



## **The Paradox of Selective Biology**

### **How Modern Feminism Denies Sex Differences Until It Needs Them**

By J A Griffin

A culture that spent fifty years insisting men and women are interchangeable now insists that women's hormonal cycles require workplace accommodation, public sympathy, and, too often, a softer standard of accountability.

Both claims come from the same movement.

Both cannot be true.

Either biology matters or it does not. Modern feminism wants it both ways.

That contradiction reveals something deeper than ordinary hypocrisy. Modern feminism has not treated biology as a stubborn truth to be understood and ordered. It has treated biology as a tactical instrument to be wielded. Biology is invoked when it earns sympathy, protection, accommodation, or leniency. It is denied when it suggests limits, differences, duties, or uncomfortable expectations.

The same body that proves nothing about ability suddenly proves everything about suffering. The same differences we are forbidden to name when they limit us are sacred and unassailable when they serve us.

This is the plastic world at work: selective, managerial, dishonest. Reality is dissolved when it imposes a limit and reasserted when it earns a benefit.

This is not just a feminist habit. It is a leftist habit. The modern left has built much of its political language around the same maneuver — invoke a fact when it earns sympathy, deny it when it imposes a limit. Race is invoked when it confers status and dissolved when it doesn't. Gender is fluid in one debate and immutable in the next. Identity itself is constructed and reasserted depending on what advantage it brings. Feminism is one expression of a broader pattern: the leftist mind treats reality as a tool to be wielded, not a truth to be honored.

Look at the pattern.



When the subject is physical strength, aggression, risk-taking, elite athletic performance, combat, sexual drive, fatherhood, motherhood, or the elementary fact that men and women are not built the same, biology is minimized or erased. We are told the differences are socially constructed, exaggerated, misleading, oppressive, or too dangerous to discuss. In those moments, the body disappears. Sex becomes a spectrum, a feeling, a performance, a choice.

But when the subject is pregnancy, breastfeeding, PMS, postpartum depression, menopause, women's intuition, the maternal bond, or the emotional burdens women supposedly carry, biology suddenly becomes real again. It becomes serious, embodied, demanding, and worthy of public deference.

The female body is quiet when it might complicate ambition. Don't talk about it. Don't notice it. Pretend it isn't there.

It is loud when it earns sympathy. Talk about it. Notice it. Bow to it.

That is not how serious people think about biology. That is how ideologues think about leverage.

The clearest example is the cultural treatment of PMS and menopause. Both are real. Both can be genuinely difficult. No honest person denies the suffering. The question is not whether the difficulty exists. The question is what the difficulty does to accountability.

Increasingly, the answer is that it weakens it.

A woman who snaps at her children during PMS is often treated as having a reason, not as having behaved badly. A woman who treats her husband with contempt during menopause is increasingly invited to see herself as a victim of her body, rather than as someone whose family also deserved kindness, restraint, and repair. The hormones explain. Then the explanation becomes an excuse. Then the excuse becomes a shield.

Now compare that with a man.

A man comes home exhausted from work. His back hurts. He slept four hours. He is stressed, aging, anxious, and carrying pressure he rarely talks about. He snaps at his wife over something small.

What does the culture tell him?

Grow up. Manage yourself. Your pain is not a license to be cruel. Be a man.



And in one sense, that expectation is right. Adults should master themselves. Pain may explain behavior, but it does not justify mistreating other people. The problem is not the standard. The problem is the asymmetry.

The same culture that tells a man his body is no excuse tells a woman her body explains everything. His biology is something to overcome. Hers is something to accommodate. His pain is his responsibility. Hers becomes everyone else's burden to carry.

That is not equality. That is preference.

Men have hormonal realities too. Testosterone changes with age. Male depression, loneliness, anxiety, purposelessness, midlife collapse, and suicide rates are part of a serious human picture that receives almost no cultural tenderness. A struggling man in his fifties is told to figure it out. A struggling woman in her fifties is told she is a warrior whose suffering must be publicly honored.

The double standard is not subtle. It is structural.

How did this get built?

Therapy culture set the stage. Once a society starts treating explanation as exoneration, every difficult emotional or biological state becomes a defense. PMS and menopause were always real. What changed is that the culture lost the nerve to distinguish between "this is hard" and "therefore I am not accountable for how I behave while it is hard."

Then feminism walked through the door. For decades, the movement denounced sex differences as oppressive social constructions. Men and women were not really that different. Mothers and fathers were interchangeable. Elite sport had no business sorting people by biology. Those differences were a myth used to hold women back.

Then the same differences became urgent and morally binding the moment they earned workplace leniency, public sympathy, emotional deference, or softened expectations.

The biology that did not exist when it imposed limits suddenly existed when it conferred benefits.

And chivalry enforces what feminism rejects in principle. The old code told men to soften toward women in hardship. Feminism denounced that code in public, then quietly absorbed its benefits. Men still instinctively lower the temperature when women suffer. Some women exploit that softness. Most simply breathe it in as part of the moral atmosphere. The chivalry feminism rejected in principle now preserves its double standard in practice.



None of this is good for women.

That is the part the conversation usually skips. The cultural pass is treated as kindness, accommodation, and long-overdue recognition that women are not machines. In one sense, that impulse is understandable. Real suffering deserves real compassion.

But there is a difference between compassion and infantilization.

A woman who is told her suffering excuses her behavior loses something profound. She loses the dignity of being treated as a full moral agent. She becomes a patient instead of a person. She is handled rather than respected. The better framework would say: yes, this is hard, and yes, you are still responsible for how you carry it.

Instead, the culture increasingly says: this is hard, so the normal standards do not fully apply.

That is not respect. That is condescension dressed as care.

The older framework, for all its flaws, treated women as adults. It expected them to manage difficult things. It expected them to apologize when they failed. It expected them to grow. The new framework treats women as fragile, governed by forces they cannot fully control, and therefore deserving of accommodation rather than capable of agency.

The first framework gave women dignity at the cost of demanding something from them. The second gives women a pass at the cost of treating them as less responsible for themselves.

Which one is liberation?

Women used to understand this. The grandmother who endured menopause without making her family pay for it was not oppressed by patriarchy. She was a serious adult. The mother who had PMS and still refused to terrorize her children was not denying her biology. She was honoring her role. The wife who had a hard week and apologized for her temper instead of hiding behind it was not submitting to male standards. She was acting like a grown woman.

The culture used to admire women like that. Now it often treats them as relics or traitors to the cause.

The honest position is harder, but healthier. Men and women are different. Those differences are real. Both sexes have biological burdens. Both sexes have emotional pressures. Both sexes suffer. And both sexes remain responsible for what they do with what they were given.



Hormones explain. They do not excuse.

Adults are accountable.

That used to be obvious. Modern feminism made it controversial.

This matters far beyond the household. A culture that cannot hold women to consistent standards is not honoring women. It is quietly removing them from the moral universe where standards apply. But that is the same universe where ambition is taken seriously, competence is measured honestly, leadership is earned, and adulthood has weight.

Tell a woman her hormones are a defense, and you have not elevated her. You have diminished her. You have told her that when her body becomes difficult, her agency becomes negotiable.

The accommodation becomes the insult. The pass becomes the cage.

Real respect for women looks different. It looks like compassion without the collapse of accountability. It looks like saying: yes, your body is doing something difficult, and yes, you are still responsible for how you walk through it.

Modern feminism could have said that. It chose leverage instead.

The result is a culture in which women are told they can do anything men can do, while also being told they cannot always be expected to behave well during predictable phases of their own biology. The contradiction is held together by social pressure and by the unspoken rule that no one is allowed to notice it.

But it should be noticed.

A movement that demands biology when biology helps and denies biology when biology complicates its claims is not a movement committed to truth. It is a movement committed to advantage.

Either biology is real or it is not.

Pick one.

---

*J A Griffin is the author of the A Plastic World trilogy, and writes on culture, power, and the organic world that survives both — at cultural.ist*