

# ATTACKS ON FATHERHOOD ARE ATTACKS ON NATURE

[Bill Donohue](#)

Attacking men, especially white, Christian, heterosexual men, is a popular sport enjoyed by left-wing pundits and activists. This is driven home every Father's Day. Normal people do not get exercised over this special day, but these folks do.

In New York State, there is a bill, supported by Democrats, to replace "father" with "non-gestating parent," and to call a "putative" father, meaning a deadbeat dad, "an alleged parent."

Why the adoption of "neutral" terms? Who is offended by calling fathers "fathers"? Radical gays and radical feminists object. They have long been at war with nature so this bill does not surprise. But why?

Radical gays, especially those who claim to be "married," object that terms like "father" and "mother" are exclusionary, leaving people like them out of familial conversations and governmental policies. They are right about that. But it is not men—it is nature—that has excluded them. To be blunt, nature has determined that people of the same sex cannot reproduce. That was part of God's design.

The problem for radical gays is that they do not believe in human nature: they think everything that exists is a "social construct." But male and female genital organs are not a "social construct"—they are an anatomical reality. Gays can carp all they want, but nature exists and they cannot change what it has ordained. It is a fight they cannot win. God has seen to that, and it is useless to try to defeat Him.

Radical feminists deplore "patriarchy." But there is a reason

why it is universal: men are predisposed, as a function of nature, to rule. How so? Sociologist Steven Goldberg, who wrote a classical book on this subject, found that male dominance can be explained by hormonal factors such as the higher levels of testosterone that males have. As he noted, "*the hormonal renders the social inevitable* (italics in the original)."

Radical feminists like to point out that Goldberg's thesis was contradicted by anthropologist Margaret Mead. Wrong. "Nowhere do I suggest that I have found any material which disproves the existence of sex differences." She even went so far as to say, "It is true, as Professor Goldberg points out, that all claims so glibly made about societies ruled by women are nonsense. We have no reason to believe that they ever existed."

In other words, radical gays and radical feminists can beat up on men, and especially fathers, all they want. But in the end, fatherhood is real and exclusionary, and so is patriarchy. The radicals may not like it, but most women throughout history have never had a problem with any of this. It's only those with a fanciful ideological agenda who bitch about it.

Happy Father's Day!