

Letter to Editor

Our Thoughts About Social Gender.

Ralovich Béla^{1*}

¹Ministry of Welfare (retired), Budapest, Hungary.

***Corresponding Author:** Ralovich Béla, Professor, 8649 Balatonberény, Rozmaring utca 13. Hungary, Tel: 36-06-85-377-874.

Citation: Ralovich Béla (2023) Our Thoughts About Social Gender. *SciEnvironm* 6: 187.

Received: September 27, 2023; **Accepted:** October 05, 2023; **Published:** October 08, 2023.

Copyright: © 2023 Ralovich Béla. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

Members of the animal world together with human beings are systematized with the help of their exact scientific characteristics. Their genetically determined sex can be diagnosed on the basis of external stamps and organs. In contrast with this according to the gender theory, the roles of women and men in a modern society cannot be interpreted by their biological differences that is a person's social gender is not defined by his/her genetically determined anatomy. It is thought that social gender in a modern community is a reflection of the personal roles expected by a given society at a given time and place specifying the relationships between women and men.

In order to understand this problem clearly, we need to go back to the process of evolution. The sex of each living being has a genetic background. The sex of a person is determined by the combination of the Y and X chromosomes, the ancestors of which, the so-called protochromosomes, appeared in reptiles about 300 million years ago, as a result of mutation, in the form of the SRY gene. Depending on the presence of the XX or YX combination, a newborn will be female or male. As the result of this in his/her organism invisible hormonal and visible constitutional and behavioral differences can be observed that is his/her sex. The only exception is the rare true hermaphrodites, in whom both gene combinations are present.

There is a wide range of creature with known sex-dependent racial and individual forms of constitution and behavior. For example, stag beetles, bees, fish, birds, rodents, carnivores, ungulates, apes, anthropoid apes and humans.

If we examine the differences in the constitution and physiological processes of men and women then in general, female organisms are smaller and weaker - which is evidenced by the differences in the performance of male and

female athletes. Female animals are less colorful in appearance and less combative and dominant although there are exceptions in this respect (for example female dominance is characteristic of spotted hyenas).

In case of animals, sexual intercourse is determined only by the biological hormonal cycle/the occurrence of oestrus (together with special smell) of a female enabling the action of the dominant male, which is generally short in time but there are exceptions, too (for example dog, pig). It is not any mark of the joyful enjoyment during that fast process. We do not know any data that any member of the animal world establishes sexual intercourse only for pleasure. After oestrus or during pregnancy, females are unattractive or even aggressive and rejective when a male tries again, whereas in case of humans neither menstruation and pregnancy nor menopause mean an obstacle.

The first determining change happened when human beings could form sexual relationship independently from the oestrus and the intercourse became a source of pleasure. In the case of humans, man can always be ready and initiate a sexual relationship and he can even compete and fight for a female like animals, while a woman's role is more tolerant and the effect of her hormonal cycle is less important but spiritual, physical and existential aspects may also play role in her decision, especially nowadays, as a result of emancipation. The main motivation factor of their romance is the pleasantness of being together, that is the act. There are people who try to elongate the length of their pleasure with medicines. In the course of time the sexual relationship became a source of pleasure which separated from its original biological function. The question is, when did this happen in the past. The intimate being together belongs to the private sphere of the individuals with the exclusion of the outside world.

(It is possible that the cause of female genital mutilation, which still occurs today among some African peoples, started as a protection against female sexual aggressiveness. At the same time the circumcision of boys has been explained by hygienic considerations. And the value of virginity before marriage at a socially accepted age, which in the case of some peoples can still be observed today, may have evolved to prevent various problems arising from a licentious sexual life at a too young age.)

As far as reproduction is concerned, only females are responsible for laying insects-eggs and the hatching of fertilized eggs or the delivery, as well as feeding and caring for the offspring. Therefore, the motherly function and tenderness are also characteristic for them. Of course, there are exceptions, too. For example: in some fish species, the male protects their fertilized eggs and the hatchlings, or the cuckoo does not incubate her egg and feed her young, or there are bird species male members of which (the fathers) also feed etc.

Endurance of the relationship between female and male during their life is an interesting issue. From this point of view, individuals of some animal species are faithful (swans, wolves, gibbons, some kinds of eagles and vultures, some voles, etc.) while the others are disloyal (dogs, cats, cock, etc.). We do not know the cause and explanation of monogamy. In the case of humans, consciousness and social factors certainly play a role.

In case of ancient people before civilization or people still living in developing civilization conditions, in addition to biological and physiological features similar to anthropoid apes, human brain activity is already characteristic. Unfortunately, we have not found any information about their sexual life, but their coexistence was generally male-dominated although in some small ethnic groups, which already either disappeared or are in the process of transformation, there was/is a female-dominated system also which may have genetic and environmental causes

unknown to us. Some observations suggest that women living in such transforming societies are happy to see that their dominance decline.

Apart from these exceptions, the entire history of human society has been and is still characterized by male dominance, not by accident, but by the order of nature, and not in order to humanly oppress women. Nevertheless, due to the ignorance of menstruation, women's identity was not understood for a time and for this reason they were discriminated, too.

In conclusion, we can say, that those who deny the primary and determining role of genetically determined anatomy that is the sex in the society are wrong. The gender theory is not in accordance with nature.

Then what is the role of human coexistence/society in the determination of people's sex? It can be stated that a society has no effect on the formation of genetically determined biological sex of an embryo and hopefully never will even in the long run. Only the artificial birth control caused change in sex ratio of the population - see China.

And then what does the society have an effect on? It has only effect on the changing of people's sexual consciousness and behavior associated with it. There are three important points in this process. The first was mentioned above. The second important event was when the individuals' self-conception unnaturally separated from his/her genetical and anatomical background. These persons do not accept their genetically determined sex. The causes of this distortion are exactly unknown at present (mental, environmental and/or genetic problem.) The third event is the unnatural and forced emancipation of women. The fourth is the excessive domination of libertinism in the societies. (Everybody can do everything.)

Examples of the social influences are shame/religion, practical considerations, fashion as well as nowadays libertinism, sex-literature, films and television. These may explain why total nudity was followed by wearing waistcloths, then animal skins and, later, sex-dependent different textile clothing. Nowadays, we are dealing with textile and plastic clothing and footwear dictated by the most diverse fashion which have given up the original and, more recently, even the hygienic function of clothing (women's underwear, for example thongs) or do not ensure the development and maintenance of a healthy body structure (stilettos). Or another example is the revival of tattooing which has atavistic roots, despite the fact that we do not know any animal species whose members have tattoos. This fashion is currently spreading immoderately, although today's people already know well that the original tempting state of damaged skin can no longer be perfectly restored.

Because of increasing awareness and autonomy of the pleasure/excitement aspects of a sexual relationship therefore its biological function is pushed into the background. Sexual desire and relations can only be intimately and consciously performed in a regulated way in accordance with social conventions. It is certain that the sexual pleasure needs of individuals vary greatly, which in many cases can cause a decisive influence on the durability and fate of a relationship/marriage. As the sexual idea and habits of single persons may be very different during a romance the act can be performed in different positions, in unnatural places of a body and in disgusting ways, even in groups, and there are also other variations (animalism, sadism, masochism, using puppets, mechanical machines and drugs, spiced up with pornography). Spreading of these forms is supported by the sex literature and media. In principle, no objections can be raised to the practice and use of these forms, as long as they are carried out among

adult partners on a voluntary basis in a non-violent, non-advertised, intimate manner, not risking their own corporal integrity.

Because of libertinism and due to harmful effects experienced by children and young persons as well as certain mental dysfunctions or perhaps genetic deviations(?), pleasure/excitement can form between persons of the same sex, too.

As regards masturbation, it is closely linked to pleasure. In the case of children masturbation may appear by chance but there is evidence of the role of older person (speaking, showing). Adult and group masturbation is beyond the bounds of normality, but it is also a private matter as long as it is not performed before the public.

The author of this article has observed masturbation in the case of a monkey at the Budapest Zoo, but it is unknown whether ejaculation also occurred or not. In the case of this monkey, masturbation could have been triggered by accidental discovery and awareness of pleasure, but also by the animal's lower position in the group dominance order that is not being able to have access to a female or by other unknown reason. Otherwise, we have no other information about masturbating animals. Our opinion is that it can only occur in species with forelimbs suitable for grasping. On the other hand, we saw that a dog that could not find a partner carried standing out sexual exercise on a hanging sack or on the leg of a standing person, or that a caw of oestrous indicated that it was ready to mate by climbing onto its partner's back.

The harmful effect of lack or inadequacy of intimacy on the developing child is illustrated by a case which was seen by us in a village on a Sunday. A 5-6 year old smudgy boy with his willie hanging out illustrated on the pavement to people coming home from church, what and on which way his mum and dad did during a sexual-intercourse at home. What may be the later harmful consequence of such childhood experience on both for the demonstrator and the spectators of different ages, only a psychologist could tell. This example verifies that all aspects of sexuality are not public but intimate private matters. Furthermore, children with not yet fully developed personality must be protected, especially from unnatural influences, and their protection and education have been the responsibility of parents in the first place, but also of those who working in educational establishments. A state must ensure with appropriate legislation those conditions which are necessary for realization of the above-mentioned tasks.

One of the most crucial elements of the problem is that every child should and must only be reared and educated in accordance with his or her genetically determined visible sex which was officially determined by the doctor or midwife who conducted the birth and recorded the data in the birth register, until adulthood, when she or he can consciously and responsibly make a decision on his or her future destiny. In the pre-adult period, a doctor may only perform surgery based on medical indication or with parental request and authorization on true hermaphrodite and on those who suffering from a developmental disorder (adhesion of the foreskin, closed hymen, undescended testicles etc.), but this treatment must not alter the genetically determined external sexual organs of the child. Only an adult can request a sex altering surgery, but a doctor cannot be obliged to perform it, just like an artificial abortion except if it is a legally authorized one. Before the authorization of a sex altering operation, it would be advisable to introduce a compulsory information discourse similar to that which precedes the authorization of an artificial abortion in Hungary.

Unfortunately, there are those persons who, despite the fact that sexuality is not a public but strictly a private matter, referring to freedom, advertise their own deviant behavior in street manifestations, despite the fact that their demonstration is completely uninteresting and even repulsive for people of natural mind. At the same time, what is more serious, they do not take into account, that their actions can have harmful effect on the formation of personality of children and young people. (It would be advisable to apply the “keep away” principle used in the Hungarian Act of 1999 which is in connection with prostitution.)

In summary, all healthy societies have not any other expectations of their members as that they should be physically and mentally healthy, intellectually cultivated and useful members of the community in a form which is most appropriate to their abilities. Neither sexual deviance/aberration, nor libertinism are not among the listed expectations moreover the goal of the societies is to prevent formation of those conditions which are necessary for their appearance. Luckily great majority of the persons accept her/his sex in natural way and have lived the usual natural everyday life.