

Prof. Maciej Giertych, MA Oxon, PhD Toronto, DSc Poznań  
Member of the European Parliament

### **Demasculinisation of men**

#### *Sex issues in the European Union*

The late European Constitution in six different paragraphs mentioned gender equality:

- 1) As a value on which the European Union is based (§ I-2),
- 2) As one of its aims (§ I-3.3),
- 3) That it is to be obligatory in all fields, particularly in employment, work and pay, and that there should be special advantages for the under-represented sex (§ II-83),
- 4) That all activities referred to are to eliminate inequalities and promote equality between women and men (§ III-116),
- 5) That the Union is to support and complement the activities of the Member States in the field of gender equality (§ III-210.li), and
- 6) Lists rules on wages that are to be equal for the same work or work of the same value, and that this applies also to other benefits a worker obtains from the employer, to measurement of piece rates and time rates, but with allowance for specific advantages for the under-represented sex (§ III-214).

The proposed Constitution forbids discrimination for reasons of sex or sexual orientation (§ II-81, III-118) and proclaims measures to combat such discrimination in Member States (§ 124.1).

While the proposed Constitution states that everyone has a right to life (§ II-62), it speaks also about the freedom of providing services (§ III-145) also medical services in view of the progressive abolition of restrictions in this field in Member Countries (§ III-141), while at the same time it forbids introduction of new restrictions (§ III-144). The whole section devoted to health (§ III-278) speaks about cross-border availability of medical services. It is obvious that this is understood to include abortion services.

While this project of the European Constitution is already dead, there are attempts to resuscitate it and, what is more important, elements of its feminist agenda are continually being introduced into various documents to be voted in the European Parliament. Always someone will make sure that to documents on almost any topic amendments are introduced that speak of the right to reproductive health (meaning abortion), of non-discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation (meaning promotion of homosexuality) and of gender equality. There is always a majority available for these amendments and they get voted in.

#### *Masculinity and femininity*

We live in strange times. The topic of gender equality is being promoted as a constant element of political correctness. Documents are being produced on this subject in the United Nations, in the European Union, in the Council of Europe etc. At universities special courses and chairs are being established on women studies and on gender equality. In various jobs, functions and in representative organs a *numerus clausus* is being imposed, a requirement that a certain minimal proportion of women be included. By force women are being introduced into various executive bodies, into

the army, into the police, into cosmic exploration teams, into male film roles (e.g. such as a policewoman with a gun chasing criminals). In communist countries in the early fifties there was a slogan “place women on tractors!” Today socialism reached the West, and now it is not only tractors that are to be manned by women, but all functions should be so manned. At the same time there are attempts to make men accept female roles. They are being shown wiping babies, cooking, washing dishes, tending the sick etc. It is said that we are all equally suited for all jobs. This is demanded by the feminist ideology and the current political correctness.

However, men and women do differ. This obvious fact got lost somewhere in the public consciousness of today. I am speaking here not only about physical differences, which are obvious to everyone, but also about psychological differences. It is not possible to separate the ones from the others. A woman has to carry her child under her heart for nine months, and then she gives birth to it, feeds it with her own breast. Lack of such experiences in the father results in him having a different attitude to children. In view of her biological role traditionally a woman performs the majority of jobs at or near the home, while the man performs those that require a longer period of absence from home. Woman’s constant toils are best seen when the work is not done, while that of the man when it is finished. To protect potential motherhood a woman performs physically less strenuous jobs while those requiring greater physical strength are left to the man. In view of her biological role a woman is endowed with traits that are necessary for performing it and a man with those traits that are needed in the role he has to play. The male and female characteristics are not opposites. They are complementary.

Today we are being told there are no differences, that both sexes are equally well adapted to perform all jobs. That is not true. Here are a few examples.

<b>Woman</b>	<b>Man</b>
Physically weaker, kind	Stronger, tough
In conflict exploits weakness, cries	In conflict exploits physical superiority, shouts, uses force
Gentle, easy to hurt, more ready to yield	Will sustain even a harsh critique
Small things important, able to remember about them	Takes care that important things do not get lost in secondary details
Guided by intuition, feels the situation	Guided by logic, lacks intuition
Wants her man to guess what she wants	Has difficulty guessing. Expresses his needs directly
Adapts easier to unexpected situations. Better at improvising, acts spontaneously	Prefers to be prepared. In unexpected situations is more at a loss. Needs time to consider the best way out
For her domestic issues more important and thinks about them when at work	For him professional issues more important and thinks about them at home
Primarily desires love	Desires recognition
Wants to feel safe under his protection	Wishes to protect, to show protectiveness

We differ but we also complement each other. Thank God we differ and thank God we complement each other. This is the way God has created us and He knew what He was doing.

### *Authority*

In a normally organized family the children accept the authority of the parents and the spouses the authority of each other in clearly divided competences. One should not expect children to accept the authority of their parents if the parents do not show respect to the grandparents and to each other. How can we expect children to respect their father if he is not shown respect by his wife? How can they respect their mother when she is not respected by her husband? Authority can be exercised by fear, penalties and shouting. But it is much more durable and authentic when it is learned by imitation. Who shows no respect, will not be respected by others either.

Nowadays families experience a crisis of authority. It almost never happens now that a boy would kiss his father's hand. Traditionally the father was respected because he was the breadwinner and mother because she gave birth. Today most commonly the paid work a father does is insufficient to maintain the family, thus also the mothers seek employment. Also there exist families without a father, supported by the mother only. In such families, even if the father pays for his children, they hardly notice that he contributes to their upkeep. When both parents are employed both have to participate in household work. The differences between the parents become blurred. Of course she continues to be the life giver and he when performing the household chores, usually much less efficiently than she does, appears to be of lesser value. Of itself his paternity commands little respect. Not being the sole breadwinner his authority declines.

It declines also because men are decreasingly masculine.

### *Emancipation and feminism*

The women emancipation movement, and now the feminist movement, aim at obliterating differences between sexes. It is obvious that for the same work the pay should be the same. However every director or chief of employment in any enterprise knows that a man's and woman's work are of different value. They are suited for different jobs. They have different psychological predispositions and different biological limitations. As Chesterton used to jest the emancipists had a slogan: "we will not be dictated to" and then they all promptly became stenotypists. It turned out that they are perfectly suited for the job of a secretary. They can care about details, they can think about and remember several issues simultaneously, they can sense the mood of the boss, they can mollify tensions. On the other hand they are usually less successful in executive positions. They take decisions more on the basis of feeling than reason, at times of crisis they break down more easily, they have less initiative.

Of course there are exceptions. There are women who are more self-confident, more industrious, tough. We say that they behave manly. All of these characteristics are considered complimentary, flattering, enhancing their value. The fact that such women do exist lies at the base of the emancipation and feminists programs. They claim that these are acquired characteristics and that every woman could acquire them and that if they lack them it is because they have been relegated to subordinate roles.

There are of course exceptions in the opposite direction. There are men with feminine traits, behaving like a woman, effeminate. These are not compliments and nobody consciously directs upbringing towards this condition.

The aim do rear everyone in the same direction, in the direction of masculinity, in fact insults women. It downgrades femininity. It treats femininity as worthless, of lesser value, as a state from which one should try to liberate oneself. Increasingly frequently the traditional respect for women vanishes. She is no longer treated as the weaker sex deserving special consideration. Such niceties as allowing a woman first through the door, as lending her a hand, as rendering a place on the bus, as serving her first at the table etc, are disappearing elements of special respect for the weaker sex. Housework is treated with contempt as is evidenced by such expressions as “non-working wife”. This is highly insulting. Housewives are very hard working women.

Aiming for equality with men women have decided to abandon the ballast of femininity, which hinders their careers. That means abandoning everything that is connected with maternity. And maternity we have less and less.

### *Abortion*

One of the prime aims of the feminist cause is to have access to abortion on demand. This is advertised as a right to one’s own body, as right to choose, as a right to dispose of the unwanted ballast of maternity. Quite apart from all the other negative consequences of abortion it also demasculinises the father of the killed baby. By the will of the mother the father of the child is deprived of his paternity. He was a father but he ceases to be one. This has a tremendous consequence on the self-consciousness of men. They cease to feel responsible for procreation. It is the mother, if she so wishes, that will give birth to a child and will make the man a father, but if she wishes not she will kill the child and he will no longer be a father. Paternity ceases to depend on his will.

As a result he ceases to feel responsible for paternity. When he does not want to be a father he compels his wife or partner to have an abortion. He complains that she did not protect herself, that she did not use contraceptives. Abortion becomes the ultimate contraceptive. By accepting contraception and abortion men deprive themselves of masculinity.

### *Contraception*

Contraception is nothing less than cancellation of the biological consequences of copulation. It amounts to elimination of the procreative function from the sex act. The pleasure associated with the sex act is indulged in but without openness to its primary biological purpose. During an infertile sexual act, not only the occasional partner but also the husband or wife becomes a supplier of pleasure, an object for quenching desires and nothing more. Instead of being a subject of love he or she becomes its object. Spousal giving transforms into taking, into using the other person.

Closing oneself to procreation challenges fertility. The present demographic crisis of the Western world is its consequence.

Formerly condoms were used only during casual, extramarital sexual contacts, in order not to complicate fornication with extramarital pregnancies. Today they have frequently become the norm also within the marriage context in order not to complicate professional life with an unwanted pregnancy. In fact coitus without a condom can be prosecuted as a rape. Today youth who get drunk are told “don’t drink”, those who take drugs are told “don’t take drugs”, those who drive too fast are

told “don’t drive too fast”, but those who are sexually active are told “use contraceptives”. In many countries in order to reduce teenage pregnancies contraceptives are distributed by schools, even without parental knowledge. Economic aid to poor countries is often made dependent on consent to accept contraceptives and to allow their promotion. To combat AIDS and other venereal diseases use of condoms is recommended. All of this encourages sexual promiscuity. On the other hand it is well known that the promotion of sexual continence and marital fidelity are much more successful in the struggle to reduce teenage pregnancies and venereal diseases, including AIDS, as is demonstrated by the example of Uganda.

The commonness of contraception has resulted in a disconnection between family life and sexual activity. To enrich this activity various perversions became trendy, all of them sterile. Since the aim is no longer procreation but only sexual pleasure it became irrelevant with whom it is attained. When sexual activity is directed towards fertility, for the benefit of the children, for their security and proper upbringing, permanent unions are necessary. For pleasure alone they need not be permanent. It is sufficient that they last while they are pleasurable. Lacking responsibility for children, for the family, for its psychological and moral health, frequent changing of partners, homosexuality, group sex and other perversions are indulged in depending on what happens to give pleasure. Contracepted sex acts amount to self abuse, even if achieved with the participation of a spouse, partner or partners.

### *Demasculinisation*

Today it is becoming increasingly obvious that contraception is having another consequence. It not only makes the sexual act infertile, but it also reduces the capacity for procreation. There are increasing numbers of signals that hormonal contraceptive pills make infertile not only the woman using them, after all she is using them for that purpose, but also everybody around. These hormones are excreted with urine, they enter into communal sewage, they are not picked up by the purification plants and return back to humans through the water system. They deprive women of ovulation capacity, after all that is their purpose, but in men they result in a lowering of the sperm count. The demasculinisation and infertility of fish in rivers below big towns is well documented. At the same time a reduction in the viability of human sperm cells by 30% to 70% over the last 20 years in all men is also observed. Increasingly frequently this is being explained as a consequence of hormones from contraceptives entering the male organism.

Ichtiologists, (fish experts), from the Canadian Department of Fisheries and Oceans claim that estrogens from contraceptive pills are responsible for the feminisation and infertility of male fish in the Ottawa River (*The Ottawa Citizen* 5.I.02 – after *The Wanderer* 31.I.02). Karen Kidd from the Canadian Freshwater Institute has conducted a study in a fresh water lake remote from civilisation by throwing into it for 3 years estrogen contraceptive pills. The fish underwent feminisation; their population drastically fell, for some species even to zero and male individuals started producing proteins typical of egg cells (*The Wanderer* 31.VII.03). It was found that below the sewage purification plants of Denver and Boulder cities in Colorado there live female fish, some fish with deformed sexual organs so that it is not possible establish their sex

and a minimal number of male fish. Above these plants the sex proportion of fish is normal. The study suggests that the reason for this is estrogen from oral contraceptives (*Christian Political Action Newsletter* Autumn 2004). A similar report came recently from Pennsylvania, from the Susquehanna River (*The Wanderer* 24.XI.05). A study conducted in Europe was reported by a member of the European Parliament, dr. Michl Ebner, in a paper he gave at the European Parliament on 9.III.05 (Hormone und Medikamente in Gewässern Gefahren für Mensch und Tier). The conclusions were the same.

I recently read a futuristic book entitled *The Children of Men*, by P.D. James (Warner Books 1994) in which a world is described dying for lack of fertility in men. The scenario is Oxford without studying youngsters, where the teaching staff has no purpose, where there is no hope for the future, where paternal instincts are being quenched by love of cats and dolls. When finally a single pregnancy appears it becomes the most important event in the whole world. The book does not provide a reason for the disappearance of fertility, but we are slowly beginning to observe its decline in the world dominated by the contraceptive mentality.

#### *Fertilisation in vitro*

There are attempts to cure the growing infertility by *in vitro* fertilisation. Of course this is not healing, because fertility is not returned, but sometimes it does give the badly wanted baby, usually at a cost of life to many others that have been conceived and later destroyed or frozen. The problem however is that this child is given by the medical team. The husband at best is the donor of the sperm, but he gives it not to his wife but to the medical team. If his sperm is insufficiently viable, use is made of sperm from an anonymous donor. He becomes a “father” of not his own child. This is not the same as adoption, because in adoption the toil of supporting a child is taken up with love, in the interest of the child. In the *in vitro* procedure it is taken up from the selfish desire to have one’s own progeny at the expense of several others destroyed in the process and with the consent for the replacement of the sex act with a medical manipulation.

#### *Families with many children*

The world of today looks with derision at families with many children. They are treated not as a blessing but as a social problem, in one line with single mothers, pathological families, the disabled etc. Parents of a large brood of children are looked upon as people who are unable to deal with their own fertility. They are being offered “help” by providing them information about contraceptive techniques, about the option for sterilization, about abortion. Nobody considers a father of such a family as being particularly manly. He is deemed irresponsible; someone who procreated many children and now is incapable of supporting them, someone who needs help from others to support the consequences of his sexual appetite.

After successive deliveries mothers of several children are being molested in the hospitals with suggestions how to protect themselves against the next pregnancy. If the delivery was by caesarean sterilization is proposed by tying up the fallopian tubes.

Employers try to defend themselves from female employees that are frequently pregnant.

Husbands are having difficulty supporting a large family because the system of tax reductions, family assistance, social security, including retirement benefits for unemployed mothers, are insufficient to ensure from a single income a proper standard of living for the family, regardless of the job the husband has. On the one hand we have unemployment and on the other an economic necessity to have two incomes in the family. Without these two incomes it is not possible to get mortgage on the house, there is not enough money for higher education of all children, and sometimes even not enough for food and clothing. Children come hungry to school. A father of such a family appears incompetent. At best he is only a semi-breadwinner. The other half has to be supplied by the mother or by social help services.

### *Promotion of homosexuality*

According to the obligatory political correctness of the western world homosexuality is an example of true masculinity. Gays are the heroes of the most trendy books and films. It is not only the fornication with other men that is promoted but also the courage to publicly admit it. Promotion of the so called "gay culture" and demands for its acceptance are the veritable essence of 21st century masculinity.

However, it is clearly shown by all serious studies of the homosexual condition that it is an upbringing defect. It is a consequence of upbringing by a dominant mother with the simultaneous educational absence of a father. This is an upbringing without paternal authority, without a positive model of masculinity. Boys deprived of positive masculine examples will avoid boys' games, will become effeminate. We have an increasing number of households where only the mother rears children, where the father, as a person responsible for the family, does not exist. We have an increasing number of men incapable of responsibility for their families, sexually active, but demasculinised. And we have an increasing number of homosexuals, that is people who are devoid true masculinity.

\*

Let us face the truth. To procreate children, to bring them up and support them is manly. To lead an active sex life for pleasure but avoiding having children, avoiding the consequences of one's fertility is unmanly, even infantile. Contraception and abortion are the basic means of depriving men of manly virtues, of demasculinising them.

As a consequence men freed from responsibility for their sexuality increasingly frequently lose also their other masculine traits. Not only do they decorate themselves with earrings, fancy hairdos and colourful garments but also lose other features of manhood. Strength is being replaced by brutality, courage by recklessness, reasonableness by rowdiness, perseverance by resignation, stamina by escapism, protectiveness by light heartiness and so on. As distinct from the feminists they are not trying to adopt the positive traits of the opposite sex, because they do not find them attractive. But they accept in themselves the opposites of positive masculine traits. They are becoming increasingly irresponsible, both for themselves and for others.

That is where the political correctness, promoted today in international bodies, such as the European Union, leads us.

## **Demasculinisation of men**

### **Sex issues in the EU**

Dead constitution

gender equality (6 times)

discrimination on sex or sexual orientation

cross-border availability of health services

Resuscitation

Back door

In many documents – majority exists

### **Masculinity and femininity**

Political correctness,

EU, CoE, UN

women studies

women on tractors

equal suitability for jobs

Yet we differ

at home, away from home

work done and work undone

Psychological differences – examples

complementarity

### **Authority**

Respect of grandparents and spouses

Example better than fear

Source of authority – life-giver, bread-winner

Co-breadwinners

Both in household chores, man less effective

Single mothers

Respect from paternity?

Decreasing masculinity

### **Emancipation and feminism**

Obliterate differences

Work of different value

Chesterton, secretaries

Exceptions, manly women

On this feminist movement based

Effeminate men

Rearing all in direction of masculinity

debases femininity

traditional respect for the weaker sex

respect for work in the home

Abandon ballast of femininity, of maternity

Maternity declines

### **Abortion**

On demand, right to choose

Demasculinises the father

He loses responsibility for paternity  
demands she protects herself  
abortion the ultimate contraceptive

### **Contraception**

Abolish consequences of copulation  
Sterile sex act, without biological purpose  
Pleasure sole aim  
Partner or spouse object not subject of love  
Fertility and demography  
Condoms, also in marriage context  
Rape when without  
Teaching youngsters (don't)  
to reduce pregnancies  
to avoid venereal diseases, incl. AIDS,  
Uganda example  
Disconnection between family life and sexual activity  
Responsibility for children and family  
Enrich sex activity  
End when no longer pleasurable  
Perversions, all sterile  
Self-abuse, with others

### **Demasculinisation**

Spreading infertility  
Contraceptives, urine, sewage plants, water system  
Deprive of ovulation, lower sperm count, down 30-70%  
Example of fish  
*The Children of Men* P.D. James, 1994

### **Fertilisation in vitro**

Not healing  
Other possibilities  
Killing or freezing some  
Replacement of sex act with medical manipulation  
Team gives baby  
Father donor of sperm

### **Families with many children**

Considered with derision, as a social problem  
Father considered irresponsible  
Molested by contraceptive advice, abortion, sterilisation  
Employers do not like multiple mothers  
Single income insufficient  
Semi-breadwinner

### **Homosexuality**

Advertised as masculine  
Outing = heroism  
"Gay culture" trendy  
Upbringing defect

Dominating mother – absent father  
Absent models of masculinity  
Sexually active but devoid of true masculinity

### **Conclusions**

Let us face the truth. To procreate children, to bring them up and support them is manly. To lead an active sex life for pleasure but avoiding having children, avoiding the consequences of one's fertility is unmanly, even infantile. Contraception and abortion are the basic means of depriving men of manly virtues, of demasculinising them.

As a consequence men freed from responsibility for their sexuality increasingly frequently loose also their other masculine traits. Not only do they decorate themselves with earrings, fancy hairdos and colourful garments but also loose other features of manhood. Strength is being replaced by brutality, courage by recklessness, reasonableness by rowdiness, perseverance by resignation, stamina by escapism, protectiveness by light heartiness and so on. As distinct from the feminists they are not trying to adopt the positive traits of the opposite sex, because they do not find them attractive. But they accept in themselves the opposites of positive masculine traits. They are becoming increasingly irresponsible, both for themselves and for others.

That is where the political correctness, promoted today in international bodies, such as the European Union, leads us.