

Beyond Feminism

Unification Thought Institute of Japan Akifumi Otani

The feminist movement started with the French Revolution. Representative activists at that time were Condorcet, who played an active part in the revolution assembly, Olympe de Gouges, who acted outside the assembly with her writing, especially with her *Declaration of the Rights of Woman and the Female Citizen*, and Mary Wollstonecraft, a British writer, who was influenced by the French Revolution.

The feminist movement, called the first wave of feminism, occurred in the first half of the 19th century in Britain and the United States. At first, it aimed at charitable work and the equality of the sexes in education, and then at the suffrage of women. Also, there was the antislavery movement in the United States, and the movement for the abolition of licensed prostitution in Britain.

In the second wave of feminism, *The Second Sex*, by Simone de Beauvoir was the pioneering work, in which she declared, “One is not born, but rather becomes, a woman.” The second wave of feminism in the United States began in the latter half of the 1960s.

Betty Friedan sought for the abolition of discrimination against women, aimed at the participation of women in all fields, and established NOW (National Organization for Women) in 1966. Juliet Mitchell wrote *Women: The Longest Revolution*, and claimed that we should make use of Marx’s dialectical materialism and Freud’s psychoanalysis for the liberation of women. Shulamith Firestone wrote *The Dialectic of Sex*, arguing that the modern, closed system of marriage and family should be dismantled, and held that we can choose from among any arbitrary lifestyle, such as a single life, communal life, heterosexuality, homosexuality, or any other of the multiple types of perversions.

Lesbian feminism, developed by those who split from NOW, claimed that the root cause of female oppression was the dominant rule of sexuality, especially the compulsion of heterosexuality, and therefore, as long as the heterosexual system was not destroyed, the liberation of women could not be realized.

In France, the MLF (Women’s Liberation Movement) was established in 1970, but afterwards it split into two groups. One was the Revolutionary Feminists, which emphasize equality. Beauvoir’s successors, Christine Delphy and Monique Wittig, are main representatives of this group. They claimed that women are socially constructed and described in the context of heterosexuality, or the dualism of man and woman, and they rejected such gender difference based on biology.

The other group was the *po et psych* faction, which emphasized the differences between man and woman. Fouque Antoinette, Julia Kristeva, Hélène Cixous, and Luce Irigaray are representative of this group of activists. Based on psychoanalysis, and the deconstruction theory of Freud, Lacan, and Derrida, they claimed that the purpose of the liberation of women is not for them to become equal to men, but rather to admit to the different identities of man and woman. This group was that of *postmodern feminism*. Their theory was introduced to the United States in 1980 and has had a huge impact.

Post-feminism, in which postmodern feminism is included, appeared following the second wave of feminism. Post-feminism is characterized as the maturity of feminism, a new feminism, depoliticizing, self-empowering, and so on.

In Japan, the term “gender-free” is prevailing as a description of the thought or movement which aims at being free from gender, or all socially-formulated sexual differences. Currently, the gender-free movement is exerting a great deal of serious damage to society, including the breakdown of the family.

In the following, the influence of post-structuralism on feminism will be discussed, and then, postmodern feminism and “queer” theory, which forms the core of today’s feminism and gay/lesbian studies, will be discussed, all from the viewpoint of Unification Thought.

(1) Postmodernism and Feminism

Mary Evans, professor of Women’s Studies at the University of Kent, says that post-modernity (post-structuralism) heavily influenced feminist thinkers:

Post-modernity offered a widely endorsed critique of the great synthesizing theories of the nineteenth century and proposed instead (à la Foucault) that the way to interpret life in the late twentieth century was through participation within, and engagement with, a series of over-lapping discourses and identities. This approach to the social, and emotional world, made perfect sense to many feminists in that it allowed differences in gender and sexual identity, and gave theoretical space to the multi-faceted lives of women.¹

According to Derrida, since language is always disturbed, the identity of sex is disturbed as well. According to Foucault, sex is regulated by power, and there is no essential identity of sex. And, according to Lacan, sex is formed by language, and originally there is no sexual relationship, and woman does not exist.

Post-structuralism served as the soil of feminism, especially French post-feminism,

which significantly impacted the United States and the world. Representative feminists are Julia Kristeva, Luce Irigaray, and Hélène Cixous.

As already stated, post-structuralism was formulated based on Marxism, Darwinism, and Freudianism. In turn, postmodern feminism was formulated based on post-structuralism. Therefore, post-structuralism and postmodern feminism will necessarily collapse if Marxism, Darwinism, and Freudianism prove to be false. Figure 5-1 shows the postmodern feminism and its foundation.



Fig 5.1 Postmodern feminism and its foundation

① Foucault and feminism

Feminism was heavily influenced by Foucault's writing. Mary Evans says:

Thus, the great enabling, and liberating, impact of Foucault's ideas was to suggest that representation does not in some sense "uncover" or "reveal" the "truth" about human reality, but rather that it constructs versions of the "truth" in different human situations and social contexts. What disappears with this argument is any set of ideas about "normal" or "real" sexuality: sexuality, according to Foucault, is all a construction and a changing construction at that.²

Foucault says that the operation of power is inherent in the discourse about sex. According to Sophia Phoca, a British critic:

Power does not operate through the repression of sex, but through increasingly "open" discussion and analysis of it which promote notions of "abnormal" or "normal" sexuality. A scientific discourse on sex was produced in the 19th century, which Foucault termed *scientia sexualis*. At stake was not sex, but the dynamics of power inherent in the scientific discourse itself. . . . *Scientia sexualis* became another means of cataloguing and regulating the human subject, which ends by entering the

“liberationist” discourse of a healthy, positive sex-life.³

Foucault’s thought was effective not only for homosexuality, but also for feminism.

② Derrida and Feminism

Sophia Phoca says that post-feminism borrows Derrida’s strategies of linguistic disruption:

Post-feminism has gained from Derrida’s strategies of linguistic disruption. His idea of an “unspeakable *différance*” could be seen as applying to the condition of repressed and unprivileged Woman. This is not a natural condition but a constructed one that can be exposed by a deconstructive criticism of “phallogocentrism.”⁴

She also says that Derrida’s “deconstruction has offered feminism new possibilities of exposing and dislocating the foundational patriarchal binary oppositions—for instance, the privilege of male over female.”⁵

③ Psychoanalysis and Feminism

According to Mary Evans, “Juliet Mitchell’s *Psychoanalysis and Feminism* re-opened the pages of Freud for feminism and in so doing allowed access to an understanding of the symbolic and the emotional world.”⁶ She also said that Freud’s theory of the unconscious, and of acquired sexual identity, brought effective theoretical grounds for feminism.

His theory of the unconscious, and of acquired sexual identity, allow access to the discussion of the metaphorical in the social world and the dynamic of the processes through which sexual identity is acquired. Crucially, psycho-analysis seemed to offer a way out of the static analysis of sex roles offered by Anglo-American social science. From the re-reading of Freud came, therefore, the discussion of women as “sign” and the reading of literature in terms of general patterns rather than individual experiences.⁷

Mary Evans says: “When psycho-analysis was re-discovered by feminism in the 1970s it gave women a framework through which they could explore the metaphorical and the symbolic in social and intellectual life, as well as the literal,”⁸ and “Indeed, familiarity with psycho-analysis has become, from the 1970s onwards, almost a *sine*

qua non of academic feminism.”⁹

④ Lacan and Feminism

After Freud, it was Jacques Lacan who had the great influence on feminism. Mary Evans says:

This psycho-analytic literacy within feminism has not, however, stopped at Freud. . . . Of these two writers [Jacques Lacan and Melanie Klein] it is Lacan who has been of particular importance in the development of the ways in which women writers conceptualize language and representation...what they have done is to emphasize Lacan’s theory of the phallus as the universal signifier, as the literal representation of the law of the father and as the prime signifier of desire.¹⁰

According to Lacan, the penis (phallus) is the active force in the construction of language and culture, and it stands for the Law of the Father and the fear of castration. For Lacan, the symbolic is the realm regulated by language, and the real is the chaotic realm which is expelled by the symbolic. Female sex is set to the position relevant to the chaos of the real (the position to be the Phallus), and male sex is set to the position of the symbolic that expels the real (the position to have the Phallus).

In the symbolic realm, phallogentric language prevails. The one who has the phallogentric value, and exercises its power, is considered as man, and the one who is left out and deleted from, and does not exist in such a position is considered as woman. Therefore, French postmodern feminism has resolutely worked on the dismantlement of language as the symbolic order of father.

(2) Marxist Feminism and Radical Feminism

① Marxism and feminism

As Mary Evans says, “Feminism re-discovered Freud, just as it discovered Marx and grew up with Foucault,”¹¹ feminism is influenced by Marxism in the first place.

According to Engels, women are the proletariat, and men the bourgeoisie in the family. Therefore, entering into the heterosexual relationship necessarily leads to the exploitation of woman by man.

According to Marxism, there was no sexual discrimination in a primitive maternal communal society. However, with the increase of productive forces, inequality of wealth and private property were brought about. Then, with the collapse of the maternal society and the world-historical defeat of the female sex, women became domestic

slaves under patriarchal domination.

The representative Marxist feminist is Christine Delphi. According to Marxist feminism, it is not true that the myths of the female and the male sexes existed in the beginning, and later the modern patriarchy was established. The patriarchy of the middle class fabricated such myths and naturalized and universalized them in order to maintain the capitalist system.¹²

As a matter of fact, Marxist feminism declared the fight against the capitalist exploitation system where women are exploited.

② Radical Feminism

Radical feminism, which appeared in the United States in the latter half of the 60's, regarded women's suppression as radical, and it is at the root of all suppressions including class suppression. Therefore, women will be liberated if gender, which is based on the discrimination between sexes, is ended.

The difference between Marxist feminism and radical feminism lies in the chronological and functional priority between industrial capitalism and the male-dependent family household. Radical feminism claims that patriarchal domination appeared within human history, whereas Marxist feminism claims that the gendered family appeared within the modern capitalist society.

Representative feminist thinkers who contributed to radical feminism were Betty Friedan, Kate Millett, Shulamith Firestone, and Juliet Mitchell.

(3) Postmodern Feminism

Postmodern feminism refers to modern French feminism, and representative thinkers include Julia Kristeva, Luce Irigaray, and Hélène Cixous.

① The Viewpoint of Postmodern Feminism

(i) Kristeva

Summarizing Kristeva's thought, Sophia Phoca writes:

Kristeva has reconceptualized Lacan's distinction between the imaginary and the symbolic in her own terms of the semiotic and the symbolic. . . . For her, the semiotic is linked to the pre-Oedipal primary impulses, the infant's earliest libidinal drives in deep relation to the maternal. . . . Kristeva explains the "uncanniness" of the semiotic by reference to the Greek term *chora* from **Plato** in his *Timaeus*. There, it means an

unnameable, chaotic “womb-like” space existing prior to nameable Form. For Kristeva, the chora is the shared body space of mother and child, which resists representation, but remains experienced as desire. The maternal chora precedes and underlies the possibility of signification—and also threatens to destabilize its order.¹³

Sophia Phoca also writes: “Kristeva’s semiotic is the pre-discursive, the pre-verbal, which has to do with rhythm, tone, color, and all that which is pre-representational. For Kristeva, the semiotic becomes the “unrepresentable” in art, but is nevertheless *present* in it and in the poetic register of language.”¹⁴

The semiotic has a disruptive and creative influence on the patriarchal symbolic, and it breaks closure and disrupts the symbolic. As Judith Butler says, Kristeva tried to subvert and disrupt the “Law of the Father” (norm) in the symbolic by introducing the semiotic. Furthermore, she aimed at pleasure beyond the paternal law—poetic language and the pleasure of maternity.¹⁵ The pre-Oedipal mother-child relationship, as Kristeva mentions, is the space of incestuous pleasure within the unity between mother and child.

(ii) Irigaray

Sophia Phoca summarizes Irigaray’s thought as follows:

Psychoanalysis is patriarchal, phallogocentric and has not sufficiently recognized the role of the maternal or female sexuality. . . . Irigaray stresses a female reading of culture which deconstructs patriarchy and seeks alternatives in a utopian post-patriarchal future. She has employed Derridian deconstruction to trace “the masculine imaginary” in major philosophical texts and “interrogate the philosophical tradition, particularly from the feminine side”. . . . Irigaray conceptualizes a future where sexual difference is recognized by giving the maternal equal status to the paternal. To do this, women should return to a pre-Oedipal imaginary, a pre-patriarchal space before language.¹⁶

Judith Butler explains what Irigaray argues: “Women are the ‘sex’ which is not ‘one.’ Within a language pervasively masculinist, a phallogocentric language, women constitute the *unrepresentable*. In other words, women represent the sex that cannot be thought, a linguistic absence and opacity. Within a language that rests on univocal signification, the female sex constitutes the unconstrainable and undesignatable. In this sense, women are the sex which is not ‘one,’ but multiple.”¹⁷

Irigaray was influenced by Lacan and Derrida, and together with Monique Witigg and Hélène Cixous, she declared the establishment of a language that refuses the phallogocentric nature and reflects the reality of woman's desire—*écriture féminine*.

As Aiko Okoshi, professor of Kinki University of Japan, states, Kristeva tried to disrupt the phallogocentric language, making a crack in it, and put the maternal semiotic into the crack, while Irigaray and Cixous, to be described next, tried to establish an independent female language outside of the phallogocentric language.¹⁸

(iii) Cixous

Hélène Cixous criticized the phallogocentric *écriture* and proposed *écriture féminine* which nullifies the phallus. Sophia Phoca writes:

Écriture féminine is an experimental writing of this type, motivated by a desire to “inscribe the feminine,” which originated in France in the mid-1970s...Écriture féminine writes that for which there is no language—the feminine which has been repressed by patriarchal culture...Cixous seeks ways out—“*sorties*”—of structures which place woman in a binary system determined by her difference to man. For Cixous, Western philosophical discourse has constructed woman as a product of linguistic difference in binary oppositionality...By destabilizing this binary structure, the privileging of the phallogocentric subject will be undermined...Her concept of *écriture féminine* acknowledges Derrida's analysis of *différance*.¹⁹

Cixous, as well as Kristeva and Irigaray, received strong influence from psychoanalysis, especially that of Lacan. According to Sophia Phoca:

For Cixous, the inscription of the rhythms and articulation of the mother's body remains present in the adult. Cixous attaches special value to Lacan's Imaginary in the pre-symbolic union between the self and the m/other which becomes inscribed in language. . . . She produces texts which “write her body” and therefore destroy the closure of binary opposites. The pleasure of this open-ended textuality is referred to as *jouissance*. Coined by Lacan, this French term has no equivalent in English. It connotes the extreme pleasure derived from sexual orgasm...Sexual *jouissance* is like the female erotic which cannot be theorized, enclosed or coded.²⁰

Cixous sought the extreme pleasure of the female

② Post-feminism as Seen from the Viewpoint of Unification Thought

(i) A Critique of Kristeva

Kristeva argues that the Law of the Father represses and interrupts female pleasure (*jouissance*), and beyond the paternal law there is an original pleasure and a true body (woman's body), which is freed from the shackles of the paternal law. It can be said that her argument is in accordance with Freud's statement that the superego, which is formed by feudal religious morality, represses humans.

From the viewpoint of Unification Thought, it is not true that there is true pleasure beyond the law (norms). The law (norms) is a guideline leading to the achievement of true love. Any love which deviates from the law (norms), cannot be true love.

Originally, a man who has completed his individuality will marry a woman who has completed her individuality. The significance of original marriage, seen from Unification Thought, is (i) the manifestation of God, who has the dual characteristics of male and female, (ii) the completion of the creation, (iii) the unity of humankind, and (iv) the perfection of the family. Immorality, homosexuality, or incest destroy such an ideal: In such distorted love God cannot operate, creation cannot be resonant with the human couple, humankind will be disrupted, and the family will collapse. Therefore, love (norms) is necessary as the guideline for love to realize a marriage of true love.

Kristeva says that the taboo of incest between mother and child is forced in the symbolic realm, but love between mother and child is not sexual, and has nothing to do with incest. Therefore, love between mother and child is not prohibited, but rather it is a precious love throughout their lives.

(ii) A Critique of Irigaray

Irigaray refused a phallogocentric language and strove to establish a language that is able to reflect the reality of woman's desire. She denied the patriarchal phallogocentric system and tried to reveal a quite different female subject, one who is driven by various pleasures.

From the viewpoint of Unification Thought, female pleasure, independent of male pleasure, or female sexuality, independent of male sexuality, is meaningless. Likewise, male pleasure independent of female pleasure, or male sexuality, independent of female sexuality is also meaningless.

Male pleasure and sexuality, and female pleasure and sexuality are realized when man and woman are engaged in true love. Without such a relationship, a man alone, or a woman alone, cannot realize male pleasure or female pleasure, nor male sexuality nor female sexuality.

As for language, even though human culture up until today has been established on the basis of language centering on the male sex (gender), it is wrong to attempt to promote the language and culture centering on the female sex (gender), in opposition to that of the male language and culture. It is necessary to establish the language and culture wherein both sexes (genders) are harmonized.

(iii) A Critique of Cixous

Cixous also sought female pleasure, in the same way as Kristeva and Irigaray. However, true pleasure cannot be obtained only by woman. Only through the true love between man and woman, can woman's pleasure, as well as man's pleasure, be obtained.

Cixous tried to establish *écriture féminine*, but it is a one-sided language, just as in the case of the phallogocentric language. It is necessary to establish a language wherein both sexes (genders) are harmonized.

(4) Queer Theory

Queer theory, which appeared in the 1990s, is a theory based on feminism and postmodern theory. It is a philosophical, theoretical research of gender and sexuality known as gay/lesbian studies and it belongs to the third wave of feminism. Representative theorists include Judith Butler, and Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick. "Queer" is the term used to oppose all forms of sexual normalizations. In other words, queer theory questions all reigning schemes of sexual norms.

① The Viewpoint of Queer theory

(i) Butler

In the United States, Judith Butler, professor at the University of California, Berkley, developed her theory while critically accepting French feminism.

She rejects binary structure or dualism, since the gender configurations are presupposed and predetermined by a hegemonic cultural discourse, which has the binary structure derived from philosophical dualism. According to her, category is essentially incomplete, and therefore, gender is performative: its identity is an illusion or a phantom, and there is no gender identity.²¹

In contrast to French feminism, which tried to establish an independent female sex (gender) in opposition to the male sex (gender), Butler tried to subvert the gender identity. In her *Gender Trouble*, she states:

This text continues, then, as an effort to think through the possibility of subverting

and displacing those naturalized and reified notions of gender that support masculine hegemony and heterosexist power, to make gender trouble, not through the strategies that figure a utopian beyond, but through the mobilization, subversive confusion, and proliferation of precisely those constitutive categories that seek to keep gender in its place by posturing as the foundational illusions of identity.²²

Further, she says that the strategy of lesbianism is a thoroughgoing appropriation of the categories of identity in order to reveal that heterosexual systems are constructs, fantasies or fetishes:

The more insidious and effective strategy it seems is a thoroughgoing appropriation and redeployment of the categories of identity themselves, not merely to contest “sex,” but to articulate the convergence of multiple sexual discourses at the site of “identity” in order to render that category, in whatever form, permanently problematic.²³

Gender is a term that is used by feminists as a “culturally constructed sex” in contrast to a “biological sex.” However, Butler says that not only gender, but also sex is socially constructed.

If the immutable character of sex is contested, perhaps this construct called “sex” is as culturally constructed as gender; indeed, perhaps it was always already gender, with the consequence that the distinction between sex and gender turns out to be no distinction at all.²⁴

Sara Salih, associate professor of English at the University of Toronto, explains Butler’s thought in her *Judith Butler*. According to Butler, “there is no gender identity that precedes language. If you like, it is not that an identity ‘does’ discourse or language, but the other way around—language and discourse ‘do’ gender.”²⁵ Thus, sex and gender are the results of discourse and the law. This means that “In the beginning was the discourse.”

In Butler, “‘the doer’ is merely a fiction imposed on the doing—the doing itself is everything,”²⁶ and “there is no doer behind the deed but the ‘doing’ itself is everything.”²⁷ This means that “in the beginning there was the deed.” Butler also says that the law is imposed by culture, and feminine and masculine dispositions are produced effects of law. After all, Butler “continued to destabilize subject-categories

and norms, and tried to suggest radical resignificatory alternatives that will undermine the law by exposing its limits.”²⁸ As Sara Salih says, Butler’s influence within feminist theory and queer theory has been crucial.

(ii) Sedgwick

Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick, who is regarded as the driving force and the Queen Mother of Queer Theory, advocated the concept of “homosocial.”

Homosocial refers to the solidarity, based on friendship and love, between heterosexual men. According to Sedgwick, western societies have been homosocial from the time of ancient Greece until the modern age. Homosocial and homosexual are not discontinuous, but rather they are continuous. In other words, homosocial society was latently homosexual.

According to Sedgwick, “the men’s heterosexual relationships...have as their *raison d’être* an ultimate bonding between men,”²⁹ and the “female figure is a solvent...for the men...bonded together.”³⁰ Women are means for men to be united with each other, in the homosocial society. Sedgwick used Lévi-Strauss’ paradigm of ‘the male traffic in women’—the use of women as exchangeable property for the primary purpose of cementing the bonds of men with men—for her theory of feminism.

In Foucault’s account, the modern category of “homosexuality” was created in the late nineteenth century, and “the homosexual” became “a species,” and Sedgwick thinks that heterosexism, which alienates homosexuality and drives it away to the edge, started at that time.

As Yoichi Ohashi, a professor at Tokyo University, clarifies, homosociality is a group of heterosexual men, where feminists who might tear men’s bonds and homosexual men who might separate a group of men from women to form a gay group, are excluded. Thus, homosociality is the patriarchal homosocial society supported by homophobia (dislike of homosexuality) and misogyny (dislike of the female). In order to liberate homosexual men and women from this solidarity of men, the solidarity of gays and feminists was born. Gays and feminists, who were natural enemies before, realized that they were both victims of the patriarchal homosocial society, and united. In this way, queer theory came to be established.³¹

According to Sedgwick, “sexual desire is an unpredictably powerful solvent of stable identities,”³² and therefore, homosexuality and heterosexuality always fluctuate, and sexuality is chaotic.

② Queer Theory as Seen from the Viewpoint of Unification Thought

(i) A Critique of Butler

According to Butler, “In the beginning was the discourse.” She claims that the subject is constructed in a discourse, by deed, and she does not admit the subject behind the discourse. This means that the subject is given rise to in a discourse. However, does discourse without a subject exist? She also says that there is no doer behind the deed. Is there any deed on earth without a doer?

At the beginning of the Gospel of John in the Bible, it is written that “In the beginning was the Word.” The Word was uttered by God, the subject, and there was no Word without the subject, God. In the same token, there cannot be a discourse without a subject (a human being). Is she saying that discourse or words exist in a vacuum? It can be said that her theory is a “linguistic materialism.”

From the viewpoint of Unification Thought, “in the beginning was love,” and words appeared through love. In other words, God was love, and words, as the plan or the scenario for the Creation, were made through love. Further, the pair system of man and woman, or male and female, was made for the realization of love. That is, for the realization of love, man was created to be masculine, and woman was created to be feminine. Furthermore, guidelines were necessary for love to become true love. Thus, word was accompanied by law (norm) as the guideline of love.

Sara Salih says: “It might be tempting to label Butler a ‘radical constructivist,’ a position that would hold simply (and perhaps doggedly) that everything is language, everything is discourse—in other words, everything, including the body, is *constructed*. However, Butler claims that this misses the point of a deconstructive approach, which is not reducible to the statement that ‘everything is discursively constructed.’ To deconstruct is to acknowledge and to analyze the operations of exclusion, erasure, foreclosure and abjection in the discursive construction of the subject.”³³

However, what Butler really wants to say is that the word and discourse construct everything. This is the same situation that we find in the “excuse” of Richard Dawkins. He claims that the gene is selfish. When an objection is raised against him, however, he responds with the excuse that what he says is a metaphor, and that the gene has a cooperative aspect.

Butler declared that she will bring gender trouble “through...mobilization, subversive confusion, and proliferation.”³⁴ Butler’s declaration is what postmodern feminism finally culminates as. Her theory is in accordance with the disruption of discourse by Derrida, and the disturbance of species by mutation in Darwinism.

From the viewpoint of Unification Thought, just as God created living beings according to their kinds, so too, man and woman were also created with clear

characteristic differences. Thus, when man and woman harmoniously love each other physically and mentally, both man and woman can obtain true joy.

(ii) A Critique of Sedgwick

According to Sedgwick, both male and female homosexuals are regarded as dangerous to the friendship between men, and they are rejected in the homosocial society. However, this is not the case. People, in general, tend to avoid homosexuality since it is a deviation from true heterosexual love.

Sedgwick says that homosexual love is latent in the friendship between men. However, friendship, or brotherly love, has nothing to do with homosexual love. Homosexual love is a distorted or transformed kind of heterosexual love, whereas friendship or brotherly love has nothing to do with sexual love.

Sedgwick also discusses homosocial society based on Lévi-Strauss' paradigm of 'the male traffic in women.' It is true that women were historically oppressed by men. The reason is that women should have to indemnify the sin of the Fall committed by Eve, the first human female ancestor.

Today, however, in line with the development of the providence of the Second Advent, the history of indemnity (restoration through indemnity) for women has come to an end, and it has now become possible for women to stand in the same position as men, and have the same value as men. That is the historical background as to why the women's liberation movement has emerged in the 20th century. It is wrong, therefore, to see women as 'exchangeable things.'

Furthermore, sexuality fluctuates, and it is chaotic, according to Sedgwick. As with the case with Butler, this is in accordance with the disruption of discourse according to Derrida, and with the disturbance of species through mutation, as in Darwinism.

(5) Beyond Feminism, and Towards True Conjugal Love

The foundation of postmodern feminism is post-structuralism and, beyond that, Marxism, Darwinism and Freudianism. This means that the root of modern feminism, especially postmodern feminism and queer theory, is Marxism, Darwinism and Freudianism, and its trunk is post-structuralism. Therefore, if Marxism, Darwinism and Freudianism collapse, and if post-structuralism collapses, these feminist views (thoughts) necessarily have to collapse. Other feminist viewpoints, such as Marxist feminism, radical feminism, ecological feminism, and so on, also collapse since even though they are not directly influenced by post-structuralism, they are based on Marxism, Darwinism, or on Freudianism.

After the collapse of feminism, there will come the ideal of true love between man and woman, or true conjugal love based on chastity, and centered on God's love. Originally, a man who has completed his individuality will marry a woman who has completed her individuality. The significance of the original marriage seen from Unification Thought is (i) the manifestation of God, who has the dual characteristics of male and female, (ii) the completion of the creation, (iii) the unity of humankind, and (iv) the perfection of the family. Immorality, homosexuality, and/or incest will destroy such an ideal. God can neither dwell nor operate in such distorted love. Creation cannot be resonant with such human couples: In the Bible, it is written that "the whole creation has been groaning in travail together until now" (Romans 8:22) and, as a Japanese proverb says, dogs will not eat (that is, run away from) a quarrel between husband and wife, to say nothing of homosexuals and other distorted loves. Humankind will be disrupted, and the family will collapse. Feminism, and the gender-free thought associated with it, will bring about such miseries.

Mother Teresa gave the following message to the 4th UN Women's Conference held in Beijing, 1995.

I do not understand why some people are saying that women and men are exactly the same, and are denying the beautiful differences between men and women. All God's gifts are good, but they are not all the same. ...God told us, "Love your neighbor as yourself." So first I am to love myself rightly, and then to love my neighbor like that. But how can I love myself unless I accept myself as God has made me? Those who deny the beautiful differences between men and women are not accepting themselves as God has made them, and so cannot love the neighbor. They will only bring division, unhappiness, and destruction of peace to the world.

The coming ideal society and world are to be established based on the true family filled with true conjugal love. There will be no domination, discrimination, or abuse of women by men, no defiance or revolt of women towards men, in that world. It is the world where both man and woman can receive joy, and realize true equality between them.

Notes

1. Mary Evans, *Introducing Contemporary Feminist Thought* (Cambridge, UK: Polity Press, 1997), 20-21.
2. *Ibid.*, 81.
3. Sophia Phoca and Rebecca Wright, *Introducing Postfeminism* (New York: Totem Books, 1999), 97.
4. *Ibid.*, 49.
5. *Ibid.*
6. Mary Evans, *Introducing Contemporary Feminist Thought*, 22.
7. *Ibid.*
8. *Ibid.*, 50.
9. *Ibid.*, 47-48.
10. *Ibid.*, 48.
11. *Ibid.*, 130-31.
12. Kazuko Takemura, *Feminism* (in Japanese) (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 2000), 17.
13. Sophia Phoca and Rebecca Wright, *Introducing Postfeminism*, 62.
14. *Ibid.*, 157.
15. Judith Butler, *Gender Trouble* (New York: Routledge, 1990), 119.
16. Sophia Phoca and Rebecca Wright, *Introducing Postfeminism*, 57-59.
17. Judith Butler, *Gender Trouble*, 13.
18. Aiko Okoshi, *Introducing Feminism* (in Japanese) (Tokyo: Chikuma Shobo, 1996), 187.
19. Sophia Phoca and Rebecca Wright, *Introducing Postfeminism*, 50-52.
20. *Ibid.*, 53-55.
21. Judith Butler, *Gender Trouble*, 34, 200.
22. *Ibid.*, 46.
23. *Ibid.*, 174.
24. *Ibid.*, 9-10.
25. Sara Salih, *Judith Butler* (New York: Routledge, 2002), 64.
26. *Ibid.*, 63.
27. *Ibid.*, 130.
28. *Ibid.*, 138.
29. Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick, *Between Men: English Literature and Male Homosocial Desire* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1985), 50.
30. *Ibid.*, 160.
31. Youich Ohashi "Explanation of Keyword" in Kazuko Aakemura ed., *Postfeminism* (Tokyo: Sakuhin-sha, 2003), 198.

32. Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick, *Epistemology of the Closet* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990), 85.
33. Sara Salih, *Judith Butler*, 81.
34. Judith Butler, *Gender Trouble*, 46.