



Boston Catholic Journal

www.boston-catholic-journal.com
editor@boston-catholic-journal.com



GENDER WARS

There is something as conspicuously absent in as many men today as something else is extraordinarily absent in many women. And both pertain to a dearth though an extraordinary permutation. What are they?

- **Manly men**
- **Womanly women**

It is the ideological repudiation of unmitigated gender.

What do I mean? The clear (readily apprehensible) distinction between men and women, both in behavior, appearance, and expectations, has radically diminished in the present generation; in fact, by a very clear agendum — a political and social correctitude foisted upon us by the liberal apparatus — the distinction has become so attenuated in some circles as to have become permeable. This is particularly true in academia, and exceptionally true in the Church.

Before the priest-pedophile scandal — the epicenter of which was here, in Boston — it was not uncommon to find a parish priest with all the effeminate mannerisms, vocal inflections, and physical sashaying associated with “liberated/outed” homosexuals. The excessively affected hand gestures more typical of a woman than a man, the lisping speech and delicate affectations did little to conceal his being homosexual. We all knew it. And we “correctly” said nothing ... until he raped our little boys and scores of other boys. It was only when the *secular law* took the moral high-ground (to the damnable shame of the bishops) that we recognized our own complicity in it by giving the “gay” priest a pass through overlooking the obvious.

The Cross and Dressing ... or Cross-Dressing?

Men have become increasingly feminized and submissive and women have become increasingly masculinized and dominant. Effeminate men and butch women. How did this happen? And how did it manage even to pervade the Church despite three millennia of unequivocal teaching explicitly prohibiting it?

Thou shall not Cross-Dress

God Himself is quite clear about this:

"A woman shall not be clothed with man's apparel, neither shall a man use woman's apparel: for he that doeth these things is abominable before God." (Deuteronomy 22:5)

Part of carrying one's Cross has always been radicated in gender and the temptations of the flesh — as we see above for both men and women. This is the clearest proscription against homosexuality together with that of Saint Paul:

"For this cause God delivered them up to shameful affections. For their women have changed the natural use into that use which is against nature. And, in like manner, the men also, leaving the natural use of the women, have burned in their lusts one towards another, men with men working that which is filthy, and receiving in themselves the recompense which was due to their error." (Romans 1:24-27)

How have the divine commandments been supplanted by municipal ordinances, state and federal sanctions? And how can we conscionably comply with these ordinances when:

"Peter and the Apostles answering, said: We ought to obey God, rather than men." (Acts 5.29)

How is a society to be deemed "free" when it not only *prescinds from*, but *legislates against* the most fundamental freedom of the individual conscience that has been informed by over 2000 years of Christian teaching — teaching which explicitly contradicts current State "policy"? With whom, then, do we stand? With God or man? With the Apostles or the politicians?

Conscience cannot be "legislated". We have learned nothing from Nazi Germany or Stalinist Russia. *The Nuremberg Laws* of 1933 were State policy: Jews, Slavs, and the handicapped are non-persons. It was law. It was *policy*. It was the steel fist of the state driven by the engine of uncompromising ideology. Its stamp was final. You either thought "correctly" — or literally ceased to think. Are there parallels here? If there are not, then we are blind ... or there are no such things as concurrent lines perpetually equidistant.

But we digress. Let us look a little more closely at this mutation, or permutation, between the sexes that is the *fundamental* ideology behind the *superficial* agenda of feminism and how it appears to have unfolded under the guise of “equality”. Being equal is not being the same. Being *equal* in the polity does not equate with being the *same* in gender, still less the broader effort to abolish the *concept* of gender despite its biological intransigence.

Men and women — if we admit to the distinction. Often they wear the same clothes and the same hair styles (women with hair as short as men, men with hair as long as women — though, happily, less so now than 30 years ago) and more than once you have asked yourself in genuine perplexity, “Is that a man or a woman ... a manly woman or a womanly man?” Sometimes you have been unable to reach an honestly definitive conclusion.

Perhaps the precursor to the vector of this mutation lies in “Rosie the Riveter” of the World War II era when women assumed jobs in dominantly male industries (welders, riveters, machinists, etc.) because the men were shipped off to war and needed the matériel to sustain it). Dressing themselves appropriately for the job, they donned slacks and other forms of erstwhile exclusively masculine attire — which they promptly put aside upon returning home and disposed of altogether when the war ended.

However, another war followed; one that did not pit nation against nation, or one political theory against another antagonistic to it, but something far more fundamental — a unilateral war, in fact, between biology and ideology; a war instigated and perpetrated by man — upon his very nature as human. Biology (apart from man’s manipulation of it), most would agree, is, at its most basic level, immutable: your gender, the color of your eyes, your anatomical structure, is determined at the most irreducible cellular level — in the DNA encoding that determines every physiological aspect pertaining to you even before your birth.

In Hollywood’s G.I. Jane of 1997, Demi Moore sports a recruit haircut to the scalp, ambitious to prove herself (as a paradigm for all women) as equally masculine, physically strong and strong-willed; as adept at close-hand combat, *mano-a-mano*, as in uttering a string of expletives after soundly stomping her seasoned, war-tested (Ranger, Navy Seal, Green Beret) drill instructor, 100 pounds heavier and one foot taller — as any man. In fact she just beat the best of them! The other (male) recruits, following the tiresomely predictable script, adulate her with cheers and embrace her as one of their own, as “one of the guys”, and off they go to have a beer, spit lungers, adjust their crotches, and pepper their speech with F-bombs. G.I. Jane is definitely “high-speed”.

Another, and far more likely contributor, was the implementation of Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, which mandated that public education treat males and females equally: dresses could not be required of female students and dress codes changed in public schools across the United States.

The Mother of All Wars

Apart from sin against God, this gender war, which — illogically — is at the same time a gender transmutation, is the most vile and contemptuous war ever waged. It is the most basic war ever waged — greater than nation against nation, culture against culture, or religion against religion. All such wars pall in significance because the malice is far more fundamental, cutting across all borders, all languages, all ethnicities in every culture and in every civilization in which this poisonous seed has been sown, nourished, and cultivated by Militant Feminism and an absolutely intolerant Homofascist lobby that sashays through the halls of Congress, state houses, and the halls of academia (not having children, there is much money to spend lobbying, and no small number of venal politicians). It is the mother of all wars, to use one madman's infamous phrase.

It is nothing less than the seed of destruction for every nation, every religion, every population ... and in the end, of humanity itself.

More accurately understood, it is a bitter, uncompromising, *unilateral* and ideological war by one *species* of humans against another species of humans (an *intraspecific* war, if you will, between species of the same genus) predicated solely on biological and ontological differences *inherent within* and *constituting the definition of* the genus itself to which both species belong. This is not simply a philosophical and biological perspective, but is necessary to understand the magnitude and the madness inherent in such a war.

It is instigated solely by one species to the end of effectively abrogating the *differentiation* within the genus itself, either by eliminating the species (which would *eo ipso* eliminate the genus) or, that failing, attempt to assimilate the species by negating any differentiation between them.

The insanity, or perhaps better yet, *madness*, is instigated by an unrelenting malice toward one human gender by the other: the malice toward men as men by women as *wannabe* men.

Simply put, it is Feminism ...

Its genesis lies in the unabashed triumph of masculinated Feminism over a once unapologetic masculinity. Let me explain.

It has little to do with the aspiration to acquire what are viewed as the prerogatives of men, and much, apparently, to do with the aspiration, not to abolish masculinity, but to *acquire* it; and if this cannot be achieved biologically, then it attempts to acquire the semblance of it, the closest proximity to it, through legislation, agitation, “social action”, and so on. There are, apparently, many women who, quite frankly, *envy* men. No, not just the presumed prerogatives of men, but *masculinity itself*. Far from being the champions of women, Feminism, in its ideological DNA,

appears to wish to **abolish women**, to extirpate femininity, as though womanhood were inferior to manhood; as though femininity were an epithet rather than a virtue. Many do not simply want parity with men, or even superiority over them ... but to **be** men. Hence, the masculinized woman: assertive, aggressive, powerful, working out with weights, body-building, tattooed, having Harleys and helmets as much as business “powersuits” ... any similitude that accrues to masculinity. Didn’t Freud say something about this?

But this is the logical surd: women ideologically antagonistic to men and expressing this antagonism by striving for masculinity, that is to say, for the very thing they purportedly detest. Another way of looking at it is the desire to abolish the masculinity of men by supplanting it with the masculinity of women. Unable to abolish it biologically, they co-opt it (as von Clausewitz would say) “by other means”. They will avenge themselves on the other species ... by **becoming** the other species!

Allies

Of course, there is a reciprocal partnership in this war on biology: the men who wish to be women. It is the complete inversion of Feminism. Attempting to abolish their own masculinity, they strive precisely for what Feminism repudiates. They are not the casualties of feminism; to the contrary, they are its closest allies. *Homofascisti* and *Feminofascists*. This alignment forms, well, an Axis around which complementary ideologies revolve. Neither Hitler nor Mussolini tolerated any opposing view, and any opposing party was summarily dealt with — demonized, marginalized, and worse. There is little difference between character assassination and summary execution: the opposition is rendered ineffective, inert. The propaganda of feminism and homofascism is no different. Intolerance is not to be tolerated! There is only one *correct* way of thinking. And if you value your livelihood, your character, your own integrity ... you had better step in line ...

Watch what you say

In a free and open society that is less afraid of its own government than any foreign enemy possibly lurking at its borders, the right to freedom of speech, expression, and especially religious belief is the definition of a free and open society. There is no Party line to toe ... and which to breach, would cost you your freedom. But who is the guarantor of this freedom of speech, expression, and especially religious belief and its observance? In America it is not invested in a person, but in a much abused parchment we call the United States Constitution. The freedoms we cherish are indited therein. While a small, elite, moneyed, and privileged few are allowed and encouraged to enjoy them ... “*We the people*” (at large) exercise them at our peril. In our history was our own freedom less precarious?



Copyright © 2004 - 2014 Boston Catholic Journal. All rights reserved.