

## Complimentary and Complementary

**MAN AND WOMAN** should compliment each other; i.e. they should give each other proper honour, courtesy, respect and reserve.

Significantly, those accustomed to paying compliments to the opposite sex do not seem to have any problem with complementarity.

Men and women are meant by God to complement each other, i.e. to "complete each other", by a sharing of their respective masculine and feminine abilities, innate talents, qualities with which they were born.

This is called the **complementarity of the sexes**. It is the foundation of marriage, family and society. It has a multitude of aspects: psychological, emotional, intellectual and spiritual, as well as bodily.

### UNISEX

**FEMINISM, on the other hand, is a unisex philosophy.** It rejects sexual complementarity, and inhibits complimenting each other as well.

**Unisex maintains that the sexes are inter-changeable.** It is often linked, at least in the lateral thinking of fuzzy logic, with co-education, cohabitation, contraception, homosexual acts, abortion, and demythologizing and deconstruction philosophies.

Unisex lacks understanding of masculinity and femininity, or even denies that there is any difference, except for reproductive organs.

**Feminists** are dissatisfied with their sexual and social status. Feminists mostly seem to lack the attractive femininity of real women. And there are male 'feminists', too; cf. the witticism in Charles Dicken's *Dombey and Son*, where the author mentions afternoon tea parties "attended by the old women of both sexes".

**It is simply not true** that traditional society was geared to making boys grow up into "male-chauvinist pigs". Even casual observation shows that social custom tames the brute in boys, and gradually fits them to become husbands and fathers. The tragedy is that the acceptance of unisex thinking is rendering girls less fit to become wives and mothers.

**Unfortunately, there are clerics** who subscribe to the unisexist manifesto; hence their support for women priests. Earlier on, they supported Marxism and Liberation Theology. We can hardly taunt politicians with stupidity or cowardice, over unisex, or any other matter, considering our own shoddy performance.

### CATHOLICS AND COMPLEMENTARITY

**THE CATHOLIC CHURCH** and common sense both affirm complementarity:

Everyone, man and woman, should acknowledge and accept his sexual *identity*. Physical, moral, and spiritual *difference* and *complementarity* are oriented towards the goods of marriage and flourishing of family life. The harmony of the couple and of society depends in part on the way in which the complementarity, needs, and mutual support between the sexes are lived out.

*Catechism of the Catholic Church* (CCC) 2333 (including the *italics*). See also 372 and 2357.

The idea of *complementarity*, but not the word itself, is Vatican II teaching, and it flatly contradicts unisex:

Make full allowance for the difference of sex and for the particular role which Providence has appointed to each sex in the family and in society.

*Declaration on Christian Education §8 (Gravissimum Educationis = GE).*

GE is about education in the fullest sense. It does not treat of schools till GE§5. Indeed, GE§1 is about an upbringing at home, and it is in that chapter that the reference is made to "a positive and prudent education in matters of sex". In 1975, these vital words were **quoted out of their proper context** of an upbringing at home, to justify classroom "sex ed" in schools, and this over the signature of an auxiliary archbishop. 'Sex-ed' has been a vehicle for unisex.

Similarly:

The tendency to turn women into men and girls into boys, in speech, dress, deeds and work weakens the complementarity of the sexes and the capacity of women to ennoble men — hence a weakening of marriage, family and civilization.

*Catholic Family Catechism Disciples' Edition* p. 111.

### BOYS WILL BE BOYS

**MODERN** boys are victims: hardly any organizations allow boys without girls; not even the Scouts, though Girl Guides continue to be for girls only. Again, St Vincent de Paul Society parish conferences used to be for men only. They failed to recruit younger men, and were pressured into admitting women.

This is refuted in Appendix 3 of *Bush Boys on the Move* (p. 495):

The Bush Boys books are about boys. Boys do not read books about girls. Girls, however, revel in both. The contrast exemplifies the difference between the sexes.

God made them male and female, to **complement** each other in marriage and with a family. The sexes are not the same and are not interchangeable. They are specializations, though overlapping. Thus the husband is usually the breadwinner, the wife the homemaker. And it really works.

An upbringing for complementarity involves activities for boys and girls together, and some for boys and girls separately.

This book suggests some activities for boys without girls.

### QUOTAS

**ONE** *difference* between the sexes is that leadership is more strongly linked with the male sex. This does not mean that all men are good leaders. Nor does it mean that women can never be leaders. But it does mean that, *on the average*, leadership is more suited to men than to women. Only a pagan society as unthinking and immoral as ours could fail to see it.

Male leadership includes service of, and self-sacrifice for women, not bullying and emotional blackmail.

The basic error behind quotas for women, and quotas for leadership by women, is an **unstated major premise** in the unisex syllogism. They simply take it for granted that women should have roles and leadership roles on a percentage basis... plus affirmative-action thrown in to ensure more women than men! An alleged injustice is to be countered by a certain injustice!

This unisexist fallacy must be challenged.

Further, if 50% of the leadership is compulsorily reserved for women, irrespective of merit, there will not be enough homemakers. Enforced percentages are anti-family, anti-motherhood, and therefore anti-children. And it is anti-leadership, because on the average, leadership suits men more than women.

### "INCLUSIVE LANGUAGE"

**SO-CALLED** inclusive language is a grievance invented to further the feminist unisex theory.

Because **unisexists** do not recognize the partnership involved in complementarity, they cannot abide the male **sharing his pronouns** (he, him, his) with women; nor indeed of women agreeing to share them.

Nor will they accept the chivalry, albeit symbolic, in women having their own **unsharable pronouns** (she, her, hers) all to themselves. Also, they repudiate chivalry.

Note that extreme feminists have coined a new spelling, WOMYN.

Even the Australian Catholic Bishops' Conference have changed CHAIRMAN to chair. But the "-man" in "chairman" means "hand", not male man, vir. And it is as nonsensical as changing 'person' to 'perhumyn'...

An insightful bishop used tell a joke: "A woman fell overboard. Another woman shrieked, and pointed down at a triangular fin moving swiftly towards the woman in the water. 'Shark!' she screamed. However, a third woman cried soothingly, 'Not to worry: it's a man-eater.'"

George Orwell, author of *1984* and *Animal Farm*, said some theories were so crazy that only an academic could believe them. Sir Paul Hasluck (a former Australian Governor General) said that it was the mark of an education to be able to tell when people were talking nonsense. In an exchange of letters in *The Australian*, Father John O'Neill chided a certain archbishop who was pleading for 'inclusive language': "Don't be silly, Your Grace; don't be silly."

### ENGLISH LEAST AMISS

**THE JOURNAL** of the Australian Confraternity of Catholic Clergy, *The Priest*, May, 2004, had an important article by Father Paul Mankowski SJ:

Inclusivists often claim that [...] English is especially poor in gender-neutral expressions [...] **This view gets the actual linguistic situation exactly backwards.** It is English that has a predominance of gender-neutral components, indeed, it is only because its gender inflections are so rare that the "inclusivist" proposal is even conceivable. For an English speaker, locutions like "he or she" and "his or her" are awkward and unnecessary, but manageable — just. Yet if anything remotely like the inclusivist project were imported into a European language, they would simply break

down and grind to a halt.

He went on to 'inclusivize' Isaiah 41:11 in French: to show up its cumbersome nonsense. Then:

...This points to an intellectual embarrassment that inclusivists have, to a man, refused to address: how can one accept the feminine theory of "grammar as linguistic injustice" as applied to English, while ignoring the necessary entailment that it applies a *fortiori* [= all the more so] to French, Latin, Greek, Hebrew, and so on? Inclusivists don't face this challenge because they realize that their premises allow them only one possible response: a francophone [= French-speaking] woman... might not realize yet that she has been excluded, but with the proper ideological coaching she can be brought to consciousness of the injustice embedded in the grammatically *masculine* generic. To make such a response would be to concede the anti-inclusivist claim: a female sense of alienation must be created before it can be cured.

### TRADITION

**CHURCHMEN** (a soothing term for prelates and priests of the male sex) and the churchgoers of both sexes **never** had a problem with "man" and the pronouns until the second wave of feminism discovered or manufactured the grievance of "inclusive language". Prior to this, an early article by a first-wave feminist appeared in a paper called *The New Statesman*. Language was not yet a grievance.

### FIXING THINGS UP

#### **Promoting complementarity against unisex:**

- bring boys up to be gentlemen who esteem manliness;
- bring girls up to be ladies who esteem womanliness;
- Dad's example of strength at the service of women;
- Mum's example of ennobling the savagery of men;
- be pro-family despite academe, media, and evil laws;
- expose Satan's anti-truth and anti-self-control policies.

#### **Resisting immaturity/immorality from schooling:**

- no dumbing-down of intellect by pseudo-education;
- no to ego-philosophy: "I am special, I love me..."
- no to ego-philosophy: "It's boring..."
- no 'sex-ed' induced immorality;
- no feminist unisex falsehoods;
- no muddling *stage & state*; adolescents & teenagers.

#### **Correcting other "politically-correct" falsehoods:**

- evolution, atheism, amorality, immorality;
- multiculturalism destroying society and Christianity;
- shallow lifestyles: no time to read, think or pray;
- too easy access to mobiles, CD/sound, cars, credit.

#### **Restoring Catholicism:**

- be counter-cultural against the anti-Christian culture;
- learn the faith, apologetics, liturgy, morality;
- practise the faith: prayer, Confession, Mass, charity.

**"Better to light one small candle  
than to curse the darkness."**