

The Sexual Revolution

Disclaimer: this is an automatically generated machine transcription - there may be small errors or mistranscriptions. Please refer to the original audio if you are in any doubt.

Date: 12 May 2019

Preacher: Tracee Horvath

[0 : 00] So my contribution begins and ends with this short introduction. I know that I was put on the thing, but actually the sign, but Tracy is really taking this talk today because this is a topic that in a sense was thrust upon us, especially with the development of the SOGI curriculum, AIDS, and it's something that as a pediatrician and as someone who's from an educational background, we've really started to explore.

And as Tracy has done so much research into this and gone deeper and deeper, you find the roots of this going far back. And so today she's bringing a talk to us that is going to help us really understand the roots of the ideology because what we're seeing is more of the fruit of a tree that has been growing for a while rather than just a symptom that we should be focused on. So without any further delay, I will introduce my wife, Tracy Horvath. Two introductions. Wow, I got two introductions. So yes, last time we talked about gender confusion in our society and we focused on some of the spiritual, philosophical ramifications of that, the educational, or how this is having an impact in education and in medicine.

Today I'm not going to be looking at sort of the medical side or what causes this or, well, actually maybe a little bit of that, but more focusing on how did we get here from there?

How did this tree develop? What were the seeds and how did they grow? So as we looked at last time, there is no denying the fact that we're living in a gender-confused generation.

[2 : 00] And we looked in the fall briefly at how and when the idea of choosing and changing one's gender originated and how it has so quickly become a mainstream phenomenon. In just a couple of generations, we've abandoned this as a society, the biblical historical understanding that men and women are created in God's image, male and female.

We've also rejected the scientific fact-based knowledge of human sexuality as binary. And this is no accident. There is an ideology behind all of this which has been strategically disseminated and popularized in a wide variety of ways and in a very short amount of time.

But there's a big difference in terms of what we've been looking at in the last 20, 30 years and I think how it developed. Because I think initially it was not so much this strategic campaign.

It really just developed out of ideologies that were rising in terms of humanism that we can trace right back to the Enlightenment. So that's what we're going to do is to go right back to the Enlightenment and trace our way forward through a variety of ideologues, philosophers, who contributed to the way our society is thinking today.

And it might seem like, wow, how can people be thinking this or doing this? This is almost crazy. But it really is a logical, just the latest logical progression of something that's been going on for a couple hundred years or more.

[3 : 30] So as I would like to say, transgenderism is just one little piece of the puzzle.

Unfortunately, I feel like this puzzle is mostly, you're thinking, I'm not sure how big this puzzle is, but it feels like we're getting close to the end of the puzzle in the sense of there's not many more pieces that you can think of, but we'll talk about that later.

There have been massive changes in our society's understanding of sexuality and gender, and this is transforming our culture, and it will have unimaginable ramifications on the trajectory of our future.

But this is simply an ongoing overturning of the human sexuality norms that have been common to the world's cultures throughout human history. Biblical doctrine, history, culture, tradition, and even scientific objectivity are being abandoned and denigrated.

And as a civilization, we are fast embracing a revolutionary ideology. Yet transgenderism is one facet, one doctrine of this worldview.

Human reasoning, warped by human sinfulness, has led us step by step to this point as we race more and more swiftly toward the logical extremes of our God-rejecting postmodern belief system. [4 : 41] It is painfully clear that fundamental presuppositions and... Sorry, we've kind of covered that. So much of what was once considered self-evidently good and right is now called bad, while evil is called good.

Truths once almost universally acknowledged in Christian societies are now labeled false, bigoted, and hateful. This is because a humanistic ideology promoting absolute freedom from any ethical norms or moral standards is being disseminated in the West and throughout the world.

The ideology aims at what German sociologist Gabrielle Kuby calls the destruction of freedom in the name of freedom. And I am much indebted to her book here. You know, if this is a talk that interests you, I highly recommend this.

At least for me, it was really helpful to go... Not to simply look at, well, what's been going on in our society? How did we get here in the last 30 years? But how have we gotten here as a society in the long-term trajectory?

And that's what she's looked at. She's a German sociologist who became a Christian, I think it was probably in her 30s. She's Roman Catholic, so her biases that direction are evident in her book, as well as definitely her belief that we shouldn't use contraception.

[5 : 58] And she sees that as part of the picture. But whether you see that as part of the picture or not, although I think at least at some level that is an element, she still has just a very clear view of what's been going on.

Where once social mores and even legal policy protected monogamy, the traditional family, and the right to life of every person born or in the womb, today people have protected rights and freedoms to engage in promiscuity, in pornography, in adultery, in public displays of indecency, in sodomy and other perversions, in marriage to the same sex, and in the murder of unborn babies, and even now we've seen outright infanticide is emerging, not to mention, of course, euthanasia of the disabled and the elderly.

Our society is all about the unlimited rights of the individual to live as they choose. The truth is, however, that every right, every freedom, every privilege in society must have its terms and conditions and limitations.

It's just a question of whose terms and based on what belief system or what worldview or values. So clearly the agenda we're facing is far broader than the matter of transgenderism.

It is just the latest crisis in our society's downward spiral into chaos and destruction. And as Kubi observes, it's merely the most recent development in the global sexual revolution, which is itself an inevitable byproduct of the rising worldviews of humanism, which we can, as I say, trace back to the Enlightenment.

[7 : 31] Humanism has taken on a variety of faces over the past couple of centuries, but its fundamental presupposition is the same. Man can and must save himself and creation we see more and more today.

To achieve this, he must individually and collectively assert himself and ultimately free himself from the constraints of traditional, authoritarian, moralistic, religious society.

In some aspects of life, there are new forms of asceticism and legalism. If you think of environmentalism, there's sort of an asceticism that is in that in terms of minimalism and putting aside my own, in a sense, hedonistic desires for the sake of creation.

There is that. But when it comes to sexuality, the highest value is unboundaried self-determination, self-expression, and self-indulgence. And by whatever means the individual deems necessary, truth and morals being relative.

In this context, human sin will flourish, including, of course, sexual sin, lust, sensuality, provocativeness, promiscuity in general, and a variety of perversions in particular.

[8 : 42] All of these, I don't know if I, can you, next slide please. And next. Oh, okay, that's good. Yeah, just hang on there.

So, there's fornication, pornography, prostitution, adultery, bisexuality, homosexuality, fetishism, voyeurism, polyandry, orgy, sadomasochism, transvestitism, etc., and now transgenderism. All of these our society is now embracing as normal and good, with polygamy, incest, pedophilia, rape, sex slavery, and bestiality following hard on their heels.

We can all remember when pornography and premarital sex, especially for teenagers, were taboo. While now they're assumed and even encouraged in our children as they're sexualized in the schooling system.

And not only by the media, as we see now, but in the public school system. So, the rise of homosexuality, did you do that slide or not?

[9 : 46] So, until the late 20th century, homosexual behavior, like every other illicit form of sexuality, had been ever present on the fringes of society, both in Europe and in America. But it was quite rare and clandestine due to social mores as well as prohibitive legislation.

Between 1850 and the 1980s, numbers rose in Europe during brief stretches and stepped with the rise of these radical humanistic ideologies and political movements, deism, materialism, Darwinism, atheism, Malthusianism, Marxism, Freudism, etc.

All of these rejected biblical doctrine and ethics. These isms sprang from a long list of influential intellectuals, such as, starting with going back to Marquis de Sade, Rousseau, Comte, Fourier, Nietzsche, Freud, Jung, Watson, Reich, and many others, I'm not going to name them all.

And all of these rejected the Christian faith. And many of them actually were what you would call apostate. In the sense they had been raised in the church, they were Christians, encountered, in a sense, it kind of picked up steam like a snowball going downhill, as they encountered others with these kinds of ideas and embraced them and followed down along that same trajectory, which we'll see again in a moment.

As Dostoevsky's character Ivan comments in *Brothers Karamazov*, is if there is no God, everything is permitted. But despite the efforts of these humanists to discard the Christian foundations of our society, their moral offspring, promiscuity, homosexuality, and other sexual debauchery never managed to gain the widespread mainstream acceptance that it sought.

[11 : 26] It wasn't until the 1970s and 80s, in post-Christian Europe and North America, that homosexuality, I'm calling it that in terms of, in a sense, as a movement, and its various bedfellows, became a militant movement, a sympathy engendering cause, an openly promoted ideology, and in-your-face agenda.

So this is where I'm saying, that's sort of where things really turned, was in the 70s and 80s, and it became this open agenda. Until then, it was like most ideas. They percolate in the ivy towers, and then kind of slowly trickle down.

There's that trickle-down effect, and it can take 10, 20, 30, 40, 50 years, or even 100 years, for those ideas to take hold in society. But things changed, as you realize, in the 70s and 80s.

In her book, Kubi describes the global sexual revolution that has been going on for more than two centuries, tracing its development from the trailblazers of the French Revolution to the post-modern gender ideology of Judith Butler, who I think we mentioned last time, and we'll come to her, but we've got a long way to get to her.

In Kubi's view, this has involved these points. I'm not going to read them all out for you. You can just have a look at them while I talk. Public sex education of children, especially in its new, fully integrated format, initiates children and teens into a hedonistic sexuality contrary to the values essential to marriage and parenthood, and thereby a threat to our very society's survival.

[12 : 52] Even more concerning, if possible, is that the sexual revolution is culminating in an attack on basic democratic freedoms and this is particularly directed against Christians. There is a new totalitarianism on the rise that is destroying freedom in the name of freedom.

Kubi outlines how, since the 1960s, with help from the United Nations, the European Union and the media, a powerful lobby has been fighting to change the value system, the goal, as I say, being absolute freedom, unfettered by any moral or natural limitations.

When freedom is understood in this way, there is no good, no evil, and no system, no standards.

The concrete weapons in this war include the destruction of male-female sexuality or gender, alteration of the population's social norms and attitudes, so this goes more broadly than just the Christians, but generally the world's societies.

This is especially true among youth. Complete legal equivalency of homosexual partnership with marriage and even social ostracism and legal criminalization of any opposition to these new norms. One more quote from Kubi is, We are born with the potential for freedom, but the ability to use our freedom for good needs formation and work within the individual.

[14 : 08] Virtue is the precondition for high culture. We must learn the cardinal virtues that allow our humanity to flourish, wisdom, justice, bravery, and restraint. But when people fall for the lie that

unrestrained satisfaction of their urges is freedom or leads to freedom, they become subservient to those urges, and another word for this is addiction.

All this Huxley, author of *Brave New World*, once observed that as political and economic freedom diminishes, sexual freedom tends compensatingly to increase, and the dictator will do well to encourage that freedom in conjunction with the freedom to daydream and the influence of dope and movies and the radio, and of course we've come a long way since Huxley, it will help to reconcile his subjects to the servitude which is their fate.

So we're going to now look at the, and here just, as we go through, I'm going to have some quotations from Romans that I think are significant to what we're talking about.

I won't read through all of them because of time, but. So the French Revolution. We're going to look at some highlights, or rather lowlights, of the sexual revolution's progression.

Skipping over the Marquis de Sade's 1791 novel *Justine*, to consider the French Revolution, which elevated autonomous human reason to the level of a goddess, a being self-liberated from God and his imperatives.

[15:29] The people were enticed by the beautiful words that spoke to the longings that everyone harbours, *liberté, égalité, fraternité*, freedom, equality, brotherhood.

But as Kubi comments, people didn't notice that freedom can only be increased at the expense of equality. Equality gains at the expense of freedom, and that brotherhood falls by the wayside where there is no justice.

The revolution quickly became a bloodthirsty reign of terror, as we know that committed genocide not only of the aristocracy, but also of dissenters, in particular Christians, and especially the clergy. The church, the Christian faith with its beliefs and ethics, was regarded as the rival worldview to be eliminated in order to make way for the new humanistic ideology. And as the scriptures make clear, sexual debauchery always goes hand in hand with rebellion, hatred, violence, and murder.

E. Michael Jones, or Michael Jones, observes that enlightenment politics is in reality nothing more than a physics of vice. Incite the passion, control the man. He further observes that vice as a form of social control is virtually invisible.

[16:36] Those who are in the thrall of their passions see only what they desire and not the bondage that those desires inflict on them. In such a context, unfettered sexual behaviour finds rich soil in which to grow.

Through following the revolution, sorry, although following the revolution, it returned mostly to festering beneath the surface and behind the scenes for another century. So we're going to move ahead and quickly mention Charles Darwin, and I think that the impact of his theories doesn't really need any explanation.

So in the interest of time, we'll just acknowledge that his infamous proposal or hypothesis reduced the view of man from divine to bestial in origin, and therefore in sexuality. It would also be too much for us to survey the ideas of all the deist, deistic, materialist, atheist, humanist philosophers in the Enlightenment period, which of course is the late 17th, early 18th century, and the impact that they had in promoting beliefs and values contrary to scripture and doctrine.

But let's just briefly consider one of these, Ludwig Fierbach. I first encountered his name in university when I was studying George Eliot's novels, and it was actually her who first translated his main work, which we'll mention in a minute.

And interesting, of course, novels were the popular media of her day, and they helped to popularize ideas, right? So it takes the philosopher ideologues' ideas and then injects them into society.

[18:04] So he was a German philosopher and anthropologist best known for the essence of Christianity. And in this work, he explained, demystified, and critiqued the Christian faith as a projection of man's own ideals and feelings.

Partly inspired, he was inspired by the revolutions in France, which he saw in a positive light, and initially a disciple of Hegel. He advocated liberalism, atheism, and materialism.

His ideas were influential in the development of historical materialism, where he often recognizes the bridge between Hegel and Marx, which we'll come to Marx in a minute.

At the University of Heidelberg, he intended to pursue a career in the church, but encountered the then predominant philosophy of Hegel and enrolled in the University of Berlin to study under him. But eventually he and another group of others, I guess students who had been disciples of Hegel, kind of formed their own offshoot of Hegelian philosophy, and they synthesized sort of sub-Hegelian

philosophy of their own.

[19 : 10] And they took Hegel's dialectic march of spirit through history, which saw Christianity as the culmination of religious ideas, sort of the apex, the flowering of man's humanity being expressed in religion, to mean that actually Western culture and institutional forms, and in particular Christianity, would actually be superseded.

So he saw that as like we've kind of reached the zenith, and they're like, well, not likely. There's probably another step. It's going to go beyond this. And they were right. He concluded that in every aspect, God corresponds to some feature or need of human nature.

Essentially, the thought of Furbach consisted in a new interpretation of religion's phenomena, giving them an anthropological explanation. His early strain of atheism strongly influenced generations of thinkers, including Marx, Engels, Freud, Wagner, and Nietzsche.

Although Marx and Engels criticized him for his inconsistent espousal of materialism. Like other atheists, he rejected the idea of absolute morality being rooted in a supreme and holy creator.

In his thinking, and I mean, basically, this is, in a sense, we're using him as representative of the Enlightenment philosophers. Like other atheists, he rejected that idea.

[20 : 30] In his thinking, one's own reason, knowledge, and will ultimately guide one in making moral decisions, or as we would call them, that are best for one's own overall maximum happiness, while at the same time balancing this with the happiness of others.

Yet, not surprisingly, as is true for most of these people, we'll be talking about, his private life proves the contrary, being marred by a severely wounded relationship with his wife after 1849, due to his infatuation with the daughter of his best friend.

So somehow his will and his reason were not working for him to make the right decisions, good for his happiness or anyone else's. So, next we're going to look at Marx and communism.

In the early 19th century, Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, as you know, developed the philosophy of dialectical materialism, their supposed utopia of a classless society, which, of course, was at its core a battle against God, belief, and the church.

Both were apostate Christians, just like Furbach and so many other philosophers, as I said, and in fact, even Joseph Stalin, as you may or may not know, was a seminarian, right, before he became, you know, the most infamous dictator or totalitarian dictator of all time.

[21 : 41] Marx and Engels wrote their manifesto of the Communist Party in 1848. And just a little quotation from that, communism abolishes eternal truths.

It abolishes all religion and all morality. Instead of constituting them on a new basis, it therefore acts in contradiction to all past historical experience. So, communists openly declare that their ends can be attained only by the forcible overthrow of all existing social conditions.

And to make the former disappear, the latter must be destroyed, both in theory and in practice. To communist revolutionaries, bourgeois morals, or Christian morals, impeded achievement of the classless society because it was in marriage that the first class antagonism rose.

The battle of the sexes, in a sense. So, in the Russian Revolution, we'll look at how this ideology played itself out in one little picture of the life of Alexandra Kollontai, who was the first woman to sit on the St. Petersburg Revolutionary Council and was commissar for public welfare under Lenin. She worked to legalize divorce and abortion and establish communal houses promoting free love to liberate women from the choice between marriage and prostitution. So, basically, she said, you know, look, if we just live communally in the sexual realm of our lives as well, that'll free women up from the slavery of having to take care of their husband and children.

[23 : 10] And it also, of course, the Bolsheviks, as a group, wanted to control the rearing of children themselves in order to make them obedient communists. So, women also were seen as an important economic resource who needed to work in production rather than for their husbands and children at home.

The state sought to co-opt the natural structure and bonds of the nuclear family, which, of course, involves dissolution of the value that sex is for marriage and procreation. But the party eventually realized that this led to social chaos and reinstated some legislation against sexual debauchery because, as Michael Jones has observed, the classical state must foster virtue.

The revolutionary state must foster vice to achieve its short-term goals. But that vice leads sooner or later to the demise of the revolutionary state as well. It can't hold together, right?

It crumbles because the glue is gone. Sigmund Freud. His depth psychology regarding the 20th century as one of the great new discoveries regarding human nature was that the human subconscious revolved around repressed sexual desires.

Oedipal impulses, penis envy, castration, anxiety, which he discovered in his patients. A child's sexual desires were supposedly directed at the parents of the opposite sex, while the child perceived the parent of the same sex as a rival, triggering feelings of jealousy and hatred.

[24 : 33] Religion, morality, and parental authority were said to be anchored in the superego, which is sort of ruling over your ego, to exert repressive power over a person, especially his sexual desires.

And of course, years of psychoanalysis could deprive that superego of its power, and with the help of the emancipated ego, the needs of the id could be satisfied without guilt. Freud, like Furbach, viewed religious practices as the neurotic compulsions.

Now, Furbach wouldn't have put it in these terms. He put things much more gently and softly and nicely, but this is the essence of it. The neurotic compulsions of a person who didn't want to grow up, that in a sense they serve as a crutch that provides to the psyche a sense of security, protection, a sense of higher purpose, and moral control.

And of course, we hear this still in our society today, that your faith, your beliefs, your religion is just a crutch that helps you deal with your pain, deal with your neuroses, whatever it is, and not have to deal with the realities of life without God.

So, his eloquently formulated psychological theories played a key role in the dismantling of Christian values and the sexualization of the culture.

[25 : 46] And we'll just mention Jung quickly. He was Freud's prodigy, as you know. He broke away and united psychology with spirituality, for which reason some Christians have thought, oh, he's bridged the divide between faith and depth psychology, but he did not speak of God, but noumena, which is a term from Roman paganism that indicated the presence of non-specific divinities, whether in a tree, a stone, the emperor, or the cosmos, or whatever.

His concept of the divine was dualistic, and people like God are a unity of coexisting good and evil, and he refers in his writings to his own initiation into the realm of darkness, and he was also open to the occult.

So, just, I mean, you probably yourselves aren't influenced by this, but I'm saying it would seem that in some Christian circles he was seen as, well, he was kind of helping to bring together this new understanding of man's psyche with spirituality, but it was definitely nothing like Christian spirituality.

In a sense, Martin Buber describes his psychology as a new pseudo-religious Gnosticism, which comes up again and again. William Reich, how am I doing? During the Weimar Republic, in what, of course, became Germany, William Reich was one of the most effective sexual revolutionaries.

As a medical student, he began to make a name for himself in the Vienna Psychoanalytic Society, founded by Sigmund Freud in 1908. His orgasm theory grew from Freud's libido theory.

[27 : 14] People need three per week to be healthy and to build the classless society as citizens of the revolution, whether by oneself, with alternating partners, or with either sex. For this, compulsory marriage and the compulsory family, meaning something that society saw as integral, as a tool of child-rearing, had to be destroyed.

The means for doing this was the sexualization of the masses, particularly of youth and even children. In his work, *The Sexual Revolution*, he has his own work by that name, Reich states that the patriarchal family is the structural and ideological breeding ground of all social orders based on the authoritarian principle, meaning one's relationship to God, the church, tradition, parents, and teachers.

He goes on to say, we do not discuss the existence or non-existence of God. We merely eliminate the sexual repressions and dissolve the infantile ties to the parents. So, we see this today in terms of what is going on in the public school system.

Reich made it crystal clear that sexualization was the vehicle for destroying all these relationships and thereby the structural order of the whole society. He joined the Communist Party, but was eventually expelled in 1933 because even they found him a little bit too edgy.

He founded the Sex Poll Movement, which organized proletarian mass rallies in pre-war Berlin. Its agenda was sexual affirmation as the core of a life-affirming cultural policy based on the socialist planned economy.

[28 : 38] In a nutshell, satisfy your sexual urges and you'll create a paradise on earth. And this is sort of the precursor to the hippie slogan make love, not war. Reich wanted to abolish the sex-negating atmosphere and structure of the family by using sexualization to release children and youth from their family ties as revolutionary youth is hostile and destructive to the family.

He promoted masturbation as a way out of the harm of abstinence and sexual intercourse starting at puberty as strategies to overthrow the norms of compulsory marriage and family and to liberate citizens from submissiveness to traditional authorities.

He recognized that total sexualization of the culture would mean extermination of the churches and the traditional state and his ideas were extremely influential. Magnus Hirschfeld.

One of the first activists for legitimization of homosexuality, Hirschfeld was a pioneer of sexology. He developed the theory that the binary gender system must be abolished in favor of radical individualization.

Each man and each woman, he claimed, was a unique mixture of male and female traits. He admitted that homosexuality was a congenital, like earlier on perhaps, he admitted that it was a congenital deformity, that he realized there's something, that it is departing from a norm.

[29 : 57] He recognized that and he actually classified it among sexual anomalies and even perversions early on. Yet he ultimately fought for its acceptance in society. In his book, Berlin's Third Sex, he calls homosexuals, actually you can go back to the other, I just wanted to draw attention to this particular quote, the woman who needs to be liberated most is the woman in every man and the man who needs to be liberated most is the man in every woman.

So, so he said, he actually called homosexual people unfortunate disenfranchised people who drag a mysterious riddle of nature throughout their lonely lives and we must be thankful to any doctor who has new treatment options because many homosexuals feel the certainly justified desire to feel inherently heterosexual.

homosexual. But as, as I say, that's not where his thinking stopped. In 1908, he founded the Journal of Sexology. In 1919, the Institute for Sexology, which organized congresses for scientifically, scientifically based sexual reform, where he promoted the idea that homosexuality was just part of nature's variety.

Recognizing the media's potential to change culture, he founded, or sorry, he launched the production of the first homosexual film, Different from the Others. In 1923, he founded the Institute for Nudism, and in Copenhagen, the World League for Sexual Reform in 1928.

He was a very busy man. He also advocated eugenics, and we'll come back to that, and was a member of the German Society for Racial Hygiene. His legacy lives on. Today, the German Society for Social Scientific Sexuality Research, founded in 1990, awards its Magnus Hirschfeld Medal Medal for Outstanding Contributions to Sexual Science and Sexual Reform.

[31 : 45] Hirschfeld tried to overcome the painful contradiction, this is Kubi's comment, between his own homosexuality and condemnation of this tendency as a deformity and perversion by dissolving gender identity itself.

As such, he is the forerunner of gender ideology. John Watson. In 1914, his book, Behaviorism, provided the foundation for a strategy of social engineering.

The manipulation of the masses to serve hidden objectives. He saw human beings as malleable objects that could be conditioned by positive and negative stimuli. Darwinism's idea that man is merely a highly evolved ape had prepared the way for this.

As people's ties to religion, tradition, and morality lesson, they could and needed to be reconditioned. And the younger the person, the more easily this could be accomplished. In 1928, he published Psychological Care of Infant and Child, which sought to replace parental love and traditional standards of child rearing with scientific behavioral control.

And he was one of Huxley's inspirations for Brave New World, in which people are conditioned to love slavery. And interestingly, I just watched another one of those kind of teen films that was kind of caught my eye and that kind of, oh, what's the name of it now, that kind of follows along the same lines of showing this kind of social engineering.

[33 : 10] And I'll remember the name later. Behaviorism promised to solve the problems of society by turning psychologists into social engineers. Edward Bernays was a nephew of Freud and was one of the first very effective social engineers and was actually listed by Life magazine as one of the most, one of the 100 most influential people of the 20th century.

He had a passion for manipulating the masses. If we understand the mechanism and motives of the group mind, is it not possible to control and regiment the masses according to our will without their knowing it?

Is what he was, a quotation from his work. In his most famous book, Propaganda, he wrote, the conscious and intelligent manipulation of the organized habits and opinions of the masses is an important element in democratic society.

Those who manipulate this unseen mechanism of society constitute an invisible government, which is the true ruling power of our country. We are governed, our minds molded, our tastes formed, our ideas suggested, largely by men we've never heard of.

It is they who pull the wires which control the public mind. These insights were not lost on Joseph Goebbels, propaganda minister of the Third Reich, but they are just as relevant to our current societies.

[34 : 26] They are the views and motives of every spin doctor of our era. A dedicated atheist, Bernays realized that a world without God would rapidly descend into chaos. He therefore contended that social manipulation by public relations counselors was justified by the end of creating a man-made, sorry, of creating man-made gods who could assert subtle social control and prevent disaster.

Pulling strings behind the scenes was necessary not only for personal advantage but for social salvation. So, putting together this manipulation of the masses with the sexualization of the masses and you have a recipe for disaster.

Bernard Berilsen developed the techniques of, and mechanisms of mass manipulation even further using TV, radio, and social scientific refinements and opinion surveys.

He worked in service of the Ford and Rockefeller foundations and their names come up again and again if you look at the history of the sexual revolution in the 20th century as financiers.

His pioneering work, Reader in Public Opinion and Communication, states that manipulating the masses requires manipulating their opinions in a manner such that they don't feel forced but they feel that they are actually doing what they believe or feel that they have chosen for themselves.

[35 : 46] As he observes, the goal of secularization was the reduction of all of life's imperatives to opinions which is to say not the expression of moral absolutes or divine law. Once this secularization occurred, the people who controlled opinions controlled the country as people are given to acting as sheep.

Ironically, secularists purport that people of faith are simply the manipulated peons of the church in contrast to the free-thinking or free-acting secularists which of course isn't true at all.

Margaret Sanger and Eugenics. The Eugenics movement aims, as you may know, to reduce population particularly, however, of the poor, of certain ethnic groups, of the disabled and other undesirables.

Margaret Sanger, who interestingly enough was praised by Hillary Clinton as a wonderful woman, was a communist-oriented feminist and she made it her life's mission to eliminate supposedly undesirable elements of the population through contraception, sterilization, and abortion.

While Sanger founded the American Birth Control League, which openly advocated eugenics for racist purposes in 1921, Marie Stopes opened a birth control clinic in London. Today, Marie Stopes International is one of the largest abortion organizations in the world.

[37 : 14] In the 1930s, the Rockefellers began to back Sanger's push for birth control as a solution to mass poverty during the Great Depression, but this birth reduction was to be selective. At a congressional hearing, she called for more children from the fit, fewer from the unfit.

In 1942, the Birth Control League changed its name to, oh, and here, sorry, a couple of quotations by her. The most merciful thing that the large family does to one of its infant members is to kill it. We've got too many, it's better for the others if you kill the new arrival. We don't, and she wasn't, she was talking about infanticide. We don't want the word to, even, to go out that we want to exterminate the Negro population.

Meaning, she's not saying, we don't want people to get the wrong impression. What she's saying is we have to be careful they don't find out our real agenda. So, as you may know as well, due to a number of factors, birth rates in the developed world have actually plummeted in many places below replacement levels.

The factors, contrary to proponents of eugenics and of population control, the factors include family breakdown, later marriage, ultra-feminism, contraception, and abortion, but there have also been

changes in our social values.

[38 : 32] God said multiply, but we've been taught to fear that the world is becoming overpopulated, that children are expensive and a lot of work, but they're worth it.

It's Mother's Day. I love you, dear. That they mean less time, freedom, and opportunity for ourselves. And again, true, but all worth it. So, yeah, next slide, please, dear.

You can go to the end again. Alfred Kinsey. How many of you are familiar with Kinsey's name? Oh, yeah. Moving ahead to the mid-20th century, Alfred Kinsey drove forward the sexualization of the Western world with his sexual behavior in the human male and then the human female in 53.

initially an entomologist. He's hailed as the father of human sexology and cited as a serious scientist. Even though he was homosexual, sadomasochistic, a self-mutilator, a substance addict, a porn addict, a child molester.

He sexually abused children and exploited prison inmates in order to arrive at his desired ends or research results. He manipulated and falsified these. But when you read his research, you're going, but to find that out, you might have to be sexually abusing children.

[39 : 47] And he was. Says Kubi, his significance in the dismantling of the fundamental values of Western culture cannot be overestimated. His goal of eliminating the repressive sexual heritage of Judeo-Christian culture in both behavior and legislation was ultimately achieved in spades.

He claimed that the laws that had previously protected families, women, and children, were relics of a hypocritical morality that no one adhered to and that stood in the way of the benefits of a sexually enlightened and honest era.

As we've seen, the result has been sexual anarchy, which has spread like a cancer. His 1948 work sold 200,000 copies in two months, leading its astonished readers to believe that it was normal and healthy to view pornography, masturbate, engage in premarital sex, have multiple partners, get divorced, indulge in homosexual behaviors, etc.

He claimed that children, according to his research, are sexually active from infancy, could have orgasms, and should be encouraged by adults to satisfy their sexual needs. The rise of no-fault divorce, the legalization of abortion, extramarital sex, cohabitation, and the toleration of fornication, sodomy, homosexuality, divorce, and prostitution all contributed to the ensuing disintegration of families, the rise of absent fathers, the explosive spread of the sexually transmitted diseases, and the increase of emotionally traumatized youth and adults.

And some of his powerful allies, you can see there, Hugh Hefner, and I'm going to just let you read through the others. John Money was the capable successor to Kinsey. He was a psychiatrist at Johns Hopkins Hospital in Baltimore.

[41 : 22] In the 60s, he opened the first clinic for sex change operations, the Gender Identity Clinic. So this is the 60s, really. Again, we look back to the 70s and 80s, but it's, again, often that these things take a while before they're known or popularized.

He experimented with twin brothers and following a badly botched circumcision, advised parents of this one child who was one of twins to subject Bruce to sex reassignment surgery to rename him Brenda and raise him as a girl, which they did for 10 years.

But he never felt at ease and he rebelled and saw the treatments he was given as tortuous. He was suicidal by 11. He learned the truth at 13 and committed suicide at 38, sadly following his brother Brian who had also committed suicide.

But this didn't, but of course, in the meantime, Money had been claiming that this was proof that sex reassignment surgery was safe. You know, of course, for the first 10 years, he's going, see, look, it's all great. You know, we just made him a girl.

It's all good. And this attracted throngs to his clinic. Like Kinsey, he advocated group sex, bisexuality, and he promoted, I can't even say it, but sex games for children.

[42 : 34] And he classified even extreme sexual perversions such as sex murder as a paraphilia, which is really just calling it a difference in preference. Simone de Beauvoir, we covered last time, so I'm just going to mention her briefly.

Her book, *The Second Sex*, was popular in the 60s. Its mantra was one is not born, but rather becomes woman. And the seminal idea is that one's sexual or gender identity is not something you were born with, rather it is imposed by society or chosen and apprehended intentionally by an individual.

And again, there's Gnosticism underpinning her ideas. And then we can also mention radical feminism, but in the interest of time, we're just going to push ahead because I want to get to Kirk and Madsen's book, *After the Ball*.

So, right here, good. So, how did we get from the feminism of the 1960s to where we are today? In 1989, *After the Ball* was published with the subtitle *How America Will Conquer Its Fear and Hatred of Gays in the 90s*.

How many of you have heard of this book? Yeah, it's very, I mean, I'd never heard of it until, you know, a few months back or I don't know. Yeah, and I was just shocked when I, basically, I haven't gotten a hold of it yet.

[43 : 53] We looked into buying it, but it's actually really expensive because it's discontinued. So, it was going to cost like \$100 some of the copies. And so, I read it through Albert Moeller, who was president of Southern Seminary, who does a summary and analysis of it.

And so, but, it speaks for itself. It was co-authored by neuropsychologist Marshall Kirk and advertising consultant Hunter Madsen.

This manifesto and call to arms of the gay revolution unabashedly promoted the homosexual agenda and has been described as one of the most influential manifestos of the movement's militant activists.

The authors of *After the Ball* proposed a massive media campaign designed to correct stereotypes and neutralize anti-gay prejudice. In fact, it became the public relations manual for the gay agenda, advocating the use of propaganda to advance the cause of gay rights.

Now, it didn't continue in production because, in a sense, you can see why. You don't actually want everyone going, wait a second, that's what they're doing! Oh, that's what's happening!

[45 : 05] So, I really do think that that's why it was taken out of production, but it definitely had its impact. And the authors made no bones about the fact that they can, oh, sorry, their goal was to convert the minds of the public and to subvert Christian culture and they had no problem with lying, deception, misrepresentation as a means to their end.

Robert Riley points out in *Making Gay Okay* that Kirk and Madsen's proposed strategy of portraying gay people as victims was hugely successful as evidenced by the fact that AIDS gets more research dollars per patient in the U.S.

than any other disease. And here are some quotations. Actually, Zolton, would you read these so I can spread it? As cynical as it may seem, AIDS gives us a chance, however brief, to establish ourselves as a victimized minority legitimately deserving of America's special care and protection. The purpose of victim imagery is to make straights feel very uncomfortable to lay the groundwork for the process of conversion of public opinion by helping straights identify with gays and sympathize with their underdog status.

Next slide. Keep going. Gays must be portrayed as victims in need of protection so that straights will be inclined by reflex to adopt the role of protector. Okay, just hang on there.

[46 : 23] So, um, after the ball encouraged gays to come out of the closet and to talk often and openly about homosexuality.

The idea was that the more openly it was discussed, the more above board and the less furtive or alien or morally repugnant and sinful it would seem. And you can, sorry, back again please. Um, so, the next...

Constant talk builds the impression that public opinion is at least divided on the subject and that a sizable block the most modern up-to-date citizens accept or even practice homosexuality.

But Kirk and Madsen further advised that the gay community keep the focus on their victimization and the need for liberation and off of their sexual practices and at the same time to evidence, at least in the initial stages and to portray in the media, more mature love relationships and sexual moderation.

The strategy was to avoid shock and moral dismay while gaining legitimacy in society by giving the lifestyle a sense of normalcy. Oh, lord. Misha? And when we say talk about homosexuality we mean just that.

[47 : 31] In the early stages of the campaign the public should not be shocked and repelled by premature exposure to homosexual behavior itself. Instead, the imagery of sex per se should be downplayed and the issue of gay rights reduced as far as possible to an abstract social question.

And let's just go right on to the next one. In practical terms this means that cocky, mustachioed, leathered men, drag queens and bull dykes would not appear in gay commercials and other public presentations.

Conventional young people, middle-aged women and other folks older folks of all races would be featured not to mention the parents and straight friends of gays. And as my husband has observed a strong dose of humor which is the sweet spoonful of sugar that helps the medicine go down. And so a lot of programs starting even in the 70s and then in the 80s and the 90s were portraying a lot of sort of funny characters who were homosexual because that kind of made it just seem kind of more normal and not a big deal.

So humor was used a lot as well. The book includes chapters debunking the belief that homosexuality is rooted in mental illness, gender confusion or dislike of the opposite sex and promoting the idea that it's simply a matter of having been born that way.

[48 : 55] We argue that for all practical purposes gays should be considered to have been born gay even though sexual orientation for most humans seems to be the product of a complex interaction between innate predispositions and environmental factors during childhood and early adolescence.

So they're recognizing this is not true but we're going to do it because it achieves our end. Our goal. And finally this one.

Or where are we? In to suggest. No, can you go back? To suggest in public that homosexuality might be chosen is to open the can of worms labeled moral choices and sin and give the religious intransigence a stick to beat us with.

Straits must be taught that it is natural for some persons to be homosexual as it is for others to be heterosexual. Wickedness and seduction have nothing to do with it. So not surprisingly Kirk and Madsen recognized Christianity as informed by the scriptures versus its liberal forms to be the greatest obstacle and threat to the legitimization of homosexuality.

Their advice to gays on how to deal with the moral question was that they should use talk to muddy the moral waters. That is to undercut the rationalizations that justify religious bigotry and to jam some of its psychic rewards is how they wrote it.

[50 : 13] This entails publicizing support by moderate churches and raising serious theological objections to conservative biblical teachings. It also means exposing the inconsistency and hatred underlying anti-gay doctrines.

Conservative churches were to be labeled homo-haters. Today homophobic is used synonymously and to be depicted as antiquated backwaters badly out of step with the times and the latest findings of psychology.

Conservative Christians were to be portrayed as hysterical backwoods preachers drooling with hate to a degree that looks both comical and deranged. A concrete example is offered.

Would you do this one, Zoltan? For several seconds, an unctuous, beady-eyed southern preacher is shown pounding the pulpit in rage against those perverted, abominable creatures.

While his tirade continues over the soundtrack, the picture switches to heart-rending photos of badly beaten persons or of gays who look decent, harmless, and likable. And then we cut back to the poisonous face of the preacher.

[51 : 12] The contrast speaks for itself. The effect is devastating. So the aim here was to conflate the bigotry and hatred of a few with the moral values and genuine tolerance and in fact love of the majority of Christians.

True Christians, of course, recognize that we're all sinners in need of God's grace. We're all saved by faith that Jesus died in our place, not because we're somehow inherently better than anyone else, whether they're homosexual in their behavior or not.

We're all called to repent of our various sins and live lives of purity, love, humility, and truth. To tolerate does not mean to agree, approve, or celebrate. Tolerance is the capacity.

And interestingly, when I looked this up, they were conflating the meaning of tolerance even in the dictionary that I found online in order to get away from the fact that tolerance does not mean what it now has come to mean.

Anyway, so tolerance is the capacity. This is my definition in putting together their two definitions to endure continued subjection to something, in particular, the existence of opinions or behavior one does not agree with without adverse reaction, without reacting in hate or disgust or unkindness.

[52 : 22] But just tolerating gay and lesbian people is not enough. The true heart of a follower of Jesus is to lovingly and truthfully share the forgiveness, healing, hope, and wholeness of being reconciled to God and of finding one's true identity in Christ, not in your sexuality.

Kirk and Madsen's book came out, and sorry for the little homily there, which I'm just saying, I think it's important that we recognize that this is not to, in order to, again, in any way promote hatred or unkindness, as we all would agree.

Their book came out in 1989. Less than two decades later, homosexuality had overwhelmingly won the ground in an astonishingly short amount of time. The goal set out in *After the Ball* had been achieved with incredible success.

No longer was homosexuality a fringe perversion. The lifestyle had been normalized, legitimized, and promoted until it had gained approval, popularity, and even celebration within European and North American societies.

The sexual revolution was set to move on to the next phase of mainstreaming sexual license and aberration. Transgenderism. Sadly, as we know, many churches have compromised the truth regarding homosexuality and transgenderism and are now complicit in promoting gender multiplicity.

[53 : 38] Again, I'm not saying this because I'm not, I'm insensitive to the pain that many people experience, the confusion that they experience, but we have to learn how to speak the truth without pulling the punches, but at the same time in love, right?

We want, and it's very difficult to find that balance, but there's the two ditches on either side of the road. The one is, you know, to sort of try to just be nice and liked and, and, and, and to compromise speaking the truth, and the other is to speak the truth without love, without sensitivity, without kindness, and even to be intolerant.

Judith Butler, I think I mentioned her last time in her 1990 book *Gender, Trouble, Feminism, the Subversion of Identity*, was an American academic philosopher and prolific author. She became the founder of gender mainstreaming queer theory that really sort of took things the next step and went from the homosexual, again, it, it came out at the same, or sorry, her book came out at the same time as *After the Ball*, but it was a little early for its time.

so the first step had to be completed before the other one came into play. Her contribution to the matter we're discussing can hardly be overstated. Her book remains the fundamental work on gender ideology.

I'm not going to go into much there because, but she basically talked about gender as a social construct, something that is just really an idea that is imposed on people.

[55 : 08] So society has come up with these particular, these arbitrary ideas about sexuality and gender and then it just sort of repeats them and foists them on people and people kind of, oh, I guess I have to think that way or be that way is what she's saying, but really we need to free ourselves and say, no, no, no, I can think or be however I want to and that includes my sexuality and there's any number of options and combinations that I can embrace here.

So it's not, it doesn't have to do with God's creation, it doesn't have to do with any absolute reality, it doesn't have to do with any scientific reality. So I'm really out of time and so I'm going to just skip to tolerance or ideological warfare.

There we go. You've heard the claim so many times that it is really all about tolerance and inclusivity, about putting an end to bigotry and bullying and of course everyone should be treated with dignity, respect, fairness and kindness, whether homosexual, heterosexual, transgender.

The LGBTQ lobby claims the moral high ground of freeing oppressed people from shame, prejudice, oppression and discrimination, which are noble aims of course, but the sex activists who lead the charge in promoting this ideology are not merely seeking tolerance or inclusivity.

They're not just trying to stamp out bigotry or bullying of minority groups, though they began with this as their mantra. Rather, they are intent on infiltrating and reprogramming society with their ideology.

[56 : 40] They set out to redefine what is normal and healthy and good and to proliferate gender multiplicity and in other words to recruit. They also aim to silence by shouting down, last listing, shaming, demonizing and punishing any voice that hints at dissent.

Their campaign is militant, vitriolic, intolerant. We must remember, however, that we're not battling against flesh and blood, but against demonic powers. Our confidence cannot be in our own strength

to overcome, but in God's.

And I'll stop there, I have more than 10 pages, but just a personal anecdote, on Thursday, we were invited to go and speak at a, not speak, I'm going to say speak, sorry, to attend, to participate in a closed meeting where these issues would be discussed.

And the speakers were a girl who had detransitioned, having gone forward along the treadmill and then went, what am I doing? This is nuts. Now she's a lesbian, living as a lesbian now, but she realized, you know, cutting off my body parts is a bad idea.

And giving myself cross-sex hormones was a bad idea. But I was influenced because I was a young person and, you know, everything in my social media, et cetera, influenced me towards this.

[57 : 58] And of course, then now you've got the medical system and the education system. Yeah, yeah, yeah, yeah, this is good. Come on, let's do this. And so you do it. And then a couple years down the road, when you, you know, you, the evidence shows that many people who once they do get on that treadmill don't turn back until many years later, I don't think they actually admit to themselves, wait a second, I'm not sure I should, someone like Walter Heyer who realizes this was not good for me.

But that if, if people are allowed to work through the, the struggle that they have, for the most part they will desist and they will ultimately reconcile themselves to their own sex and if nothing else at least decide that they're going to live as a homosexual rather than mutilate their bodies.

So the other, there was also a feminist and again, we could agree, you know, pretty ultra feminist but at the same time I think someone who still wanted to engage in reasonable dialogue and had a lot of good points to share about how this is bad for women in general.

And then the third speaker was the, the famous or once infamous Dr. Zucker who had done a great deal of research that, and had helped many, many hundreds of young people work through their gender confusion issues successfully and had a, like, 90% desistance rate for the people he worked with in his clinic in Toronto and then was fired because they didn't like the results he was getting because they wanted someone who was going to, like, Wallace Wong who was going to promote the agenda and now he has a private clinic.

So he spoke more on the scientific side of things. We had to have three levels of security. There were police there, there were private security team and the security from the Croatian Cultural Center.

[59 : 44] When we arrived we're going, I hope our car is going to be safe out here because there's a huge contingent of people shouting swear words and hateful names, et cetera. And of course the irony of it all is they're saying you intolerant and bigoted people who say that people shouldn't become transgender and cut off their body parts and that's really what they're saying and they're angry and bitter.

They hate this feminist. They hate this girl who did transition because she has abandoned the cause. She's an apostate. And they send them horrible hate mail and et cetera, right?

And so I'm saying it took three levels of security just to have this meeting because of the large contingent of objectors. I'm going to hand over to my husband to say anything more that he wants to there. Any questions?

I just, one thing I wanted to just to wrap up and I know we're gone over a little bit, but I'm sure everybody in this room remembers that horrible shooting that happened in Florida at the Pulse nightclub.

Do we all know that, right? I really would like to see a show of hands. How many people heard or believe that that had to do with this man's suppressed, repressed homosexual urges that he actually frequented the nightclub itself?

[60 : 59] I remember watching interviews people who were there said, yeah, I recognize that guy. He's been here. How many people heard that narrative? How many people heard that that's been debunked?

See? This is the propaganda, right? The police investigation was ongoing. Now, immediately following the shooting, you had all these eyewitnesses saying, oh, yeah, I remember this guy. He used to come here all the time. And then when the police did their investigations and they looked in his computer, he never frequented that nightclub. He targeted that nightclub, in fact, not because it had anything to do with homosexuality, because it actually had the least security. When they looked in his laptop, he was just targeting nightclubs in the area. It was close to where he lived. It had no security. He went in and shot the place up. He did not hurl any anti-gay was the

immediate thing that was put out.

They wanted to say that these intolerant religious people went after the Pulse nightclub because they were gay. Now, again, we're all horrified at what happened there, and no one should be condoning that.

[62 : 05] But that's the propaganda that the media is colluding on, and no one knows this because, and you can Google it, it's there in the record, but they don't promote it now and say, by the way, that was wrong.

So, any questions?