


Dariusz Oko

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9292-3472>

The Pontifical University of John Paul II in Kraków, Poland

 <https://ror.org/0583g9182>

Biology versus gender ideology: What we can learn from the successful lawsuit of Prof. Ulrich Kutschera

 <https://doi.org/10.15633/pch.15115>

Abstract

Professor Ulrich Kutschera, a renowned German biologist, is known not only for academic work but also for engaging the public in scientific debate. He strongly criticizes gender theory, which he considers pseudoscience, warning against its spread at universities and the misuse of research funding. Kutschera defends the biological family model as key to human development, a stance that led to public backlash and legal charges filed by a same-sex couple. After a lengthy trial, he was acquitted in all instances, presenting scientific arguments to support his position. Kutschera's case exemplifies resistance to ideologies imposed without scientific grounding, often enforced with totalitarian methods. His attitude evokes comparisons to Andrei Sakharov's fight against Soviet ideology. Kutschera stands as a model of courage in defending science, truth, and freedom—offering encouragement to those committed to the common good and the pursuit of truth.

Keywords

gender ideology, Moneyism, philosophical criticism of ideology, biological criticism of gender theory, homosexuality, totalitarianism in science and the state

Proponents of gender theory claim that it is a credible and well-founded theory that fulfils the contemporary requirements for scientific research. As a result, they demand that it becomes a universally accepted and permanent basis for all university and social life (especially education, politics, law, media, and art). In many countries, these demands have already been largely met, and powerful political forces are working to ensure that they are implemented everywhere and to the highest degree possible. However, the political success of those who support this theory does not contribute to its validity. Our historical experience and theoretical philosophical considerations show that even the most absurd and harmful theories can be imposed through violence and dominate not only entire countries but also continents if a sufficiently determined and politically, media, economically, or even militarily influential group of people imposes them. This has been the case with many forms of imperialism and nationalism but also with communism. In particular, gender theory appears to have much in common with communism – in fact, it seems to be its modern-day incarnation.¹

What gender theory and communism share is their alleged “scientific” character. Also, just like communism, gender theory is “free from violence.”² With these two traits, it has been under scrutiny (and consequently rejected) from various standpoints. However, in science, the most important arguments must be scientific and philosophical. Accordingly, we shall focus on them. It is impossible to overlook the fact that gender theory is heavily criticised especially in the field of biology. Biologists find it to be blatantly contradictory to biological data, so they usually treat it as yet another false ideology, a collective fantasy of humanists who lack the basic biological/natural knowledge and scientific integrity or do not fully adhere to the principles of formal logic and scientific methodology.

As soon as proponents of gender theory gain political power in a given country, they suppress or even prevent any criticism directed at themselves and their

¹ On the Marxist roots of gender ideology see, for example, K. Karoń, *Historia antykultury 1.0. Podstawy wiedzy społecznej*, Warszawa 2019, pp. 470–492; as well as D. Rozwadowski, *Marksizm kulturowy. 50 lat walki z cywilizacją Zachodu*, Warszawa 2018.

² As for meeting the requirements of scientific rigor, one can see the similarities between gender theory and communism while reading a work by Moscow Marxists that used to be particularly representative: P. N. Fiedosiejew, W. G. Afanasjew, K. N. Brutenc et al., *Naukowy komunizm* [Scientific communism], transl. by M. Skwieciński, Warszawa 1975. The book may discourage one from embracing communism, just like Leszek Kołakowski’s visit to Moscow and encounters with these types of specialists put him off.

theory (in this regard they are also similar to their spiritual, and sometimes actual, forefathers – communists). To conduct such criticism, aside from knowledge, scientific proficiency, and integrity, one also needs many courage to take risks and speak out for the truth. As was evident during communism, few scientists actually possess these traits. Therefore, as difficult as it was to find such heroes of truth then, so it remains now. Fortunately, there is too much honesty and nobility in most people for even the most totalitarian power to completely silence the voice of truth, critique, or opposition. Eventually, there will always be people like Andrei Sakharov, who, as one of the most eminent Russian physicists and later a Nobel Peace Prize laureate, challenged Soviet authorities. Thanks to his knowledge, he could no longer bear the alleged scientific truths (in reality absurd) that these authorities were guided by and which they were imposing on society by force. Subsequently, he was subjected to cruel persecution by these authorities to the full extent of their law. Significantly, his rebellion began with criticism of the biological theories of Trofim Lysenko, Joseph Stalin's golden boy, who, in the field of biology, propagated absurdities similar to those propagated by gender theorists today.³ Just as the absurdities proclaimed by Lysenko were unbearable for Sakharov, so too should the follies proclaimed by gender theorists be unbearable to us. Lysenko's anti-scientific theories were implemented in biology and agriculture with the aid of Soviet state apparatus violence, with resulting catastrophic consequences. Today, what is being implemented is anti-scientific gender theories.

1. Criticism directed at Professor from Kassel and his subsequent trial

It seems that one of the greatest dissidents in a similar mould to Andrey Sakharov, who has the requisite knowledge, skills, honesty, and courage to criticise theories that are tools in the hands of totalitarians, is the German professor of evolutionary biology and physiology, Ulrich Kutschera (born 1955). The author of over 300 scientific papers and 15 books, he is one of the most eminent biologists in the world. He has worked in leading scientific centres in Germany (mainly at the University in Kassel), the United States, and the United Kingdom.

³ On the life and activity of Trofim Lysenko see, for example, S. Amsterdamski, *Życie naukowe a monopol władzy (casus Łysenko)*, Warszawa 1981.

He feels a duty towards the integrity of the world of science and the consciousness of society. Many years ago, he started paying special attention to the theses of gender theory. Due to his vast biological knowledge, he realised that its various fundamental theses are ideological absurdities that have nothing to do with sound science. And yet they are very dangerous for they are politically imposed on the entire society which (the young generation in particular) is to be formed and governed by them.⁴

At first, prof. Kutschera started to criticise theses of the so-called “Darwinian feminism”, and then moved on to comprehensively scrutinise gender theory that seems to him an ideology.⁵ As a result, his fundamental oeuvre *Das Gender-Paradoxon* [The paradox of gender] was published in 2016 and immediately gained widespread recognition among experts on the subject.⁶ As a father of five children, he pays special attention to the homosexual ideology, which is at the centre of gender theory and poses a threat to the upbringing and education of children.

A critical remark he made on this issue, which was part of one of his interviews, had ramifications: he was taken to court. He said: “If the right to adoption were to be established for erotic relationships between men or between women, I see it as state-supported pedophilia and the worst violence against children.”⁷ Following this statement, two German homosexuals filed a judicial

⁴ Many people may find the criticism that Kutschera undertakes all the more convincing because he is an atheist previously known for his critique of so-called creationism (a belief shared by some believers – from the United States in particular) within which one tries to reconcile biological data with the creation of the world by God; however, it is often done too literally and in a simplified manner. (Fr Prof. Michał Heller, a great Polish scientist, physicist, philosopher, and theologian, agrees with such critique to a large extent). At present, Prof. Ulrich Kutschera collaborates with scientists with a Christian background to criticise gender ideology. Surely, his Catholic education contributes to his stance and so he is an atheist that is friendly towards Christianity much more than towards atheistic gender theory created mainly by militant atheists.

⁵ On the critique of such feminism, see, for example, G. Vandermassen, *Who's afraid of Charles Darwin? Debating feminism and evolutionary theory*, Rowman&Littlefield Publishing Group Inc. 2020 (Polish translation: G. Vandermassen, *Kto się boi Karola Darwina? Feminizm wobec teorii ewolucji*, Warszawa 2018), and P. Schlafly, *Feminist fantasies*, Spence Pub, 2003 (Polish translation: P. Schlafly, *Feministyczne fantazje*, transl. by N. Dueholm, M. Dueholm, Kąty Wrocławskie 2006).

⁶ Cf. U. Kutschera, *Das Gender-Paradoxon. Mann und Frau als evolvierte Menschentypen*, Berlin 2016, p. 446.

⁷ *Professor will umstrittene Aussagen zu Homosexuellen belegen*, <https://www.faz.net/aktuell/rhein-main/prozess-wegen-volksverhetzung-gegen-professor-16222726.html> (12.02.2024).

complaint against him, which was accepted by the prosecutor's office at the District Court in Kassel and turned into an accusation of "incitement to hatred" (Volksverhetzung). As a result of this charge and trial, despite the various scientific evidence presented by Professor Kutschera, which perfectly justified his stance, on August 3, 2020, the court sentenced him to either 60 days in prison or a fine of 6000 Euros. He did not accept the verdict and appealed to a higher court, which acknowledged his arguments. As a result, the District Court in Kassel acquitted him on 4 March 2021. His accusers, however, did not accept the verdict, and the Prosecutor's Office appealed. Nonetheless, the Higher Regional Court in Frankfurt on the Main confirmed the finding of the District Court on 8 February 2022. Consequently, the legal battle this time ended with a victory for the besieged scientist.⁸

⁸ This trial has been all the more important to me as I was sued for similar reasons and with a similar result. In the January/February 2021 issue of the German theological magazine "Theologisches", I published a paper *Über die Notwendigkeit, homosexuelle Cliques in der Kirche zu begrenzen* [On the Need to Limit Homosexual Cliques in the Church], which was part of my book *Lawendowa mafia. Z papieżami i biskupami przeciwko homoklikom w Kościele* (Kraków 2020) [Lavender mafia: With the Popes and Bishops against homosexual cliques in the Church]. The book turned out to be a bestseller – over 35,000 copies sold. Due to the publication of my paper, the German priest, Wolfgang Rothe, filed a report to the prosecutor's office in Cologne, and, based on that, the District Court in Cologne, on July 6, 2021, sentenced me to 120 days in prison or a fine of EUR 4,800 for "incitement to hatred" (Volksverhetzung). A similar verdict was received by the publisher of the magazine, Fr. Prof. Johannes Stöhr. However, this verdict caused widespread outrage and became known in the Polish and foreign media. Over 85,000 people signed a protest in my defence on the website of the legal organisation *Ordo Iuris*, which was an absolute record. Many prominent people stood up for me, including the greatest living theologian, Cardinal Gerhard Ludwig Müller. All this made a great impression on the court, which is why at the hearing on May 20, 2022, in Cologne, it withdrew almost all of its allegations. The judge first publicly read the entire article (which took her over three hours), and, at the end, she received applause from the people gathered in the courtroom. Then, she admitted that she agreed with the contents of the paper and found only a few words to be inappropriate – when translated into German, they are too strong because of this nation's Nazi past (this, however, does not refer to other nations, like the Polish). We were told that if I changed these words and made a voluntary donation of 3,150 Euro to charities for victims of pedophiles (especially homosexual epebophiles and pedophiles), this article could be accepted and published in Germany, and the court could withdraw all charges and penalties and finally end all proceedings in this case – without the possibility of any review in a higher court. A similar proposal was received by Fr. prof. Johannes Stöhr. Our lawyers said that such a withdrawal by the court was great for us and, in fact, meant our victory. Therefore we accepted it and that is how the lawsuit finally ended. See also D. Oko, *Bericht über das Gerichtsverfahren in Deutschland*,

2. The biologist's argumentation

Professor Kutschera's comprehensive argumentation with which he convinced the court is crucial to us. Apart from the already mentioned *Das Gender-Paradoxon*, he conveyed it in the book he wrote on the occasion of the trial: *Strafsache Sexualbiologie. Darwinische Wahrheiten zu Ehe und Kindeswohl vor Gericht* [A Criminal Case in the Biology of Sexuality: Darwinian Truths About Marriage and Children's Welfare in Court].⁹

According to Prof. Kutschera, the brain child of gender ideology and its fundamental fallacies is the New Zealand-American psychologist John Money (1921–2006) who specialised in research on sexual identity and gender biology. His studies on hermaphroditism convinced him that we are born sexually neutral, and proper sex, or gender, is only assigned during the process of socialisation and upbringing, roughly from the second year of life onwards. This also corresponded with Simone de Beauvoir's well-known statement that *one is not born, but rather becomes, a woman*, and served as the main thesis of "Moneyism" (as Professor Kutschera put it), which is the basis of gender ideology.¹⁰ To prove that his theory was valid, Money did not hesitate to conduct experiments on living individuals, including the identical twins David and Brian Reimer.

As a 7-month-old baby, David completely lost his penis due to a medical error, so Money advised his parents to castrate him and subject him to hormonal

gegen Prof. Dr. Dr. Dariusz Oko von der Philosophischen Fakultät der Päpstlichen Universität Johannes Paul II. in Krakau, "The Person and the Challenges" 13 (2023) No. 2, pp. 293–299. The court case involving Father Professor Manfred Hauke, the publisher of this article who lives in Switzerland, also concluded successfully. Like me in Germany, he was accused of publishing an article allegedly offensive to all homosexuals. However, the court in Bellinzona, in its session on April 22, 2024, determined that this was not true because the article only contained criticism of those Catholic clergy with homosexual tendencies who committed very bad deeds within the Church. As a result, the court acquitted Father Professor Hauke and ordered the prosecutor's office, which had baselessly accused him, to pay him 20,000 Swiss francs as compensation for legal costs.

See *Text zu homosexuellen Priestern: Theologe Hauke freigesprochen*, <https://www.katholisch.de/artikel/52826-text-zu-homosexuellen-priestern-theologe-hauke-freigesprochen> (23.04.2024) and *Mutmasslich homophobe Textstellen in umstrittenem Aufsatz: Gericht spricht Theologieprofessor aus Lugano frei*, <https://www.nzz.ch/schweiz/homophobie-vorwurf-theologieprofessor-freigesprochen-ld.1827482> (23.04.2024).

⁹ Cf. U. Kutschera, *Strafsache Sexualbiologie. Darwinische Wahrheiten zu Ehe und Kindeswohl vor Gericht*, Hamburg 2021, p. 572.

¹⁰ Cf. U. Kutschera, *Das Gender-Paradoxon*, p. 56.

therapy to raise him as a woman. The confused parents agreed. As part of this “therapy” and further education, Money then forced David (named Brenda) and Brian to play female and male sexual roles, respectively, under his direction. Money must have found it all the easier because he was a known supporter of pedophilia. This “experiment”, however, did not confirm his theory. As soon as David could influence his fate, he returned to his male identity as a teenager, firmly rejecting the female identity that was imposed on him and which he never identified with in any way. He also tried to reverse the medical effects of the procedures performed on him, which, of course, could only be successful to a small extent because the changes were essentially irreversible. However, the spiritual and psychological wounds inflicted on both twins by Money’s therapy were so great that both adult men, despite their attempts to live normal lives, committed suicide: Brian at the age of 36 and David at 38.¹¹ Their deaths notwithstanding, dr. Money continued to present this “experiment” as a success that proved his theory. He avoided, however, facing his critics and opponents.¹² Followers and proponents of his stance are, unfortunately, still active today.¹³

It is with hard biological facts that Prof. Kutschera responds to Money’s concept. He ceaselessly stresses that women and men are equal to dignity, but they are not the same in terms of their nature, especially biologically. Our common experience and reliable scientific studies from all over the world show that over 99% of all newborns can be unequivocally biologically identified as either boys or girls.¹⁴ Their biological differences cannot be underestimated. It turns out that between men and women, there is only about a 1,5% genetic difference

¹¹ The most comprehensive description of the tragic fate of the twins can be found in: J. Colapinto, *As nature made him: The boy who was raised as a girl*, New York 2006.

¹² Por. J. Money, A. Ehrhardt, *Man and woman, boy and girl: the differentiation and dimorphism of gender identity from conception to maturity*, This Week’s Citation Classic, 11 Baltimore Current Contents 11.03.1972. Among the leading critics of Money’s theory was his colleague, professor of biology Milton Diamond, which is why Money’s experiment on the twins may have served as his self-defence. Cf. M. Diamond, *A critical evaluation of the ontogeny of human sexual behavior*, “Quarterly Review of Biology” 40 (1965), pp. 147–175 and M. Diamond, *Sex, gender, and identity over the years: A changing perspective*, “Child and Adolescent Psychiatric Clinics of North America” 3 (2004), pp. 591–607 and U. Kutschera, *Strafsache Sexualbiologie*, pp. 113–115.

¹³ Cf. U. Kutschera, *Das Gender-Paradoxon*, pp. 300–320.

¹⁴ Cf. for example, M. Blackless, A. Charuvastra, A. Derryck, A. Fausto-Sterling, K. Lauzanne, E. Lee, *How sexually dimorphic are we? Review and synthesis*, “American Journal of Human Biology” 12 (2000) Issue 2, pp. 151–166.

out of approximately 20,000 protein-coding genes. A similar difference of only 1,5% in these genes can be found when we compare humans and chimpanzees. Therefore, to ignore such a genetic difference between humans is like overlooking the genetic difference between humans and chimpanzees (of course, we maintain and assume complete equality of dignity of women and men).¹⁵

As for the differences between adult men and women, one of the most noticeable is the greater height of men. Worldwide, this difference ranges from 6% to 11% (with an average of 8 percent). Young men typically have several percent more muscle mass, making their physical effort significantly more effective. On the other hand, women have several percent more body fat, which decisively helps as a reserve during pregnancy and breastfeeding. Greater body mass also translates into an 8% greater brain mass in men. This, however, does not result in differences in intelligence. Moreover, women's brains have significantly more connections between the nerve cells and both hemispheres. Nonetheless, there are significant differences in abilities conditioned by these brain differences. Generally, it can be said that women, on average, are more inclined towards humanistic, personal, and relational spheres, while men excel in material, objective, and technical areas. Of course, both men and women possess certain abilities in other areas; we are only discussing dominant tendencies here. Principally, women excel in various language skills and have greater empathy, emotional understanding, communication abilities, and conflict-resolution skills. They tend to be better at dialogue and compromise, have a quick comprehension of personal relationships, better imagine new situations among people, and possess a greater ability to perform precise micro-movements.

Generally, men have greater mathematical skills, spatial imagination and orientation, and can theorise and systematise. In addition, they tended to have greater aggressiveness, courage, the ability to take up the glove and engage in a fight and impose their opinions. They also work better in teams and obey leaders. Women are also much more sensitive, especially to touch – the least sensitive woman is more sensitive than the most sensitive man. Obviously, this is evolutionarily conditioned by the tasks men perform during fighting

¹⁵ Cf. E. D. Wildman, M. Uddin, G. Liu, I. L. Grossman, M. Goodman, *Implications of natural selection in shaping 99.4% nonsynonymous DNA identity between humans and chimpanzees: enlarging genus Homo*, "Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America" 100 (2003) No. 12, pp. 7181–7188.

or hunting while working in agriculture or construction. Meanwhile, the women were engaged in housework, gathering, and caring for children and the elderly.¹⁶

These differences are also (or especially) evident in children, even infants, manifesting themselves within a few hours of birth. Girls tend to be more interested in faces leaning over them for longer, while boys quickly transition to playing with the toys presented to them. Girls are more sensitive to sounds and tend to prefer dolls as toys, whereas boys prefer toy cars and toolboxes (despite all the fruitless efforts of atheist feminists to reverse these preferences). Girls also tend to start speaking earlier and with more grammatical correctness, forming complete sentences. These differences are noticeable in schools, where girls generally reign supreme in the humanities, while boys tend to outdo them in mathematics and natural sciences. These differences are perhaps most obvious in their choices of vocational schools or fields of study at universities, where young people have great or even complete freedom. Despite the efforts of the activists of gender ideology, young women still generally choose fields related to working with people: pedagogy studies, psychological, medical and linguistic studies, whereas men are more likely to choose studies in engineering, construction, mathematics and natural sciences. One look at the classes and lecture rooms in technical schools and universities shows how much their attendance contradicts gender ideology. For example, in Germany, in 2013, about 83% of graduates from technical universities were men, while only 17% were women. Meanwhile, among philologists, 80% of graduates were women, with only 20% being men. This is very similar to the situation in the United States, where as recently as 1972, 88% of PhDs in mathematics and other sciences were awarded to men.¹⁷ Naturally, this also translates into job choices. One can barely find women working in mines, on construction sites, fishing trawlers, oil rigs, and high-voltage lines. Similarly, men are rarely nurses or kindergarten teachers.¹⁸

¹⁶ Cf. A. Moir, D. Jessel, *Brain sex: The real difference between men and women*, Dell Bantam 1997 and W. Larimore, B. Larimore, *His brain, her brain: How Divinely designed differences can strengthen your marriage*, Zondervan 2008.

¹⁷ Cf. U. Kutschera, *Das Gender-Paradoxon*, p. 185 and P. Schlafly, *Feministyczne fantazje*, p. 146ff.

¹⁸ Cf. A. Moir, D. Jessel, *Brain sex*. Another chief German biologist, Professor Axel Meyer, thus writes about educational attempts to change sex-specific interests, for example by organising days devoted to them (in fact, devoted to the interest of the other sex): "If girls have different inclinations than boys, then we should not waste any more resources on the so-called girls' days and boys' days. Instead of trying to change the differences typical of a given sex,

All this has deep biological foundations—biochemical dimorphism is visible in the entire body of a woman and the entire body of a man, in each of their cells and organs. Based on the morphology of their genital organs, 99.95% of newborn children can be classified as a girl or a boy. The consensus among scientists is that the so-called “hermaphrodites” or “intersex babies” in individual countries constitute no more than 0.2% to 2% of the total population. Therefore, it can be assumed that their number may be less than about 1% globally.¹⁹ This is a well-known reality for biologists because they often encounter in living organisms certain small deviations from the typical systems found in a given species; this cannot be understood as any biological ideal, but just a typical, average system.²⁰ These are not, however, grounds to discriminate against such organisms or people. Similarly, these are not grounds to be called “the third”, “nth” or “x” gender since they are simply the result of various kinds of divergence or disorders in one’s biological development whether that be in foetal life, childhood, puberty, or adolescence. Our body is biologically the most wonderfully complex organism on Earth, a system of systems. Still, we know well that each such system, each component of it, may be subject to some deformation or disease, including our gender and sexual systems. Just as we may have cardiological, immunological, diabetic, etc. disorders, so may we develop disorders in the sphere of sexuality and gender. One should neither deny this nor treat the sphere of gender as if it does not have such problems. Neither should we demand that almost everything here is “approved of” – especially if the interested parties wish it. It is as if a narcissistic patient dictated to their doctor how they should be diagnosed and treated.

The obvious division into two sexes is vital regarding the transmission of life and the upbringing of offspring. In the course of evolution, an especially strong relationship has developed between the child and the mother. She plays a huge,

we should make much more use of every strong suit of these sexes. Let me repeat this: it is difficult to determine which differences between genders are conditioned biologically and which are conditioned culturally. However, the radical standpoint of Simone de Beauvoir that no one is born a woman but is made one is certainly completely false just like the statement that everything is genetically determined.” A. Meyer, *Adams Apfel und Evas Erbe. Wie die Gene unser Leben bestimmen und warum Frauen anders sind als Männer*, München 2015, p. 342.

¹⁹ M. Blackless, A. Charuvastra, A. Derryck, A. Fausto-Sterling, K. Lauzanne, E. Lee Ellen, *How sexually dimorphic are we?*, pp. 151–166.

²⁰ Cf. U. Kutschera, *Das Gender-Paradoxon*, p. 187.

irreplaceable role not only in conceiving the child and nurturing its biological development but also in its upbringing and shaping them as a human being, particularly in the formative years. From the very beginning, an infant needs a central person like this in their life, and the mother is the most suitable person for this role, not only because of their biological relationship but also because of her feminine biological, emotional, and personal characteristics. This relationship between a child and their mother, its depth, intensity, and long duration, is also a great evolutionary achievement. Moreover, it decisively distinguishes us from all other animals. This kind of care best protects the child and contributes to their optimum growth. As such, it contributes to the development of society as a whole, composed of children who have been raised in the best conditions possible in a family, with their biological mothers and fathers who usually best fulfil the child's needs and contribute to their ongoing development. These conditions decisively contribute to the emergence and maintenance of our advantage over other species on Earth.

It is a fundamental right of every child to be raised by their mother and father. Therefore, one cannot remove this right of the child for any ideological reason since this may entail great harm and injustice which might cause them to unduly suffer for the rest of their lives.²¹

Therefore it is the basic duty of the state to guard the elementary rights of children and defend them against the designs of ideologists. The state should also do so in the name of its best-understood interest and the welfare of all of society; the fate of the state fundamentally depends on the propagation and condition of future generations. This includes how well children are brought up, and in what conditions, which translates into what kind of people they become, and how healthy and strong biologically, mentally, intellectually, emotionally and spiritually they will be. We need to be careful and watchful because we already

²¹ Cf. U. Kutschera, *Strafsache Sexualbiologie*, p. 243ff. This gender-based disregard for biological data and succumbing to this ideology has led to a real epidemic of teenage white girls from wealthy middle-class families in the USA identifying as trans people. Impacted by gender theory propaganda, they increasingly explain their problems typically related to puberty and growing up as evidence that they are trans-sexual. They believe that the only solution is to immediately undergo hormonal treatment (without their parents' knowledge) and take testosterone regularly. This causes some irreversible changes in their body (including lifelong infertility). Often, it is only a single stage on the road towards the amputation of their internal and external female organs, which is irreversible. Cf. A. Shrier, *Irreversible damage. The transgender craze seducing our daughters*, Regnery Publishing, 2020.

know the results of a wealth of reliable research and the aftereffects of bringing children up in relationships forged within the boundaries of gender ideology. They prompt us to be decisive and not allow children to be harmed in the name of ideologies that contradict science at the most elementary, biological level.²²

One cannot carelessly question basic biological truths, one cannot devalue what it means to be a woman and a man, a mother and father, growing up and being educated in the secure surrounds of one's own family. An anti-biological ideology cannot be imposed on children in nurseries, kindergartens, or schools. From a strictly scientific perspective, prof. Kutschera firmly rejects the statements of Judith Butler (the successor of John Money, and the main guru of contemporary gender ideology). She claims that "gender" precedes and dominates biological sex (and not vice versa as had been commonly claimed until today). She also speaks about the discursive, performative construction of the very term. As Butler explains: "Gender ought not to be conceived merely as the cultural inscription of meaning on a pre-given sex (a juridical conception); gender must also designate the very apparatus of production whereby the sexes themselves are established. As a result, gender is not to culture as sex is to nature; gender is also the discursive/cultural means by which 'sexed nature' or a 'natural sex' is produced and established as 'pre-discursive', prior to culture, a politically neutral surface on which culture acts."²³

Prof. Kutschera reports that he has often discussed such statements, which constitute the essence of gender theory and prove its anti-biological character,

²² Cf. M. Regnerus, *How different are the adult children of parents who have same-sex relationships? Findings from the New Family Structures Study*, "Social Science Research" 41 (2012) Issue 4, pp. 752–770; M. Regnerus, *Parental same-sex relationships, family instability, and subsequent life outcomes for adult children: Answering critics of the new family structures study with additional analyses*, "Social Science Research" 41 (2012) Issue 6, pp. 1367–1377 and *Jephthah's daughters: Innocent casualties in the war for family 'equality'*, ed. R. O. Lopez, Los Angeles 2017 and *Jephthah's children: The innocent casualties of same-sex parenting*, eds. R. O. Lopez, B. Klein, Los Angeles 2016.

²³ J. Butler, *Gender trouble: Feminism and the subversion of identity*, New York 1990, p. 7 and J. Butler, *Excitable speech: A politics of the performative*, New York 2021. The already-mentioned Axel Meyer, a renowned professor of biology, thus comments on such statements: "While conducting research for this book, I noticed increasingly often that dogmatic feminists from the field of gender studies find it difficult to agree with the discoveries of biology. Indeed, biology is even demonised and presented as a kind of superstition." A. Meyer, *Adams Apfel und Evas Erbe*, p. 351. This is exactly what we should have expected: as in the case of Marxism, if an ideology is considered a science, then science must be seen as superstition and ideology.

with his colleagues – some of the most renowned biologists in the world. As a result of such conversations held during the international congress in San Jose, California in 2015, Prof. Kutschera made the following observation: “During an informal discussion regarding ‘gender ideology’ in Europe, we realised that this fundamentalist, anti-Darwinian ideology has the same roots as creationism, i.e. a literal biblical understanding of the Creation. Moneyistic representatives of gender [ideology] believe that a person’s ‘social gender’, i.e. masculinity or femininity (being a man or a woman), can be expressed and interpreted as a ‘social construct’ regardless of biological sex (XY or XX chromosome arrangement, testosterone or estrogen levels, etc.). We do not yet have a based-on-facts and natural sciences analysis of this destructive, quasi-religious belief. The following conclusion can, however, be definitely drawn: In the humanities, nothing can make sense if it is not consistent with biological data. The discussion in San Jose led to the following consensus: evolutionary biologists should analyse gender theory, i.e., university pseudo-science that costs German taxpayers millions of euros annually (jobs for professors of pointless gender studies), and refute it equally seriously as they do with creationism, which is in a similar vein.”²⁴

3. State violence against children, society, and science

Adhering to a false, erroneous ideology, however, is far from innocent, for it surpasses the framework of theory. The proponents of gender theory, like Marxists, are not only interested in constructing theories, even the most absurd, but they also want to impact reality, which is much worse. Moreover, they do not undertake their aims by democratic means, for with such an agenda they would

²⁴ U. Kutschera, *Das Gender-Paradoxon*, p. 77n. Prof. Kutschera also states that: “Indeed, gender-creationism is a closed, subjective system of belief and no science open to facts”, *ibid.*, p. 188, see also pp. 199, 237 and 331. In many ways, gender ideology resembles a significantly distorted (or rather mocked) religious faith. We need to work on its fundamental critique in a similar way as on the critique of Marxism, its predecessor. See my texts that are part of this indispensable critique: *Gender jako współczesna namiastka religii*, in: *Religie w dialogu kultur. Materiały z V Międzynarodowego Kongresu Religioznawczego, Toruń 14–16 września 2017*, eds. M. Szulakiewicz, Ł. Dominiak, vol. 2, Toruń 2017, pp. 271–295 and *Gender jako dzieło rozumu ateistycznego. Dekonstrukcja dekonstrukcjonistów*, in: *Gender – spojrzenie krytyczne*, eds. J. Jagiełło, D. Oko, Kielce 2016, pp. 157–180.

lose every election. Instead, they lobby, take over and subdue culture, media, and state institutions so that they can “forcefully” spread and impose their ideas. Otherwise, these ideas would not be persuasive enough to disseminate and take root.

Professor Kutschera sees such strategies and lays them bare. As a father of five, his main concern is the good and protection of the new generation: its correct development thanks to the achievements of evolution and human culture, refusing to be suppressed because of ideology (as it was in the Soviet Union). In particular, he criticises raising a child without her/his father or mother as if their presence was not needed. Our everyday experience and scientific research show that it is exactly the opposite. Furthermore, it is not homophobia or lesbophobia, but an unequivocal scientific maxim. Atheists also believe that man has the highest natural value on Earth. That is why, we have to do whatever we can to make the new generation fine, strong, and capable of using and achieving their potential – for the good of themselves and society. Apart from genetic “composition” and their free will, it is being brought up in one’s family that determines what a given person will be like. A newborn is like a priceless diamond that is shaped throughout the long process of upbringing – first in one’s family, then in school and culture. They are like molten gold that is poured into the form of one’s family and culture – it later solidifies and takes on their shape. Men and their lives are, to a large extent, what their families were like in the first years of their existence. That is why all of society and the state should do whatever they can to ensure the very best conditions of education at home, in school, and culturally. Nothing, no ideology should ever disturb or distort this educational process. Should it happen, it would mean destroying the most crucial and “sacred” process of becoming a person, the shaping of the very foundations of their humanity. In fact, this would mean destroying someone, blocking the key aspects of their growth. If we apply maximum requirements in the production process of valuable objects (integrated, miniature electronic circuits or diamonds), should we not apply the same high standards in the process of “producing” priceless diamonds such as people?

Prof. Kutschera, who understands what is at stake, is decisively against typical “gender” attacks on the fundamental good of the new generation (the earliest possible sexualization and depravity of children). They were evident in e.g. the actions of Prof. Helmut Kentler, one of the greatest German authorities on “gender” sexual education. However, he turned out to be a supporter

and organiser of crimes against boys by adult homosexuals.²⁵ Prof. Kutschera also consistently criticises lessons introduced into the school system by Prof. Elisabeth Tuider (for example, *Der neue Puff für alle* [A new brothel for everyone]. In Germany, 15-year-old children have to participate in such classes during which they should develop *personal freedom to use and provide sexual services*.²⁶ These are only a few out of many examples of serious abuses against children and youth committed in the name of gender ideology. Moreover, this way of dealing with the younger generation is supported and financed by the state, which threatens people who oppose it with legal “violence.” The Green Party, which today co-governs Germany, has supported the legalisation of pedophilia, even preparing a draft law on this matter, which Prof. Kutschera discusses with horror.²⁷ The media (especially the left-wing one) effectively helps the state “genderize” society. This, however, entails the depravity and downfall of the essence of objective science and a democratic state. In his trial and books, Professor Kutschera has referred to many scientific works that reveal that this path is fundamentally wrong and unacceptable, and that it resembles actions that in totalitarian states are intended to impose a given ideology. As prof. Axel Meyer states: “In my opinion, it is exactly these political and politicised aspects that should be rooted in solid scientific foundations, and not in ideological convictions. Therefore scientists should engage even more in social debates and politics so that they are not left to ideologists.”²⁸

The engagement in political and social matters has brought Prof. Kutschera recognition, but also attacks and ultimately a court trial in three instances. His

²⁵ Cf. U. Kutschera, *Strafsache Sexualbiologie*, pp. 147–156. Kutschera also refers to such works as, for example, *Healing sexually betrayed men and boys. Treatment for sexual abuse, assault, and trauma*, ed. R. B. Gartner, London 2018 and R. M. Sapolsky, *Behave: The biology of humans at our best and worst*, New York 2017.

²⁶ E. Tuider, M. S. Müller, S. Timmermans, P. Bruns-Bachmann, C. Koppermann, *Sexualpädagogik der Vielfalt. Praxismethoden zu Identitäten, Beziehungen, Körper und Prävention für Schule und Jugendarbeit*, Weinheim/Basel 2012, p. 77; Cf. U. Kutschera, *Strafsache Sexualbiologie*, pp. 157–174. To see what introducing gender ideology with the help of state institutions may look like, see: J. Barcentowicz, D. Oko, K. Petryszak, *Ethical perfectionism as one of the solutions to prevent anti-civilization activities: an analysis based on the case study of Joseph Beuys*, “Logos i Ethos” 29 (2023) 2 (62), pp. 193–166.

²⁷ Cf., for example, Michael Grandt, *Die Grünen: Zwischen Kindersex, Kriegshetze und Zwangsbeglückung*, Rottenburg 2015, pp. 93–121 i 200–234 and Franz Walter, Stephan Klecha, Alexander Hensel, *Die Grünen und die Pädosexualität: Eine bundesdeutsche Geschichte*, Göttingen 2015, pp. 160–227.

²⁸ A. Meyer, *Adams Apfel und Evas Erbe*, p. 317.

arguments, however, were so diverse and so water-tight that this time the ideology lost out. The fact that he managed to defend his case in court and win the trial is a great personal success for anyone who, like him, tries to defend the truth and the common good, and is against all the ideologies that oppose this. This gives us a scent of victory and a new sense of hope, and so we must continue these struggles, the defence of society – especially children and young people – against such ideologies. Obviously, one successful trial does not end an ideology. The spirit of man is weak and frail, so it is susceptible to creating such appearances of truth and succumbing to them. Therefore we need people who will expose and refute these illusions and delusions to best serve science and society.

References

- Amsterdamski S., *Życie naukowe a monopol władzy (casus Łysenko)*, Warszawa 1981.
- Barcentowicz J., Oko D., Petryszak K., *Ethical perfectionism as one of the solutions to prevent anti-civilization activities: an analysis based on the case study of Joseph Beuys*, “Logos i Ethos” 29 (2023) 2 (62), pp. 193–166.
- Blackless M., Charuvastra A., Derrycck A., Fausto-Sterling A., Lauzanne K., Lee E., *How sexually dimorphic are we? Review and synthesis*, “American Journal of Human Biology” 12 (2000) Issue 2, pp. 151–166.
- Butler J., *Excitable speech: A politics of the performative*, New York 2021.
- Butler J., *Gender trouble: Feminism and the subversion of identity*, New York 1990.
- Butler J., *Uwikłani w płęć*, transl. by K. Krasuska, Warszawa 2008.
- Butler J., *Walczące słowa*, transl. by A. Ostolski, Warszawa 2010.
- Colapinto J., *As nature made him: The boy who was raised as a girl*, New York 2006.
- Diamond M., *A critical evaluation of the ontogeny of human sexual behavior*, “Quarterly Review of Biology” 40 (1965), pp. 147–175.
- Diamond M., *Sex, gender, and identity over the years: a changing perspective*, “Child and Adolescent Psychiatric Clinics of North America” 3 (2004), pp. 591–607.
- Fiedosiejew P. N., Afanasjew W. G., Brutenc K. N. et al, *Naukowy komunizm*, transl. by M. Skwieciński, Warszawa 1975.
- Grandt M., *Die Grünen: Zwischen Kindersex, Kriegshetze und Zwangsbeglückung*, Rottenburg 2015.
- Healing sexually betrayed men and boys. Treatment for sexual abuse, assault, and trauma*, ed. R. B. Gartner, London 2018.
- Jephthah’s children: The innocent casualties of same-sex parenting*, eds. R. O. Lopez, B. Klein, Los Angeles 2016.

- Jephtah's daughters: Innocent casualties in the war for family 'equality'*, ed. R. O. Lopez, Los Angeles 2017.
- Karoń K., *Historia antykultury 1.0. Podstawy wiedzy społecznej*, Warszawa 2019.
- Kutschera U., *Das Gender-Paradoxon. Mann und Frau als evolvierte Menschentypen*, Berlin 2016.
- Kutschera U., *Strafsache Sexualbiologie. Darwinische Wahrheiten zu Ehe und Kindeswohl vor Gericht*, Hamburg 2021.
- Larimore W., Larimore B., *His brain, her brain: How Divinely designed differences can strengthen your marriage*, Zondervan 2008.
- Larimore W., Larimore B., *Jej mózg, jego mózg, czyli Bóg wie, co robi*, transl. by A. Wawrzyniak-Kędziołek, Poznań 2016, pp. 191–219.
- Meyer A., *Adams Apfel und Evas Erbe. Wie die Gene unser Leben bestimmen und warum Frauen anders sind als Männer*, München 2015.
- Moir A., Jessel D., *Brain sex: The real difference between men and women*, Bantam Dell 1997.
- Moir A., Jessel D., *Płeć mózgu. O prawdziwej różnicy między mężczyzną a kobietą*, transl. by N. Kancewicz-Hoffman, Warszawa 2014.
- Money J., Ehrhardt A., *Man and woman, boy and girl: the differentiation and dimorphism of gender identity from conception to maturity*, This Week's Citation Classic, 11 Baltimore Current Contents 11.03.1972.
- Mutmasslich homophobe Textstellen in umstrittenem Aufsatz: Gericht spricht Theologieprofessor aus Lugano frei*, <https://www.nzz.ch/schweiz/homophobie-vorwurf-theologieprofessor-freigesprochen-ld.1827482> (23.04.2024).
- Oko D., *Bericht über das Gerichtsverfahren in Deutschland, gegen Prof. Dr. Dr. Dariusz Oko von der Philosophischen Fakultät der Päpstlichen Universität Johannes Paul II. in Krakau*, "The Person and the Challenges" 13 (2023) No. 2, pp. 293–299.
- Oko D., *Gender jako dzieło rozumu ateistycznego. Dekonstrukcja dekonstrukcjonistów*, in: *Gender – spojrzenie krytyczne*, eds. J. Jagiełło, D. Oko, Kielce 2016, pp. 157–180.
- Oko D., *Gender jako współczesna namiastka religii*, in: *Religie w dialogu kultur. Materiały z V Międzynarodowego Kongresu Religioznawczego, Toruń 14–16 września 2017*, eds. M. Szulakiewicz, Ł. Dominiak, vol. 2, Toruń 2017, pp. 271–295.
- Oko D., *Über die Notwendigkeit homosexuelle Cliques in der Kirche zu begrenzen* (part 1), "Theologisches. Katholische Monatsschrift" 51 (2021) No. 01/02, pp. 47–75.
- Oko D., *Über die Notwendigkeit homosexuelle Cliques in der Kirche zu begrenzen* (part 2), "Theologisches. Katholische Monatsschrift" 52 (2021) 03/04, pp. 123–136.
- Professor will umstrittene Aussagen zu Homosexuellen belegen*, <https://www.faz.net/aktuell/rhein-main/prozess-wegen-volksverhetzung-gegen-professor-16222726.html> (12.02.2024).
- Regnerus M., *How different are the adult children of parents who have same-sex relationships? Findings from the New Family Structures Study*, "Social Science Research" 41 (2012) Issue 4, pp. 752–770.

- Regnerus M., *Parental same-sex relationships, family instability, and subsequent life outcomes for adult children: Answering critics of the new family structures study with additional analyses*, "Social Science Research" 41 (2012) Issue 6, pp. 1367–1377.
- Rozwadowski D., *Marskizm kulturowy. 50 lat walki z cywilizacją Zachodu*, Warszawa 2018.
- Sapolsky R. M., *Behave: The biology of humans at our best and worst*, New York 2017.
- Schlafly P., *Feminist fantasies*, Spence Pub, 2003.
- Schlafly P., *Feministyczne fantazje*, transl. by N. Dueholm, M. Dueholm, Kąty Wrocławskie 2006.
- Shrier A., *Irreversible damage. The transgender craze seducing our daughters*, Regnery Publishing, 2020.
- Shrier A., *Nieodwracalna krzywda. Tragiczne losy nastolatek, które zmieniły płeć*, transl. by M. Samborska, Kraków 2023.
- Text zu homosexuellen Priestern: Theologe Hauke freigesprochen*, <https://www.katholisch.de/artikel/52826-text-zu-homosexuellen-priestern-theologe-hauke-freigesprochen> (23.04.2024).
- Tuider E., Müller M., S. Timmermans, P. Bruns-Bachmann, C. Koppermann, *Sexualpädagogik der Vielfalt. Praxismethoden zu Identitäten, Beziehungen, Körper und Prävention für Schule und Jugendarbeit*, Weinheim–Basel 2012.
- Vandermassen G., *Kto się boi Karola Darwina? Feminizm wobec teorii ewolucji*, Warszawa 2018.
- Vandermassen G., *Who's afraid of Charles Darwin? Debating feminism and evolutionary theory*, Rowman&Littlefield Publishing Group Inc. 2020.
- Walter F., Klecha S., Hensel A., *Die Grünen und die Pädosexualität: Eine bundesdeutsche Geschichte*, Göttingen 2015.
- Wildman E. D., Uddin M., Liu G., Grossman I. L., Goodman M., *Implications of natural selection in shaping 99.4% nonsynonymous DNA identity between humans and chimpanzees: enlarging genus Homo*, "Proceedings of the National Academy of Science of the United States of America" 100 (2003) No. 12, pp. 7181–7188.