



NEW MALE STUDIES – AN INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL

VOLUME 11, ISSUE 2 – 2022



INTRODUCTION

Issue two of *New Male Studies: An International Journal* for 2022 includes examinations of topical concepts such as the demographic transition, male disappointment, prejudice against men, and toxic masculinity. Solutions to the problem of thwarted masculine affirmation include gender equalism, healthy identities, and male-framed approaches to men's issues. The seven contributors offer scholarly articles, analysis and opinion pieces, a book review, and a photographic essay.

The first of two articles in this issue, Steven P. Moxon's investigation into the sex-influenced roots of "the globally ubiquitous demographic transition" (abbreviated as DT), presents the reader startling evidence of the complex nature of sexual-and-social affect. Moxon argues, "those who hold DT to be a multi-factorially complex cultural phenomenon, elusive as to locus or level of causation, are obliged to consider that the logic of evolution dictates that all necessarily arises out of biology." Furthermore, he notes, "any and every evolutionary elaboration, not least a facility to engage in culture, functions to feed back to fine-tune and reinforce the very biology that gave rise to it. Otherwise, there would be no basis for such facility to have evolved in the first place." This implies, "it is easy to see what would not work: to try to counteract the problem DT poses of adverse support ratios of workers to non-workers by population replacement through immigration is counter-productive, as this actually still further intensifies DT, so will exacerbate demographically driven economic implosion." Moxon speculates, "if a much greater proportion of the population is either obliged to or comes to realise again profoundly the value of remaining close to family and community roots, perhaps a



significant difference could ensue.”

Rob Pluke’s article, “Fathers and sons: Disappointment, power and powerlessness.” argues that “analyzing fathers’ responses” to their disappointment concerning their sons “provides important insights into what power actually feels like for a father who loves his son.” Pluke suggests “practitioners need to help fathers see and value the various ways they can draw close to their sons or ‘be’ with their sons, in the absence of shared activity.”

In his analysis-and-opinion piece, “A reminder of what gender equalism is all about,” Tim Goldich observes, “Our world is not a *patriarchy*: it is a *patrimatrisensus*—a male-female consensus.” He explains that this consensus occurs because, “gender equalism proceeds from the premise that the sexes have always been equal—not the same.” Goldich suggests that if we are to understand “Woman and Man as equal partners in the human system,” it would be “possible for women to get the respect they’re starving for and for men to get the love they’re starving for.”

Aman Siddiqi argues, in “Prejudice against men: The new focus of the men’s movement,” since “issues facing men and boys have finally begun receiving attention,” the ensuing “positive momentum” could be continued by “focusing the discussion of men’s issues around a singular theme: [...] ending prejudice against men.” Siddiqi also explores the adverse “consequences of allowing men’s issues to be framed by those who are not advocates for men.”

Jerome Teelucksingh’s “The illusion of toxic masculinity,” suggests that, “various theories, models and terms associated with anti-social actions of boys and men need to be questioned” because “some are unscientific, and others promote a false and negative image of masculinity.” Teelucksingh argues that toxic masculinity and similar concepts, “create a confused generation of boys and men who are reluctant to express themselves and realize their full potential.”

Paul Nathanson reviews Anthony Esolen’s topical *No apologies: Why civilization depends on the strength of men*. Nathanson declares, “this is not an academic book and



therefore does not require an academic review.” He describes the book as “a *cri de coeur*,” one deserving “a response that is at least partly both subjective and emotional.” In addition, he acknowledges his “profound ambivalence over what this book says” because he “agrees with Esolen’s general thesis” but “deplores his presentation of it.” The resulting bipartite review offers its reader an edifying potted history of the “problem” of masculinity while faulting Esolen’s tendency to “cherry-pick” his evidence and to “preach” rather than to argue. Nathanson argues, “both men and women, need healthy identities”; by this phrase he means “the ability to make at least one contribution (to family, community or society) that is (a) distinctive, (b) necessary and (c) publicly valued.”

We are pleased to include another photographic essay by Jan H. Andersen in this issue of *New Male Studies*. Andersen describes these photographs as being, “from a larger experimental series of handhold long exposures in continuous light.” They offer images that explore a visual tension between potential male energy and the masculine roles through which maleness expresses itself.

The opinions expressed by the authors in this issue do not necessarily reflect those of the Editorial Team. The articles published here are offered in a spirit of open, evidence-based dialogue regarding sex, gender, relationships, and issues related to the experience of males.

We appreciate the thoughtful work done by those who contributed to this issue.



Dennis Gouws
Editor in Chief