend to be more socially conservative than Catholics even when levels of religious observance are taken into account. For more details, see below.

Views on Same-Sex Marriage Across most of Latin America, the preponderance of public opinion is opposed to same-sex marriage. Majorities or pluralities in 13 of the 18 countries surveyed, plus Puerto Rico, say that gay and lesbian couples should not be allowed to marry legally. However, opinion is more closely divided in Brazil, Chile, Mexico and Argentina, which in became the first Latin American country to legalize same-sex marriage. Across the countries and territories surveyed in Latin America, Protestants oppose same-sex marriage by greater margins than do Catholics. In places where adequate sample sizes are available for analysis, people with no religious affiliation tend to be more supportive of gay marriage. Across Latin America, women and men are about equally likely to oppose same-sex marriage, but young adults ages are generally more supportive of gay marriage than are older adults. Views on Abortion Most Latin Americans believe that abortion should be illegal in all or most cases. Even in Puerto Rico, where U. Protestants lean more strongly than Catholics toward the position that abortion should be illegal in all or most cases. In Chile, for example, about two-thirds of Protestants say abortion should be illegal, while half of Catholics take that position. The survey finds that across Latin America, men and women are about equally likely to oppose legal abortion, as are older and younger adults. Only in Argentina, Chile and Uruguay do fewer than half of adults consider homosexual behavior morally wrong. In most countries surveyed, majorities of both Protestants and Catholics agree that homosexuality is immoral. However, Protestants are particularly inclined toward this view. Indeed, in several countries, the percentages of Protestants who say homosexual behavior is morally wrong exceed the comparable percentages of Catholics by at least 20 points. Overall, the religiously unaffiliated are less likely than either Protestants or Catholics to say that homosexuality is morally wrong. Across Latin America, people between the ages of 18 and 34 are less likely than their elders to find homosexual behavior morally objectionable. In most countries, men and women share similar views on the moral acceptability of homosexuality. But in a handful of countries, more men than women say that homosexuality is morally wrong. Clear majorities across the region describe abortion as morally wrong. Protestants are more likely than Catholics to describe abortion as morally unacceptable. In most countries, many people who do not identify with any religion also subscribe to the view that abortion is immoral. Only in Argentina, Chile, Mexico and Uruguay do fewer than half of religiously unaffiliated people say abortion is morally wrong. Across the region, women are about as likely as men to say that abortion is morally unacceptable. And younger Latin Americans are about as likely as older Latin Americans to say that abortion is morally wrong. Where differences do arise, more women than men generally say that abortion is morally wrong. And in a handful of countries, those above the age of 34 are more likely than those between the ages of 18 and 34 to say that abortion is morally unacceptable. Other Moral Issues When it comes to the

moral acceptability of drinking alcohol, divorce, having sexual relations outside of marriage and using artificial means of birth control, the survey shows that Protestants express considerably more conservative opinions than do Catholics. And on balance, the religiously unaffiliated are more accepting of these behaviors than are either Protestants or Catholics. Drinking Alcohol Many Latin Americans see the consumption of alcohol as morally objectionable. Protestants tend to object to alcohol consumption more strongly than do Catholics. In most countries, clear majorities of Protestants say that drinking alcohol is morally wrong. Among Catholics, opinion is more divided. In about half of the countries surveyed, majorities of Catholics say that they have moral objections to drinking alcohol. But elsewhere, half of Catholics or fewer say that drinking alcohol is morally wrong. Wide differences between the opinions of Catholics and Protestants also are seen in Ecuador, Peru and Chile, all of which have gaps of 28 percentage points between Protestants and Catholics on this question. Smaller shares of the religiously unaffiliated have moral objections to drinking alcohol. Across Latin America, more women than men say that drinking alcohol is morally objectionable. Latin Americans ages 35 and older also are somewhat more likely to object to drinking alcohol than are adults under 35. Divorce In most Latin American countries, fewer than half of people say that divorce is morally wrong. Overall, fewer Latin Americans object to divorce on moral grounds than do older people in the region. Latin American men are about as likely as women to say that divorce is morally wrong. Sex Outside Marriage Latin Americans are divided on the morality of sex outside marriage. In eight of the countries surveyed, majorities of adults say that sex between people who are not married to one another is morally wrong. But in other countries, roughly half or fewer object to sex outside marriage. Generally, Protestants are more likely to oppose sex outside marriage than are Catholics. In 15 countries plus Puerto Rico, majorities of Protestants say that sex between people who are not married to each other is morally wrong. Among Catholics, half or fewer share this view in most countries surveyed. Gaps of 30 percentage points or more between Protestants and Catholics also are seen in Colombia, Chile, Brazil and Panama. In nearly all countries where adequate sample sizes are available for analysis, fewer than half of people who are unaffiliated with any religion say that sex outside marriage is morally wrong. Younger Latin Americans those ages 18-34 are less likely than older adults to find sex outside marriage morally objectionable. In most countries, men and women are about as likely to object to sex outside marriage. In a few countries, however, men are less likely to say that sex between people who are not married is morally wrong. Artificial Means of Birth Control Fewer Latin Americans express moral objections to the use of contraceptives than object to abortion and same-sex marriage. Objections to artificial means of birth control are highest in Guatemala, Honduras, El Salvador and Panama, where roughly four-in-ten or more adults view contraception as morally wrong. In many countries surveyed, significantly higher shares of Protestants than Catholics say that using contraceptives is morally wrong. Latin Americans who do not identify with any religion are less likely to object to contraceptive use than are either Catholics or Protestants. See survey topline for full results. Young Latin American adults ages 18-34 are less likely than older adults to object to using contraceptives. Across the region, women are about as likely as men to say that using artificial means of birth control is morally wrong. Gender Roles in the Family The socially conservative attitudes espoused by Latin Americans extend to traditional notions about gender roles in the family. Protestants are especially likely to say that wives must obey their husbands; four-in-ten or more in every country surveyed completely or mostly agree with this statement. Many Catholics, too, adhere to the idea that wives should subordinate themselves to their husbands. But in most countries, Catholics are less likely than Protestants to express this view. In Venezuela, Argentina, Uruguay and Chile, for example, the shares of Protestants who say that a wife must always obey her husband are at least 20 percentage points higher than the comparable figures among Catholics. In most countries where adequate sample sizes are available for analysis, fewer than half of religiously unaffiliated people completely or mostly agree that a wife is obligated to obey her husband. Younger adults ages 18-34 are less likely than their elders to say that a wife is obligated to obey her husband. And overall, more Latin American men than women say that wives are obligated to obey their husbands. Women across Latin America are divided on this question. In about half of the countries surveyed, majorities or pluralities of women completely or mostly agree that wives are obligated to obey their husbands. These countries include Honduras, Guatemala and the Dominican Republic, where more than eight-in-ten

women say that wives are obligated to obey their husbands. In other places – such as Chile, Uruguay, Argentina, Puerto Rico and Mexico – women either mostly disagree with this view or express divided opinions. Religious Commitment and Moral Views Protestants who attend church at least weekly express more conservative views on social issues than do Catholics who attend Mass weekly. Protestants are more likely than Catholics to take conservative positions on issues such as gay marriage, divorce and gender roles, even after holding religious observance, age, education and gender constant.

Chapter 9 : Social Attitudes on Moral Issues in Latin America

Mary's husband's mention that "it's kind of a bad time" refers to the fact that he is abandoning not only Mary but also their unborn child. In his promise to send her money and in his dismissal of her potential emotions and reactions as "fuss," he implicitly dismisses the idea that his wife is a thinking and feeling human being.

Roosevelt had just been reelected president. The country was recovering from the Great Depression, unions were developing, and child labor in manufacturing was terminated. Jones She was one of the few women in her time to gain equality in a male-dominated society. For most women, liberation was a bitter fight usually ending in defeat. This frustration is evident when Elisa is first introduced. Her home has the masculine qualities of being "hard-swept" and "hard-polished" Steinbeck Elisa is bored with her husband and with her life. According to Sweet, Elisa is unhappy with the traditional female role and is attempting to extend her abilities into masculine areas Elisa initially reacts to each situation as a man would, but is forever reminded that she is a woman. When her husband, Henry, comments about her "strong" chrysanthemum crop, Elisa is pleased by the manliness the word implies, but her husband reminds her of her femininity by offering her an evening on the town. After this conversation with her husband, she goes back to her masculine role of transplanting the flowers. The next situation involves the tinker. According to Sweet, he is to Elisa what the meat buyers were to Henry The tinker then hits her in her vulnerable spot--her chrysanthemums. He pretends to be interested in her love for her flowers. He compares her flowers to a "quick puff of colored smoke" Steinbeck She is attracted to the tinker because, as Stanley Renner points out, he represents a world of adventure and freedom that only men enjoy She allows her emotions to control her and lets go of her masculine side, freeing her central feminine sexuality, according to Sweet By the time she realizes her feminine emotions, it is too late: She has allowed herself to become emotional, "the trait women possess," whereas men conduct business unemotionally Sweet Elisa realizes her hopes for equality are nothing but a dream because she has been betrayed by her basic nature and by men. She gives the tinker the seedling and retreats indoors to find him some pots to mend. After the tinker leaves, Elisa goes indoors to bathe. She scrubs herself "until her skin was scratched and red" Steinbeck By this action, Elisa is unconsciously withdrawing back to her feminine side and cleansing herself "of the masculine situation by turning to the feminine world in which she best functions" Sweet When she dresses, she puts on her best underwear and applies makeup to her face. By doing these purely feminine things, according to Marcus, she hopes to accentuate her role as a woman Henry immediately notices the transformation and compliments her with the feminine "nice" instead of "strong," which is masculine. Elisa prefers "strong," but the meaning of it has changed from "masculine equal" to "feminine overlord" Sweet Henry warms the car up to go into town while Elisa gets herself ready. As they drive along, Elisa spots the flowers she had given the tinker beside the road. Her dreams of feminine equality are so broken that she can never go back to being what she once was; thus "she must endure her typical social role" Sweet Her only goal is to become "an old woman" Steinbeck Because she has gone back to her feminine role, according to Renner, "she remains a pitiable victim of male domination and female disadvantage" Throughout the story, Elisa suffers a regression from the masculine role she sees as equality to the feminine role she sees as submissive. Her frustration with the male-dominated society causes her to let go of her dreams for liberation and to become what society expects her to be--a passive woman. Steinbeck portrays women according to his time period. Works Cited Jones, James H. America and Its People: Volume Two From