

ZULF'S POSITION ON FEMINISM IS VIRTUALLY IDENTICAL TO MY POSITION ON ISLAMISM

ZULFIKAR MOINUDDIN AHMED

My political position on Feminism is virtually identical to my position on Islamism. I am not keen on either of these positions. I believe that people's natural right of liberty ought to be strictly secured, that Feminists and Islamists and many other positions I am not keen on ought not to be suppressed by state or other coercive forces. But I don't like them in my private life and prefer to avoid having my peace be disturbed by them. I am 49 now and don't have much tolerance for my private life being poisoned by these sorts of ideologies. I find Feminism puerile and don't see a great deal of value in it; I am natural rights oriented and dislike politicization of relations between men and women. I don't want any feminist women in my private life at all.

1. PRINCIPLES

People need to have full freedoms to hold their convictions for their happiness and well-being; that is true for eight billion people. I strongly support plurality and openness in *public sphere*. Feminism and Islamism and all manner of various conflicting and convergent ideologies all have their place in the *public sphere*. But I will not tolerate them in my living room and my private sphere, in my romantic life, and so on. I don't adhere to most of these ideologies, and I don't want them at all in my private sphere at all. They poison my private sphere too much.

The key principle here is that people's private spheres are sacred and ought to be strictly secure from the very necessary rancor and enthusiasm of the public sphere pluralistic extravaganza. That's life of public sphere, rancor, clashes, hustle and bustle. I don't like all that entering my private space where I like peace and tranquility.

2. THAT'S RIGHT UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

The *health* of the public sphere is precisely it's ability to handle the most amazing plurality and chaos and the extravaganza that comes from diversity of all manner of colourful political views that all stem from deep convictions of the heart of people. The world will be even more pluralistic as time goes on; as individuality strengthens and is more necessary in a larger population, there will be explosions of diversity of viewpoints. And that's all great. They just should be managed to stay out of people's private sphere and disturb their private right to tranquil peace.

There should be some laws restricting political rancor that goes from public sphere to anyone's private life generally. The reason this happens is that there are not enough ways for governments to manage natural political diversity in public

Date: December 16, 2021.

institutions. This requires effort by government and cannot be expected to arise spontaneously.

Today, you have reasonable volume in these things in academia, some parts of society, but there is too much tolerance of *commercial norms* where business dominates every social aspect of American people. This is a recipe for disaster. People need more sophisticate forums, more inclusiveness in diversity and social support. Social networks and such are no substitute for authentic pluralistic public spheres.