

The BBC's Double Standards

18/9/14

Imagine a TV programme in which a man, Mr Blimp, a wealthy captain of industry, advises small business owners on how to improve their business. Imagine that our man is being shown around a woman's business premises. Seeing something substandard our Mr Blimp exclaims, "*Darling, I know women are intellectually challenged but you really are the stupidest*". Is it likely that the BBC would air this remark? No chance whatsoever. It has surely been many decades since a responsible man would even make such a flagrantly derogatory remark about women, even without cameras rolling. And there is no chance that a remark like this would be regarded by the BBC as suitable to be broadcast. In fact, if the remark stopped at just the word "Darling" it would be regarded as outrageous by many.

Of course, no such event occurred. What did occur is this. BBC2 runs a series of programmes called *The Fixer* in which a woman captain of industry, Alex Polizzi, advises small business owners. On 1st September 2014 she was advising a man, Paul, on his micro-brewery business. Paul was showing her around the brewery, with its great vats of gleaming stainless steel. Polizzi thought it appropriate to react to the sight thus, "Darling, I mean, men have a lot of perverted desires but yours is possibly the sickest". You understand now my introduction. Frankly, being called a sick pervert is a great deal worse than being called stupid.

Glen Poole at *insideMAN*, Ref.[1], has already noted the double standard at play here. He gives many examples of how changing the demographic results in an unacceptable statement. For example, "*Can you imagine if Mary Berry turned to an Asian contestant on the Great British Bake Off who was licking freshly whipped meringue mixture off the end of her finger and quipped: "I know, Pakistanis have a lot of perverted desires but yours is the sickest"?*" It really does not matter what demographic you insert, the result is unacceptable - except, apparently, if its "men" - all men. Then, at least according to the BBC, it's fine and dandy.

I raised a complaint on the BBC web site on 3rd September. Today, the 18th September, I received this reply...

Dear *****

Reference CAS-2899443-QQH5D1

Thanks for contacting us regarding 'Alex Polizzi: the Fixer' on BBC Two.

We note you were unhappy with a comment Alex made to self-confessed microbrewery obsessive Paul Walker on the 1 September programme.

We appreciate your concerns. While Alex is expressing a personal view, we believe it's clear that she isn't being entirely serious here and her remark is made within a very precise context – Paul's obsession with the equipment in his microbrewery – but we're sorry you found it unacceptable. It certainly wasn't the intention to offend.

All complaints are sent to senior management and the 'Alex Polizzi: the Fixer' programme makers every morning and we included your points in this overnight report. These reports are among the most widely read sources of feedback in the BBC and ensures that your complaint has been seen by the right people quickly. This helps inform their decisions about current and future programmes.

Thanks again for contacting us.

Kind Regards

Lucia Fortucci

BBC Complaints, www.bbc.co.uk/complaints

The implications of this reply are as follows,

- There is not the slightest hint that the BBC regard the statement "*Darling, I mean, men have a lot of perverted desires but yours is possibly the sickest*" as unacceptable. They are "sorry that *I* found it unacceptable" - suggesting that the BBC themselves find it acceptable (and they think I am just a fuss-pot).
- Since it is acceptable, we can expect similar anti-male sexist remarks to occur again, whenever any presenter wishes to indulge in such. The BBC don't mind at all.

Now let's examine the reply a little more closely.

The attempt is made to excuse Ms Polizzi's remark on the grounds that she wasn't being entirely serious and it wasn't the intention to offend.

Not *entirely* serious? Just a bit serious, then?

Let's take a look again at our Mr Blimp and his remark: "*Darling, I know women are intellectually challenged but you really are the stupidest*". Oh, don't take umbrage, dearie. He wasn't being entirely serious. OK? No?

Calm down, dear! He didn't mean to offend. What, are you still not mollified? I cannot imagine why not.

But, of course, I *can* imagine why not. If you say something offensive, then people will be offended. Is Ms Polizzi so stupid that she does not realise that being called a pervert is offensive? Clearly she is not. What is actually going on here is that she doesn't care. And neither does the BBC. Ms Polizzi has been raised in a culture - reflected by, and partly created by, the BBC - in which this sort of casual, unthinking denigration of men is regarded as acceptable. It's OK to say that all men are perverts. The BBC have formally confirmed the fact.

It's OK because feminists have been telling us for decades that all men are rapists. And the media tell us obliquely every day that we men are all wife beaters and child molesters. The very phrase "rape culture" tells us that we are all rapists, if we think we can get away with it. And if we are left in any doubt, the so-called anti-rape posters on university campuses remind us. They remind us not to rape because they are sure we would do so if not reminded. Or so they pretend. And the family courts tell us we are not safe around children. And the behaviour of the police and divorce lawyers tell us we are all wife beaters.

It's OK to say that all men are rapists because if a man says he is not, then he's a vile, despicable rape apologist.

It's OK to say that all men are wife beaters, and to shame a man into taking selfies promising to stop it, because otherwise he's a vile, despicable man in favour of violence against women.

It's OK to say that men are responsible for all child abuse, because if a man objects, well he's probably one of those vile, despicable paedophiles himself.

And it does not matter that these things are untrue.

And it does not matter that the accusations are logically incoherent.

All that matters is control of public perception.

It's OK to say that all men are perverts because men are whipped dogs who are too cowed to fight back, so long as the denigration has been going on.

Well, fuck that.

I may be a worm, and I may anticipate being trodden on if I turn, but the worm is definitely for turning.

I see through this game.

I see the direct causal connection between this universal misandry and real male disadvantage.

Give a dog a bad name and you may be inclined to whip him harder - and that's why men are treated six times more harshly in the criminal justice system (Ref.[2]).

Give a dog a bad name and he will not be regarded highly in society - and that may be why men commit suicide 3.5 times more often than women.

Give a dog a bad name and it is so much easier to ignore the fact that men are the overwhelming majority of deaths in war, deaths at work, violent deaths in general, violence in general, homelessness, premature death from disease, etc.

Give men a bad name and you will feel entitled to treat them more like dogs. It's so much easier than to take their children off them, or to trick them into raising a child which is not theirs. It's not like they're, you know, properly human. They don't have the same feelings that real humans do, you know, women (Ref.[3]).

Give men a bad name and it is easier to pretend that, when men work more to earn money for women to spend, it's a great privilege for men and a great disadvantage to women called the "pay gap".

Give males a bad enough name and you can absolve yourself of the silly burden of needing to feel any compassion for them. You can practice your facility with this by seeing if you can simultaneously regard female genital mutilation as one of the vilest things there is, whilst regarding male genital mutilation as fine - in fact a good thing - in fact you'd do it to your own baby. You can? Good for you, sister!

Give males a bad name and you will not be surprised when they fail in the education system. It's not the system's fault. It's the boys' own fault, of course. It's all part of being that broken, unfortunate, despicable thing - male.

That's why all men should object to "*Darling, I mean, men have a lot of perverted desires but yours is possibly the sickest*" because it is part of the process by which we become disadvantaged, part of the Great Lie.

References

- [1] <http://www.inside-man.co.uk/2014/09/03/is-it-acceptable-for-bbc-to-say-this-about-men/>
- [2] <http://redpilluk.co.uk/CrimeAndPunishment.html>
- [3] <http://en.breakingthecircle.org/> This is a UNI Global Union web site. The second video on the web page is a 17 minute tutorial on feminism in baby language and includes the statement about men (all men) that, "*They are aggressive beings with no contact with their emotions; highly competitive and unable to control their impulses, especially sexual ones*". Give a dog a bad name, then get him to wear a white ribbon to tell the world what a shitty little dog he is.