

The Venus Fly Trap: Gender Feminism and its Consequences

Psychology PhD Dissertation

Richard B. Sorensen

February 2024

Dedicated to my mother (now deceased) who was an instructor and assistant professor in the child psychology department at the University of Minnesota and taught me the history of psychology as a kid at the dinner table.

Table of Contents

Abstract	i
Introduction.....	ii
Hypothesis.....	ix
Gender and Sex	1
Male-Female Differences.....	4
Body Differences.....	5
Brain Differences	8
Fetal Brain Development	8
Impact of Differences in Brain Structure and Wiring	17
Intelligence and IQ	18
Math, Engineering, and Spatial Thinking.....	20
Reading, Writing, Language, and Verbal Skills.....	21
Interest Differences.....	21
Morality and Religiosity	27
Crime Rates and Aggression.....	29
Leadership, Goal-Setting, and Risk-Taking.....	31
Dominance and Submission	34
Sexual Pleasure.....	43
Summary of Male-Female Differences	52
Homosexuality	62
Biological Precursors to Homosexual Inclinations	63
Environmental Drivers to Homosexual Practice	67
Biological Inclination and Environmental Choice	72
Changing Sexual Orientation from Homo to Hetero	75
Homophobia and Repugnance Toward Homosexual Behavior	76
Prevalence of Depression and Suicide	79
Gender Incongruence and Dysphoria.....	82
Summary and Conclusions on Homosexuality	96
The History of Feminism	98

Philosophical Background.....	98
The First Wave – Workplace Feminism	108
The Industrial Revolution.....	109
Birth Control and Abortion.....	112
The Second Wave – Gender Feminism	118
Simone de Beauvoir.....	118
The Disciples of Simone de Beauvoir	122
The Invention of Gender.....	124
Feminist Theology and Archaeology.....	128
Sex Education	135
Summary of Second-Wave Feminism	139
The Third Wave – #MeToo and Transgenderism	141
The #MeToo Movement	144
The Gender Pay Gap.....	149
Queer Theory	155
Summary of Third-Wave Feminism	159
The Fourth Wave – Critical Theory and Intersectionality	159
The Fifth Wave – Empowerment	164
Feminism and Social Pathologies	166
Relational Dissatisfaction and Divorce	166
Fatherlessness and Family Breakdown	174
The Welfare Society	174
Fatherless Boys.....	176
Fatherless Girls	179
Feminist Response	180
Gangs, Drugs, and Violent Crime	184
Dysfunctional Families	184
The Significance of Marriage	184
Responsible Parenting	187
Poverty	193
Abortion	201

Materialism.....	205
Mental Illness, Guilt, Anxiety, Depression, and Suicide.....	210
Depression	211
Suicide	214
Sexually Transmitted Diseases.....	215
Pornography and Sex	217
Higher Taxes and Costs.....	220
Summary of Feminist Pathologies	220
Feminism and Psychology	223
Women’s Studies Programs.....	225
Criticism of Peer-Review and Research Bias	229
Cancel Culture.....	231
Counseling Modalities.....	241
The Ultimate Union – Ideal Male-Female Relationships	249
The Blue Zones	250
Principles of Religion.....	251
Comparing Religions	251
Criticism of Christianity	254
Science and Christianity	255
Giving and Christianity	257
Ecumenicalism and Christianity	262
Principles of Divine Nature.....	266
Principles of Human Nature.....	272
Principles of Love	275
Principles of Forgiveness and Repentance.....	276
Principles of Life Improvement	280
Gratitude	284
Prayer.....	284
Bible Reading	285
Church Attendance	286
Surrender and Action	286

Principles for Couples	289
Selecting a Marriage Partner	294
Love Languages.....	295
Sex	296
The Man/Husband	309
The Woman/Wife.....	312
Principles for Homosexuals	318
Principles of Counterfeits.....	323
Conclusions.....	325
Areas for Future Research.....	326
Appendices.....	328
Funding Feminist Ideology and Turning Disease into Profits	328
Rockefeller and Big Pharma.....	329
Planned Parenthood	330
Gender Transition	331
Steps in Gender Transitioning.....	333
Victims of Cancel Culture	338
Definitions of Terms	342
Afterword.....	358
Quotes and Poems.....	362
Male-Female, Marriage, and Sexuality	362
Psychology and Philosophy	366
Spirituality and Theology.....	367
Videography and Bibliography	371
Music Videos about Heaven.....	371
Movies with Traditional Male-Female Themes	371
Non-Fiction Books	372
Fiction Books	382
By the Author	384
References.....	386

Abstract

This dissertation is an analysis of the negative impacts of gender feminism on society. Although feminism has provided benefits to women, it has also caused or abetted many social pathologies deeply affecting the fabric of Western society, and this has not been generally acknowledged, particularly in the field of psychology. The history of feminism is reviewed and its large impact on thinking in all areas of Western society. In particular, the social construction of gender is rejected, the biological and therefore enduring impacts of male-female differences are explored, and the feminist accusations of “gender inequality” are challenged. In conclusion, traditional and religious concepts as related to feminism and ideal male-female relationships are considered.

Introduction

Since the 1960s Western society in general and America in particular has been suffering from increasing levels of relational dissatisfaction, divorce, fatherlessness, poverty, depression, mental illness, suicide, autism, and parenting problems such as child rebellion, misbehavior, violence, and poor educational results etc. ([Prager, 2023](#); [Walsh & Jorgensen, 2020](#); [Walsh, 2010](#); [Witters, 2023](#)) In addition, the last few years have seen a dramatic increase in gender dysphoria, particularly among girls, which was relatively rare prior to the 2000s ([Littman, 2018](#); [Malone, 2023](#)).

The question is, why? What factors have caused and continue to cause this increase in social pathologies? This is a broad question, and there are a number of possible answers including political alienation, liberal divorce laws, the homosexual and social justice movements, shifts in philosophy such as the growth of postmodernism, the abandonment of traditional morality, poverty, racism, materialism, technology (e.g., video games and electronic communication that reduce personal contact), food additives, environmental pollution, the Covid pandemic, and so on ([Gallick, 2021](#)). We cannot “boil the ocean” and fully explore all of these issues, and in particular we shall avoid factors over which people have little control, such as the environment. The focus here will be on behavioral issues – considerations over which we have a greater degree of influence.

The major factor underlying most of these behavioral-related pathologies affecting relationships and parenting is the nature and evolution of male-female relationships over the past sixty or so years. Individual couples comprise the foundation of society in that they produce and raise the children who will eventually become the next generation and continue the cycle. In

turn, the major factor over this time period in the evolution of male-female relationships is feminism.

Any social movement that is able to command the attention of large groups of people has at least some elements of truth and value within it. Feminism holds out the prospect for women of achieving more professional opportunities, wealth, independence, and ways to use their abilities unhindered by sexual bias. The Woman's Movement also has increased opportunities for women and nurtured the ability for them to dream of activities and accomplishments that former generations would not have considered. Those are good things, as everyone should be encouraged to use and develop their gifts. Following are the significant changes benefitting women that were primarily a result of feminism:

1. New educational and career opportunities for women that were previously perceived to be the exclusive domain of men.
2. Greater appreciation paid to female ideas and concerns.
3. Equal pay for equal work and more financial independence.
4. More freedom available to women to make unfettered decisions about their lives. The previously perceived obligations of marriage and motherhood have come to be seen more as options.

Increasing the ability to choose and therefore increasing freedom is one of the quintessential aspects of American culture. It is axiomatic in American thinking that increasing choice should lead to increasing happiness and satisfaction, and the plethora of choice should therefore be available to kids as well as adults. However, that is not necessarily true – significant choices made early in life may be regretted as we get older; this is considered in more detail below. Nevertheless, given the fact that the above choices and benefits to women have accrued largely from the Women's Movement, questioning feminism could be characterized as the

ultimate in misogyny¹ and has typically been portrayed that way, e.g., ([Anderson, 2015](#); [Beinart, 2019](#); [Dafaure, 2022](#); [DeBoise, 2020](#); [Shvanyukova, 2022](#); [Szelewa, 2014](#)), etc. But like other broad social movements, feminism encompasses a variety of perspectives. On one end of the spectrum are women who love men or at least are willing to put up with them, and simply want more fulfillment in their relationships (denoted herein as “workplace feminists”). On the other end are women who distrust and/or hate men and feel that marriage and sex encumber women by their very nature (denoted herein as “gender feminists”). Gender feminism is a relatively recent movement which grew out of workplace feminism, and its advocates who are both male and female believe that to fully benefit and liberate women, all differences between males and females must be eliminated to the greatest extent possible. Therefore, they are not stopping with the above benefits, but are pressing on to total equality between the sexes, and perhaps even superiority for females. It is gender feminism and the associated drive to equivalence, androgyny, bisexuality, and its many implications which shall be explored, questioned, and challenged herein.

Supporters of feminism typically view challenges to it as an evil attack on females (e.g., the title of one of the aforementioned articles is “The Global Backlash Against Women”), so there is usually a hyper-aggressive reaction to any criticism, making the subject very contentious and hard to discuss. Along with the areas of race and transgender, feminism is an essential part of the social justice movement, which is probably the most divisive force in American politics and one of the main dividing lines between the major political parties. Therefore, readers of this document may well have strong feelings for or against it, but it is requested that kudos and/or denunciations be withheld until after the evidence is considered.

¹ As indicated in the [Definitions of Terms](#) section below, the word “misogyny” has been, in NewSpeak fashion, culturally redefined from “hatred of women” to “anyone who opposes feminism.”

History is replete with examples of injustice and the use of power to maintain the authority of groups in power, resulting in the perpetuation of injustice. The questions for would-be activists and reformers are twofold:

1. Are they sure that what they perceive as injustice is actually injustice?
2. What will be the consequences of the reforms that they envision and enact?

The negative results of feminism can be appreciated by understanding how activists have answered (or failed to answer) these two questions, and in the process have encountered the principle of “perverse and unintended consequences.”

Perhaps this can best be encapsulated by considering a historical example of a reformer who dedicated his life to what he saw as injustice in his society. Joseph Dzhugashvili was born to poor parents – a shoemaker and a washerwoman. He was frail and picked-on as a child and developed an inferiority complex but was also very intelligent and driven. With the encouragement of his mother, he attended a religious school and later entered a seminary to become a priest. There he became steeped in Marxist ideas about oppressors and the oppressed, so he left the seminary before graduating in order to become an activist. His goal was to fix injustice in society by abandoning religion and creating a secular heaven on earth. The middle part of his life was spent in relative obscurity, engaging in union and worker agitation, being arrested by police, escaping, and being re-arrested. But at age 39 he came to power due to an unlikely chain of events, and then was presented with the opportunity to implement his vision to eliminate injustice and improve society. At first, he was constrained by having to co-operate with others, but by his intelligence, work ethic, and the force of his personality, he eventually was able to thrust everyone else aside and become the sole dictator of his nation with virtually unlimited authority. During his rise to power, he took the name by which we know him: “Stalin” – the man

of steel. He then proceeded to implement his vision of social justice to improve Russian society. In the process, he killed over 20 million of his own people, erected a police state, and liquidated everyone he saw as a threat to his influence. Russia under Stalin became “Orwellian” – meaning a dystopian and totalitarian society founded on lies. That word came from George Orwell, who based his novels *Animal Farm* and *1984* on the society that Stalin created.

However, Stalin was not born bad and did not set out to destroy society – his original intention was the opposite. All of this evil was done not because Stalin was a murderer or a psychopath, rather he did it for the noble purpose of eliminating injustice. In the same way Pope Innocent III who ordered the 13th century Albigensian Crusade did so, not because he was inherently evil, rather because he was trying to eliminate what he considered to be heresy. The communist dictators of China, Cambodia, and other nations likewise liquidated millions in order to eliminate what they considered to be heresy against their religion of communism. Russia under Stalin is thus a prime example of the principle of “perverse and unintended consequences” – of relentlessly following a mistaken ideology that one thinks will produce heaven on earth, but in fact it produces hell.

The social justice movement in America and the West is likewise concerned with correcting what it views as racial, gender, and transgender injustice, and similarly seeks to construct a secular heaven on earth based on Marxian ideology which unfortunately views history as simply a study of oppressors and the oppressed. Thus, it has taken the valid concerns of minorities, women, and LGBTQ+ individuals and – following the dictates of Marxism – has transmogrified these concerns into a weapon to tear down and destroy Western culture. Like Stalin, it is also totalitarian, but fortunately, the movement does not yet have Stalin’s power. Nevertheless, anyone who opposes this dismantling of American culture is accused of racism,

misogyny, or homophobia, even though they may be pro-minority, pro-female, and pro-LGBT. Our focus here will be on feminism, but with the understanding that it is only one aspect of the serious problems in American culture.

Dr. Barry Schwartz gave what was perhaps one of the most powerful TED talks ever in discussing his book *The Paradox of Choice: Why More is Less*. The official dogma of America is to maximize individual freedom, and the American way to do that is by maximizing choice. The more choice that people have, the more freedom they have, and the more freedom they have, the more happiness they supposedly will have. This mantra is deeply engrained in the historical DNA of America, so questioning it seems unthinkable – for example, large supermarkets have hundreds of different chips, pasta, and other food options. However, the official dogma is false; some choice is better than none, but it doesn't follow that more choice is better than some choice. Having this much choice leads to several paradoxical and bad results: 1) It produces paralysis rather than liberation, and people find it difficult to choose at all; 2) After making a choice people are often less satisfied with the results than if they had fewer options. ([Schwartz, 2016](#)).

All of us live within constraints on our sexual identity which could be thought of as a fishbowl of gender. If we exercise our freedom and choose to smash the fishbowl and become “free” as gender feminism is pushing us to do, are we truly happier and freer, or will that destroy us? The two questions posed above need to be answered in regard to feminism:

1. Is the fact that women are different than men and therefore “unequal” truly an injustice that needs to be fixed? The answer proposed herein is “no.”
2. Have the solutions proposed and implemented by gender feminism had perverse and unintended consequences and created pathologies? The answer proposed herein is “yes.”

Gender feminism is a therefore a Venus fly trap with the characteristics of that carnivorous plant, both attracting people through the aroma of female empowerment, and then

forcing people into conformity with its dictates and swallowing them. It may look innocent, but it is digesting and poisoning American culture, destroying relationships, and creating social havoc. Despite the damage, Venus fly traps are sitting comfortably on the shelves of America and are being politely overlooked. To use another analogy, like hoarders we have ignored the increasing mess and dysfunctionality in our homes and under our own noses.

This document is an indication of the magnitude of the problems combined with a seeming refusal of psychology and major portions of American media, government, education, and culture to acknowledge gender feminism as mendacious in its analysis of male-female differences, and a significant source of social pathologies. It is important to consider these pathologies, clearly identify the sources, and honestly face the consequences of what we have done to ourselves. But it is also important, and perhaps even more so, to move beyond the negative to the positive and propose how things can be better, to cast a vision that combines the positive and beneficial aspects of feminism with the reality of male-female differences and explore characteristics of the “ultimate union.”

Hypothesis

The hypothesis to be explored herein is that a major – and possibly the major – behavioral reason for the current level of social pathologies afflicting male-female relationships and parenting in America is gender feminism and its associated ideologies. As previously stated, there are other non-behavioral factors that have contributed to these problems, such as isolation during the Covid pandemic. But given the importance of the male-female dynamic and its behavioral nature (i.e., an issue over which people have a significant degree of control), this investigation shall be limited to that element. We shall attempt to demonstrate the above hypothesis by considering in turn the following questions:

1. “Is it possible and/or desirable for a male to become female and vice versa?” This will involve an exploration of male-female differences and the degree to which they are mutable or immutable, and considerations of homosexuality and transgenderism.
2. “How did American society get to where we are today in terms of male-female relationships?” This will involve an exploration of the history of feminism.
3. “What negative impacts has gender feminism had on society?” This will involve an exploration of the social pathologies generated by feminism.
4. “How has gender feminism affected the field of psychology?” This will involve an exploration of feminism in psychology.
5. “What value is there in traditional and religious alternatives to feminism?” This will involve an exploration of ideal relationships between men and women.

Gender and Sex

Perhaps the core issue of gender feminism is the separation of gender from sex and the redefinition of the word “gender.” Feminism has given new definitions to a number of other words such as “misogyny” and “patriarchy” (see the [Definitions of Terms](#) section below), but none are more significant than how “gender” has been redefined.

Sex is a characteristic of one’s body which is either male or female, whereas gender is one’s perceived sexual identity and psychological orientation. Prior to the 1960s these terms were seen as essentially the same; to the extent that the word “gender” was used, it was previously a synonym for “the sex of a person” except in cases of the few intersex individuals born with sexual abnormalities. But now many in the Western world have accepted what seemed previously inconceivable – that gender is arbitrary, socially constructed, and can be adopted and possibly chosen by everyone.

Gender is not how a person acts, rather it is how the person senses him or herself to be. Therefore gender-related activities must not be confused with gender perception. As explored in more detail below, children are born with their gender identity already in place, but they must learn what things men do and what things women do. Boys are not born knowing how to handle weapons, girls are not born knowing how to care for babies, and people in different societies have different sex-specific behaviors. Male-specific and female-specific activities come from society, and therefore they are socially constructed and environmentally determined, but the real question is related to gender perception and identity – whether and to what extent it is inborn and biological as opposed to socially constructed and environmental.

Feminist scholars have proposed a framework for gender development that is entirely based on conditioning, e.g., ([Ainsworth, 2015](#); [Fausto-Sterling, 2021](#); [Strkalj & Pather, 2021](#)). In determining a child's gender, three phases are described which occur after birth:

1. Under 15 months the child is exposed to different stimuli, depending on sex, which impact brain development.
2. From 15 to 18 months is a fluid period in which the child's sense of gender develops but is not yet apparent.
3. After 18 months the child has developed their sense of gender and begins to act accordingly.

Even on the observation level, this approach ignores or minimizes the fact that boy and girl babies are typically distinct from birth in factors associated with gender identity. Every parent can observe this. For example, as Moir states, girl babies are more sensitive to touch than boy babies, more distressed by noise, pain, and discomfort, and are more easily comforted by soothing words and singing. Girl babies show a greater interest in faces and in communicating with people and will focus on a speaking adult for longer periods than boy babies, who tend to focus more on what they see rather than what they hear. Boy babies are more active and wakeful than girls – they may be just as talkative, but their focus is less on people and faces and more on toys and designs, reflecting the male bias to things vs. the female bias to relationships ([Moir & Jessel, 1991, pp. 55-56.](#)).

On the neurobiological level, the social construction approach ignores or minimizes what neurobiology has revealed about the formation of the fetal brain and its impact on determining gender. The biological model (described in detail below) indicates that the child's gender is determined long before birth during the time when the fetal brain is being wired. The wiring process is dimorphic in that various brain regions are differentiated by gender ([Allen et al., 1992](#)). Sex-specific receptor areas in the brain are created for activation by sex-specific

hormones later in the child's life. A few areas of the brain are distinctly different between the sexes, while others seem to be the same but may be employed in gender-specific ways. Clearly, biology plays *the major role* in genderizing babies. After birth, parents and environment will certainly have an impact on the child's behavior and therefore on how the child's personality and gender identity is shaped, but the basic pattern is established before the child is born.

Neurobiological research has conclusively shown that babies are not blank slates and have "made up their minds" in regard to sexual orientation even before birth, and as they grow to adulthood they tend to think, react, and ultimately behave in ways that are stereotypical of their gender as they see and learn how males and females act and what they do.

Many have been surprised at the rapid rise of transgenderism and the acceptance of homosexuality in Western society. But as discussed below in the [Philosophical Background](#) of Feminism, these have extensive historical roots and have culminated in the rejection of all transcendent authority and morality. The separation of gender from sex is an essential step in the elimination of masculinity and femininity, one of cornerstones of gender feminism, and one of the latest salvos in the culture wars to establish the contemporary ideology of self.

Male-Female Differences²

As Anne Moir observed in her book *Brain Sex*, male-female differences used to be a non-issue – “If the statement: ‘men are different from women and always have been’ was made a hundred years ago, it would have been a leaden truism, and yawningly obvious” ([Moir & Jessel, 1991, p. 9](#)). But if such a remark is uttered by a man today, he would likely be labeled as sexist and misogynistic, and a woman offering that opinion would probably be considered a traitor to her sex. The concern, of course, is that patriarchal forces will employ this knowledge to force women back into being second class citizens, from which they have supposedly escaped.

Recent decades have seen two contradictory developments: the progress of scientific and neurological research detailing the biological differences between the sexes, and the political and cultural denial that such differences exist. Prior to the 1960s, gender differences would not have been questioned, or even have caused any eyebrows to be raised. Human nature has not changed since antiquity and male-female differences in behavior have always been and still are obvious to an unbiased observer ([Moir & Jessel, 1991, p. 9](#)).

As described above, an extremely significant issue to feminism is the mutability of differences between the sexes. Gender feminism is based on the assertion that gender identity is socially constructed and therefore male-female differences are essentially environmental. This is exemplified in a statement by Kate Millet, an early leading feminist and one of the founders of NOW (National Organization for Women):

It’s time that we realized that the whole structure of male and female personality is entirely imposed by social conditioning. ([Millet, 1970, p. 28](#))

² It must be noted that this discussion of male/female differences is concerned with the *average* man and the *average* woman. For example, there are some women who are taller, stronger, more competitive, and/or have more mathematical and logical skills than some men, just as some men may have better language skills and are more cooperative and empathetic than some women. But these are exceptions to the typical male/female pattern, and exceptions do not invalidate a general rule.

The core idea behind this statement has become the philosophical basis of the hundreds of gender studies across the Western world. A more recent version of the same idea from *Feminist Approaches to Science* is the quote: “Gender is constructed and social” ([Moir & Moir, 1999, p. 13](#)). However, as we shall see, gender is biological.

Body Differences

When we look at another person our immediate and even subconscious reaction is to identify them by gender, so when an individual’s gender is not readily apparent, it attracts notice, which may be positive or negative. People rapidly form impressions of others based on their gender. Women tend to be liked more than men, but men tend to be regarded as more powerful. In other words, the attractiveness of a female is typically related to perception of her femininity, while a male is assessed by his masculinity ([Bailey et al., 2020](#)).

There is relatively little controversy about body differences between the sexes because they are obvious. Gender dimorphism (differences in body structure) is readily apparent and shows no signs of disappearance despite the huge push for female empowerment. Led by the Title IX legislation mandating equal facilities and funding for male and female collegiate sports, there has been an enormous drive by government, media, higher education, and advertising to promote female athletics. Nevertheless, the physical differences between the sexes remain more or less as they always have been. Men are typically taller than women and have been since antiquity. In 1996 the global average of human height was 171.28 cm for men and 159.49 cm for women ([Roser et al., 2013](#)). Men are therefore around 7% taller than women on average, and this variation in height has been consistently maintained since the time when data was first collected, even as the average height of both sexes has increased over the last 200 years ([Gorelik, 2021](#)).

Males and females are distinct in their senses – girls hear and smell better than boys, and in taste girls tend to prefer things that are sweet as opposed to salty ([Reinisch, 1974](#)). Females have a greater sensitivity to pain and to tactile pressure in general – in some tactility tests the least sensitive female was more sensitive than the most sensitive male ([Reinisch, 1974](#)). This is a factor in explaining the more aggressive nature of male sports – men feel pain less than women.³ Female vision is more attuned to the red end of the spectrum, and women typically have a wider peripheral vision (there are more receptor cells in the female retina), while male vision is more focused with a greater depth concentration and sense of perspective ([McGuinness, 1985](#)).

The sexes also differ in musculature and bone structure – men have higher levels of lean muscle mass, fast-twitch muscles, and bone density than women, especially in their arms. Female lean muscle mass is 91% of male muscle, and female bone density is 83% of male bones, so men are stronger and more rugged than women ([Nindl et al., 2002](#)). Men are able to add muscle mass more effectively than women because of the male hormone testosterone, which in moderation also has multiple health benefits for men, such as good heart and bone health and assistance in reasoning, mood, and libido ([Rogers, 2018](#)). Males also have superior hand-eye coordination necessary for many sports ([Burg, 1966](#)).

These differences become obvious when males and females compete directly against each other, such as the current spate of male athletes identifying as women and competing in female sports. Carli Lloyd, a two-time Olympic gold medalist in US women's soccer, admitted that her team had lost in a scrimmage against 15-year-old boys, because they were “bigger, stronger, and faster” ([Prestigiacomio, 2023a](#)). In women's volleyball, teams that include male players are trouncing others, and have “Massive strength and size advantages over the actual women they

³ For example, a characteristic of men's ice hockey is checking (i.e., hitting others and slamming them into the boards) whereas checking is not allowed in women's ice hockey.

were competing against – trans volleyball is a spike to the face for women in sports” ([Steinbuch, 2024](#)). As of 2020, the male world record for the mile in track is 3’43.13, and for women it is 4’12.33 – no woman has even come close to breaking the four-minute mile barrier achieved by a man in 1953. Even more to the point, no male running as fast as the fastest woman would even be competitive at the Division 1 college level at that distance ([Trueman, 2020, p. 398](#)).

Perhaps the best-known trans athlete is Lia Thomas, a swimmer from the University of Pennsylvania who became a poster child for the transgender movement after winning many female races (one of them by 38 seconds which is a huge margin in swimming) and an NCAA championship in a women’s freestyle event, despite being a biological male with a male body structure and a penis. Top female swimmers are, on average, 11-12% slower than males ([Zeigler, 2022](#)). Thomas had been an also-ran when swimming as a male, but after transitioning became one of the top female swimmers in the U.S. ([DeLuca, 2022](#)).⁴

For years US women soccer players have been demanding equal pay with men despite the fact that athletes are paid by the revenue they generate, and male soccer generates millions more than the female equivalent. For example, in a recent world cup, male soccer was watched by 3.5 billion people and generated over \$6 billion in revenue, while female soccer was watched by 700 million and generated \$131 million, which was 2% of the male version; the male teams received around 7% of this revenue while the female teams received 23% ([Balčiauskas, 2019](#)). The same difference in viewers holds true for other sports such as basketball and hockey. The 2019 NCAA male basketball tournament generated \$918 million in revenue and \$865 million in net income, while the female tournament generated \$15 million in revenue and had a net loss of

⁴ Due to the outcry against unfair competition, the NCAA has recently revised its rules and prohibited male athletes from competing in female sports Ennis, D. (2022). *Goodbye, Lia Thomas? New NCAA Trans Student-Athlete Policy Is ‘Effective Immediately’*. <https://www.forbes.com/sites/dawnstaceyennis/2022/01/20/goodbye-lia-thomas-new-ncaa-trans-student-athlete-policy-is-effective-immediately/?sh=6232006a34db>.

\$3 million (again revenue for the female version was around 2% of the male) ([Bushnell, 2021](#)).

The viewership and revenue differences are smaller in some sports such as tennis, but they are unlikely to change due to the fact that male sports are more aggressive and competitive, and therefore draw much larger audiences.

Brain Differences

Body differences are important, but the most significant difference between men and women is their brain structure and functioning. This has become a hyper-controversial subject due to feminism, but the truth is that virtually every neuroscientist has concluded that male and female brains are different, and short of massive genetic re-engineering the differences are immutable. “There has seldom been a greater divide between what intelligent, enlightened opinion presumes – that men and women have the same brains – and what science knows – that they do not” ([Moir & Jessel, 1991, p. 12](#)). The French doctor, psychologist, and scientist Gustave Le Bon who studied female brain structure presciently noted in the 1890s:

The day when... women leave the home and take part in [male] battles; on that day a social revolution will begin and everything that maintains the sacred ties of family will disappear. ([Gould, 1978](#))

Fetal Brain Development

It was once believed that babies were a “tabula rasa” – a blank slate. In 1930 the behaviorist John Watson stated, “There are for us no instincts – we no longer need that term in psychology... People are built, not born.” ([Watson, 1930](#)). In a similar vein, B.F. Skinner wrote that “entrenched belief in free will and moral autonomy hinders the prospect of using scientific methods to modify behavior and employ psychological principles of cultural engineering”

([Skinner, 1971](#)). His statement leaves us with dystopian doubts about the trustworthiness of psychological “experts.”

In the 1960s Dr. John Money tried to turn a boy into a girl and became a darling of the feminist and transgender movements (more on Dr. Money in the [Invention of Gender](#) section below). However, he was unsuccessful because the gender of a baby is formed in the womb long before birth.

Sexual identity comes from the genetic material of the baby’s parents – half from each of them. The sperm cell from the father and the egg cell from the mother each contain twenty-three chromosomes, and these contain the genes that determine the characteristics of the eventual person (genes represent sections of DNA which is present in the nucleus of each cell). When one of the sperm cells joins with the egg cell, the fertilized egg then has forty-six chromosomes; they pair with each other and form the genetic unit of the fetus. One of these chromosome pairs determines the sex of the baby – the mother contributes an “X” chromosome (so-called because of its shape), and the father contributes either an “X” or a “Y” chromosome. If the chromosome pair is “XX” the fetus will become a girl, and if “XY” it will become a boy; thus the sex of the fetus is governed by the father’s contribution. The fertilized egg repeatedly divides by creating identical copies of itself in a process known as mitosis, forming the fetus which then grows within the womb of the mother. In an amazing display of complex biochemistry, the cells differentiate into all of the areas of the body – brain, heart, muscle, organs, skin, etc. All of the baby’s cells therefore contain either the “XX” or the “XY” pairing of chromosomes and other genetic material from the original fertilized egg cell, so the DNA in all cells of each person’s body are either male or female ([Goy & McEwen, 1980](#)).

The sixth through the eighth week of pregnancy is when the fetal brain is being wired, and the wiring pattern is either distinctly male or female, which accounts for the later differences in capabilities and behavioral tendencies that show up in stages throughout childhood, adolescence, and adulthood. A major factor in determining which pattern will be generated is the presence or absence of the male hormone testosterone in the womb. Fetal gonads in boy babies develop very early and begin to secrete testosterone in large amounts, causing the fetal brain to be wired in a male pattern. This implies that the absence of testosterone will cause the fetal brain to be wired in a female pattern ([Goy & McEwen, 1980](#)).

It would thus seem to be the case that the female brain is the “default template” or prototype that develops in the absence of testicular hormones – just add testosterone to make a male brain or omit it during the prenatal period to make a female brain. But recent research has shown that this theory of brain development is incorrect in that both ovarian and testicular hormones are critical determinants of genderizing the fetal brain ([Halpern, 2011](#)). However, the presence or absence of testosterone seems to be the most significant factor.

This has been demonstrated by experiments with rats. According to Gorski, when testosterone is removed from a developing male rat fetus, after birth it will display female behavior patterns such as taking an interest in baby rats. The lower the testosterone level, the more feminine the rat behavior will be. Likewise, if testosterone is added to the environment of a female rat fetus, it will display masculine behavior after birth such as being more aggressive ([Gorski, 1996](#)). These types of experiments have been repeated with other animals such as monkeys and songbirds, for which the capacity to sing can depend on hormonal brain development ([Goy & McEwen, 1980](#)). Manipulating the hormone levels at various stages of brain development has been shown to generate specific behavioral characteristics, so the

imprinting of male behavior happens gradually by affecting the wiring in discrete areas of the brain, section by section ([Moir & Jessel, 1991, p. 28](#)). However, after the critical period of fetal development and when the brain wiring process has been completed, the addition or removal of testosterone will not affect brain structure; the brain is then set in its male or female configuration ([Gorski, 1991](#)).

More confirmation of the biological nature of sexual identity comes from studies of women who are missing one of the two “X” chromosomes – a condition known as Turner’s Syndrome. The ovaries in a normal female fetus produce small amounts of testosterone which masculinize the developing brain of girls to a small degree. But the ovaries in Turner’s syndrome fetuses are missing, so no testosterone is produced. The behavior of the eventual girl/woman will be overtly feminine ([Hutt, 1975, 1976](#)). More so than other girls, they love to play with dolls, take care of babies, do housework, talk on the phone, shop for clothes, put on makeup, and other conventional feminine activities. A study of female college students found that stereotypically feminine women, as measured by sex role self-descriptions, have lower levels of testosterone ([Udry, 1988](#)).

Further evidence of the impact of hormones on pre-natal development comes from studying the children of mothers who were given male or female hormones to treat medical issues during pregnancy, which was often done in the 1950s and 1960s ([Siler-Kohodr, 1978](#)). For example, some diabetic mothers who suffered from spontaneous abortions caused by low levels of natural female hormone were treated with a synthetic female hormone, which reduced abortions but had unintended side-effects – their male children were effeminate. “Jim” was a sixteen-year-old boy who was shy, unassertive, a poor athlete, considered to be a sissy by other boys, and was afraid to fight or confront them. This was in contrast to his overtly masculine

older brother who was brought up in the same family and culture, with the only difference being that his mother had not taken any hormonal drugs during the earlier pregnancy ([Reinisch, 1987](#)). A similar effect has been seen with mothers-to-be who were given male hormone during pregnancy to treat discomforts caused by toxemia. Girl babies born to those mothers typically had tomboy characteristics ([Reinisch, 1987](#)).

As mentioned above, pre-natal hormonal interaction is not limited to the presence or absence of testosterone. There are a number of different hormones responsible for sexing various aspects of fetal masculinity; for example, if the hormone that causes the phallus to drop is not present in sufficient amounts, then at birth the child will appear to be female. But regardless of upbringing, dress, and other parental and cultural influences, the child will think, feel, and act as a boy, and this will become obvious at puberty when the phallus appears ([Berg, 1963](#)). Fetal brain development creates the structures (e.g., the hormone secreting glands and the receptor sites in the brain) that will be activated later in the life of the individual, such as the changes that occur at puberty; some sex differences are present in young children but become more distinct as individuals proceed through adolescence. In other words, the *organization* as well as sexual orientation are set in the womb before birth, but the *activation* occurs primarily at puberty ([Jelsma, 2022](#)).⁵

As neuroscientists have continued to explore the connection between brain structure and gender, the picture has become even more complex. Research focus in the past was primarily devoted to the effects of testosterone on the developing brain, but there is an increasing awareness that the X or Y sex chromosome has a variety of effects that are not yet fully understood. For example, research on transcriptomics (i.e., the sum of all DNA and RNA effects)

⁵ Tony Jelsma's article entitled "An Attempt to Understand the Biology of Gender and Gender Dysphoria" is a very helpful and balanced summary with many resources specified.

has revealed thousands of unexpected differences in gene expression in specific regions of male and female brains which may produce sex differences that are potentially latent until puberty or other developmental changes ([McCarthy, 2020](#)). Also, there has been an identification of the role of inflammatory signaling molecules and immune cells in masculinization of the brain and male behavior ([McCarthy, 2020](#)). It has recently been shown that there are over 6,500 genetic differences between men and women ([Pietrokovski, 2017](#)). It seems that the sex chromosome contributes substantially to the masculinization or feminization of the fetal brain but that hormonal effects are stronger and possibly an overriding factor.

The sexual differentiation of the brain has many implications, some of which are obvious morphological brain disparities. One of the main differences is the structure of the hypothalamus, which is an organ in the brain that controls sexual behavior. In humans there is a region within the hypothalamus which is several times larger in males than in females ([Allen & Gorski, 1991](#); [Swaab, 1995](#)). There is a significant difference in the size of the corpus callosum which is a neural layer connecting the brain hemispheres. It is typically larger in females than in males, allowing women to be more “whole brained” – to communicate more readily, express their feelings more fully, and be more intuitive about people and circumstances. Females have better reading, language, and verbal skills than males, as discussed below, as well as better social cognition and memory recall capability. Female brains are thus optimized for inter-hemispheric communication giving them superior memory and social cognition skills ([Ingallhalikara & al, 2013](#)).

Males have more interconnections in the cerebellum which is involved in processing input from various areas of the body that enter the brain through the spinal cord, which could help to account for superior athleticism and hand-eye coordination in men. Also, the better intra-

hemispheric connectivity in males causes them to use specific brain regions in a more “pinpoint manner,” resulting in men being less emotional and more logical and decisive ([Ingalhalikara & al, 2013](#)). Male brains have a higher percentage of “white matter” – neurons whose axonal components have been coated with myelin. Myelinated neurons can carry electrical impulses up to 100 times faster than non-myelinated ones which speeds thinking and reaction ([Guy-Evans, 2023](#)). Male brains also display increased development of neural subnetworks within the brain hemispheres which are thought to be critical in strategic planning and thinking. Male brains are thus optimized for communicating within the hemispheres giving them better motor and spatial abilities ([Ingalhalikara & al, 2013](#)). Combined with the male propensity for dominance, provision, and leading, this may account for the fact that most scientists, philosophers, entrepreneurs, architects, and inventors throughout history have been men.

In contrast, female brains have more “grey matter” – non myelinated neurons. This may help give women an advantage over men in memory and recall capabilities ([Guy-Evans, 2023](#)). Tasks like reading or following instructions must be completed in a fixed order or sequence, whereas tasks such as processing information from a diagram can be simultaneous as information from several parts of the diagram could potentially be analyzed at the same time. The female brain seems to be better organized to support the former and the male brain the latter ([Halpern, 2011](#)). People take in most of their information through auditory and visual pathways, and the current theory of processing is that such input from the cerebellum is fed forward into the parietal and frontal lobes for abstraction and elaboration; these are organized in male or female patterns as discussed above, so reaction to input is potentially “gendered.” ([Halpern, 2011](#)). Neurons connect with neighboring neurons via the release of neurotransmitters, which are chemicals released into the synapse (the gap) between the axon terminal ending of the sending

neuron and the dendrite of the receiving neuron. The message is often simple, to fire or stop firing, but there are from 80 to 90 billion neurons in the human brain (around 70 billion in the cerebellum and 16 billion in the cerebrum) and each neuron has multiple endings and synapses, so the communication patterns are incredibly complex ([Halpern, 2011](#)).

Contrary to the idea of memory being a vast collection of archived data like books on a shelf in a library, memories are reconstructions drawn from places throughout the brain. This is similar to a computer app retrieving a file from a hard drive; to a user the file seems to be a contiguous block of data but is actually constructed of pieces that are retrieved from various locations on the hard drive. Remembering is therefore not a simple retrieval of fixed data, but rather as an ongoing reclassification process that results in continuous changes to our neural pathways, so that as we learn and remember, the circuits in our brains are essentially reshaped ([Dubuc, 2014](#)). At present, this process is still poorly understood.

Males and females achieve similar levels of *general* intelligence by potentially using different brain regions in different ways, suggesting that there is no singular underlying structure that is generally superior or inferior. Nevertheless, males and females differ in specific types of intelligence which their distinct brain organization pattern either supports or detracts from. Thus, there is a definite gender difference in brain design, with male brains designed to facilitate connectivity between perception and coordinated action, and female brains designed to facilitate communication between analytical and intuitive/emotional processing ([Ingallhalikara & al, 2013](#)).

Male and female brains look similar, but there are many differences in how their brains work and are employed in thinking, motivation, emotion, and desires, all of which produce the stereotypical distinctions in male and female behavior. Add to this the effect of environment and the plasticity of the brain (discussed below), which shapes us into unique individuals. Gender

differences are, of course, hyper-controversial, with feminists blaming them on patriarchy and the historic suppression of women. But understanding the mainly biological nature and origin of gender helps to realize this fundamental error in feminist analysis.

This understanding also explains why some individuals are not distinctly male or female. There is a small number of “intersex” babies who have genitals, chromosomes, or reproductive organs that don’t fit into a male-female sex binary category, and/or whose brain wiring doesn’t correspond to their physical sex. As explained above, these are due to abnormal intrauterine conditions, and are true of approximately 1% of the American population ([ClevelandClinic, 2022](#)). Such individuals may have homosexual inclinations as discussed below.

Neuroscientists speak of the “plasticity” of the brain – as a child grows and has different experiences, his or her brain forms and refines its synaptic connections, and when experiences are repeated, the synaptic connections are strengthened (“neurons that wire together tend to fire together”) ([Wu, 2021](#)). Therefore, we tend to become what we think about and experience if the experiences become a significant subject of focus and repeated thought. There are models describing the anatomy and circuitry of the brain – how synapses work, how neurons fire and connect with other neurons, and so on. However, this is an exceedingly complex process and far from being understood. The tools currently available for studying brain activity in humans are far too crude to analyze complex neural pathways, synaptic rearrangements, and subnetworks which are essential to understanding how the human brain actually functions ([Marek & al, 2022](#)). We know some of the mechanics, but we don’t understand how consciousness works, how we think, where memory is stored and how it is retrieved, and for our present concern, how we perceive gender. Further complicating the issue of gender perception is that, as indicated above, the neural

communication process takes place within the context of brain regions which have male or female distinctions. Thought therefore tends to be “genderized” ([Cobb, 2020](#)).

The fact that hormones have such a significant impact on pre-natal development during the critical period while the infant brain is being wired means that we are on the dangerous brink of possibilities for social engineering and mind control, which would be much more far-reaching than trying to get girls to do construction work and boys to care for babies. We are nearing a place where government policies could change the way people think and behave, by adjusting the hormonal content of the womb, as in Aldous Huxley’s dystopian novel *Brave New World*.

Impact of Differences in Brain Structure and Wiring

The New York writer and feminist Norah Vincent decided that as a study project, she would try to portray herself as a man, but purely by disguise and without any drugs or medical procedures. Her book entitled *Self-Made Man – One Woman’s Year Disguised as a Man* was the result. She was not unhappy as a woman and emphasized that she did this not because of any sexual identity crisis, but rather as a reporter in order to explore the world of men from a woman’s perspective to see if being a male was truly better, as alleged by feminists. But in the course of this psychological experiment, she was surprised by several things:

1. The subtle male-female differences even in stance, speech patterns, and behavior, and the difficulty of modifying herself sufficiently to convincingly fool people so that she could interact with them as a man would – she had to take lessons in how to walk, talk, stand, and gesture.
2. The insecurities that men feel with women and the degree to which they seek to hide it so as to appear macho and tough.
3. The compulsiveness of the male sex drive. She went to strip clubs and saw the cheap tawdriness of male desire among the men who went there (“the squalid subbasement of male sexuality... where there was just as much electricity as the weekly bingo game at the VA”, p. 67-69).

4. The feelings of being attacked and continually judged by women who had had bad experiences, always blamed men, and complained about being misunderstood without realizing their own ignorance of male psychology (“they seemed to transform each new man, benign or otherwise, into the malignancy they were expecting him to be... somehow men’s seeming imposition of a superficial standard of beauty in women felt less intrusive and less harsh than the character appraisals of women” p. 107-110).
5. That the women she dated wanted to defer to men, to be held up, led, cherished, and to have him take control, but at the same time have him be a gentleman who would listen and open doors for them.

Noah Vincent found that despite the feminization of society and the feminist education via the women’s studies courses that she had taken in college, men were still men and women were still women, warts and all ([Vincent, 2006](#)). Following are ways in which the distinct male and female brain wiring genderizes thinking and behavior.

Intelligence and IQ

The first psychological testing of sex-based differences was done in 1882 at the South Kensington Museum in London by Francis Gatton, who concluded that men were stronger and were able to work better under pressure, and women seemed to be more sensitive to pain. Ten years later more studies concluded that men preferred abstract and general thought, while women favored practical problems and tasks ([Garai & Scheinfeld, 1968](#)). In 1894 an extensive study by Havelock Ellis was published indicating that women were better in compassion, memory, tidiness, and patience, and that they tended to be more precise than men but seemed to be lacking in breadth and initiative ([Ellis, 1894](#)).

The current consensus in psychology is that males and females are equal in *general* intelligence ([Halpern, 2011](#)). However, there are many aspects to intelligence, including distinct gender differences. It is mostly for that reason that psychologists studying it have delineated subtypes – one popular model states that there are nine forms of intelligence ([Gartner, 2023](#)):

- Visual-spatial
- Linguistic-verbal
- Mathematical
- Kinesthetic
- Musical
- Interpersonal
- Intrapersonal
- Naturalistic
- Existential

This contrasts with older views that sought to determine one overall metric of intelligence – the IQ (intelligence quotient) measurement. In the 1950s the first tests were developed to measure intelligence, but to the dismay of the researchers, it was found that over thirty tests “discriminated” in favor of one sex or the other. Researchers sought to remedy this problem by deliberately introducing male-slanted and female-slanted questions in order to arrive at scores that were approximately equal. But they still had significant problems trying to equalize the male superiority in spatial and mathematical reasoning and the female superiority in language ([Garai & Scheinfeld, 1968](#)).

Males seem to exceed females at both the high and the low end of the intelligence spectrum, rising above them as well as dropping below them, and there has been a long history of studies that both support and challenge this. The largest study to date confirms this assertion and suggests that it be conceptualized as a mixture of two distributions: one reflecting biological brain-related differences between the sexes, and the other reflecting conditions that disrupt intelligence ([Johnson et al., 2008](#)). The discussion above on brain distinctions indicated that male brain is structured to facilitate connectivity between perception and coordinated action, which could possibly explain the high-end aspect, particularly as related to agentic and enterprising behavior in top performing men. It is these who have made the main male-related contributions to society throughout history. But males also have more mental and behavioral pathologies,

which could explain the low-end aspect. This issue is also hyper-controversial and emotionally charged due to feminism:

But the laws of nature are not responsible to us or to our values and may not conform to them. It is important to understand the laws of nature as completely as possible within our circumstances in order to actualize our values as we intend. This article is thus an attempt to make an objective exploration of scientific data about the way the laws of nature related to the variability hypothesis are manifested. ([Johnson et al., 2008](#))

Math, Engineering, and Spatial Thinking

The dominance of men in traditionally masculine disciplines is reflected in the continuing feminist push for women to enter STEM fields (science, technology, engineering, and mathematics). But regardless of this push, the dominance of men in those fields continues. This is due to the fact that males have more “spatial ability” – being able to picture the shape, position, geography, and proportion of three-dimensional objects, and leading to increased competence in logic, design, engineering, and construction ([Gaulin & Fitzgerald, 1986](#)). Boys typically outperform girls in abstract concepts of space, math, and theory, and this has been documented in hundreds of scientific studies ([Harris, 1978, pp. 405-522; 1981](#)). Psychologists working with highly gifted math students of both sexes discovered that the best boy always beat the best girl, and that for every exceptional girl there were more than thirteen exceptional boys ([Benbow & Stanley, 1980, 1983](#)). One of the researchers doing the study noted, “After fifteen years looking for an environmental explanation and getting zero results, I gave up” ([Benbow & Stanley, 1984](#)).

A study of route selection and navigation found that males were more likely to take shortcuts and reached their goal location faster than females, while females were more likely to follow learned routes ([Boone et al., 2018](#)).

In tests related to object rotation and perspective, males were superior to females and also seemed to use different mental models. Females were more likely to pay attention to local details. In contrast, males were more likely to notice aspects of the overall shape of the object that could be used to quickly identify structure, and to rotate objects as a whole, rather than in sections. This suggests that men and women differ in their preferences or abilities for global as opposed to piecemeal processing of visual-spatial stimuli ([Hegarty, 2017](#)), and reflects the male-female brain differences discussed above. The preference of males for STEM education is reflected in the large disparity of men vs. women in computer science, engineering, and related fields.

Reading, Writing, Language, and Verbal Skills

Girls typically outperform boys in verbal skills and are generally more fluent, especially as children; stuttering and other speech defects are largely male problems. Girls typically read earlier and are better at foreign languages, and also have better memory as the corpus callosum connecting the two hemispheres in the brain is larger in females allowing them to use both halves of the brain more effectively and possibly improving memory recall. Behavior problems with boys reduce reading ability as well as the desire to read, and boys have more issues in reading impairment, dyslexia, attention disorders, and mental retardation. They may also disdain reading and writing as being a “female” activity. Another factor making comparison difficult is that there is a larger swing in male language competence than in females with more males at the lower end of the scale ([Reilly et al., 2019](#)).

Interest Differences

A significant factor underlying male-female interests is “sex-typing” – the perception that a given interest or activity is masculine or feminine and the associated degree of attraction or detraction. As females have begun to participate in more male-related activities, and to a lesser extent, males in female-related activities, the influence of sex-typing for the average person has declined to some degree. However, distinctions remain and continue to persist. For example, there are now female boxers, but boxing is still primarily a male sport, and will probably continue to be thought of as such.

Men are more interested in the maintenance of sex roles and gender-identity than women and seek to both consciously and unconsciously affirm their masculinity. Men will thus typically avoid things that are perceived as feminine or gay. This is seen, for example, in the fact that men are less attracted than women to environmentally friendly products because there is a stereotype (held by both men and women) that green consumers are more feminine. Consumers who purchase green products are stereotyped by others as more feminine and even perceive themselves as more feminine. The green/feminine stereotype thus influences men to avoid green products ([Brough et al., 2016](#)).

Males, are of course, more attracted to competition and winning than females. The body differences mentioned above are significant (increased strength, musculature, and ruggedness, decreased sensitivity to pain, and better hand-eye coordination), but even more significant are the mental differences (increased tolerance for danger and risk, more enjoyment of combat-type activities and games, more aggression and less empathy, and a greater desire to win and defeat opponents).

A significant mental difference that underlies many others is that females are mainly interested in “being” whereas males are drawn to “doing.” Women are more concerned with

clothing, jewelry, and appearance and they seek to be beautiful, both outwardly and inwardly. Inward beauty would consist of being kind, caring, loving, sympathetic, considerate, and gentle. Women often seek peace, serenity, and tranquility, and advertisements typically depict women relaxing in pools and displaying their bodies. Men, on the other hand, are more concerned with action – engaging in vigorous sports, doing business, and making money – advertisements typically depict men driving fast cars or going off-road with trucks. Women are certainly interested in doing and men in being and there are many crossover activities, but the general rule still holds.

Another significant mental difference that underlies many others is that females are more attuned to people whereas males are more attuned to things. A much greater part of the lives of women is related to giving birth and nurturing children, so the mental characteristic of interest in people goes along with female physiology and body structure. As indicated above, girl babies are much more interested in faces whereas boy babies are equally interested in objects. Women are better at picking up on nuances of meaning and social cues from body language and tones of voice, so they tend to be better judges of character ([McGuiness, 1985](#)). This accounts for the phenomenon of female “intuition.”

Regarding career, studies show that women generally consider marriage, children, and family as more important, e.g., ([Chen, 2018](#)), but in the milieu of feminism and the dissolution of marriage, careers have become more important to women. Occupational counselors often use interest inventories to help individuals choose college majors and careers because interests typically predict the best outcomes. A popular theory of job themes differentiates them as realistic, investigative, artistic, social, enterprising, and conventional. Gender differences in academic subjects are extensive with women typically expressing more interest in people-

oriented occupations (social, artistic, and conventional) and men normally expressing greater interest in thing-oriented careers (realistic, investigative, and enterprising) ([Ludwikowski & al, 2018](#)). There are more women in colleges and universities than men and for many years it has been the case that more females are gaining advanced degrees than males([Perry, 2021](#)).

Therefore, the question may be posed, “If you’re so smart, why aren’t you rich?” The answer is that women typically select fields that are people-oriented rather than thing-oriented and are less prone to seek high-level positions (see the [Leadership, Goal-Setting, and Risk-Taking](#) section below). People-oriented jobs such as teaching, social work, and nursing in general pay less than jobs in engineering and technology. Compensation for the former is more from government and society on behalf of those who are less able to pay for themselves and therefore have more of a charitable aspect requiring taxation and communal support. But thing-oriented companies produce products and services that people purchase directly, so the compensation for those occupations is higher. The above holds true for children’s career aspirations. In one study, boys were more likely to indicate military, manual labor, and math/computer science careers, while girls were more likely to choose stay at home parent, education, and animal care careers ([Conlon et al., 2022](#)). Studies consistently demonstrate these biases and show that the “people vs. things” factor is the most important predictor of occupational gender segregation ([Kuhn & Wolter, 2022](#)).

Because females are more attuned to people, women naturally devote themselves to home, children, and family much more so than men, who are typically more devoted to careers and making money. The propensity of women is to relate downward to children and the weak, as opposed to the propensity of men to relate upward to hierarchy and power. Both the female and the male orientations are necessary for a successful society, with the male drive to production and money paying for the female drive to children, family, and the disadvantaged.

Women focus more on relationships and remember relationship details better than men ([Holmberg et al., 2016](#)). In regard to employment, according to Catherine Hakim in *Key Issues in Women's Work*, women are not generally disadvantaged or dissatisfied with their work. She indicated that part-time employment is a “conscious and preferred choice” for a large percentage of women, and she contradicts the feminist argument that women are forced into part-time working by the need to combine employment and child-care activities; many part-time female workers with children feel they “get the best of both worlds” ([Hakim, 1996](#)). This, of course, means that such women are either married or in cohabiting relationships with a man who is employed full time, as opposed to the pathology of female-headed households where the woman is the only breadwinner – either via a job or government welfare. Hakim emphasizes the privileged position of the majority of women who live in male-headed households and who have more choices than men in terms of their working life – a choice to work full- or part-time or the choice to become a full-time homemaker. Single women and men, on the other hand, must work full-time and have few other options. She also challenges the assertion that gender differences in work orientation and commitment have faded, asserting that such a conclusion is the result of political correctness, and accusing researchers of a feminist bias in selective presentations of the research evidence: “The polarization of the female workforce is too pronounced for us to ignore it any longer in research and requires different analytical approaches” ([Hakim, 1996, p. 186](#)). Hakim proposes that men and women still generally accept the sexual division of labor where men are the primary breadwinners and women are primarily homemakers: “Work orientations and work commitment, work plans and interest in promotion are all determined by or consistent with acceptance of fundamental sex role differentiation” ([Hakim, 1996, p. 118](#)). Unless required by the lack of male provider, employment has not become a priority in women’s lives. Rather, it

is an interruption of domestic activities that dominate and take precedence for most women.

Hakim also suggests that differences in attitudes about work and about traditional male and female roles are more distinct between career and non-career women than between men and women in general, with the only group challenging the traditional sexual division of labor being career women working full-time. They are a minority and not representative of all working women, let alone adult women, but theirs is the voice that is most often heard ([Hakim, 1996](#)).

These perspectives are a key to understating the Gender Pay Gap Myth discussed below.

A perceptive review of J.R.R. Tolkien's novel series *The Lord of the Rings* stated the following:

I'm beginning to realize why *The Lord of the Rings* is the book most often recommended by the men around me. The series is masculinity at its finest, describing the types of actions that cause men to thrive, increase in strength and valor, and rise to the occasion. In this quest, the male characters are always working their way toward Mordor. They don't get to take the easy way there; instead, they must rely on their wits and be willing to take risks in order to make it – to be heroes – even if it means losing their lives to do so.

Solid male friendship is also a strong, if not subtle, aspect. There are no women on the quest that the nine males set out upon, meaning that none of them have to compete with each other for female attention, nor do they have to expend energy fulfilling the natural instinct to protect the opposite sex. At first blush, some may think these observations offensive, a suggestion that the novel is full of male stereotypes, and that all the men who seem to hold this classic work as one of their favorite reads are the knuckle-dragging thugs of toxic masculinity that are anathema in today's society. But I don't see it that way. Instead, I think *The Lord of the Rings* gives us a glimpse into the type of men we need in society, while simultaneously giving us clues on how to encourage such masculinity.

Just as the team of males in the quest to destroy the ring had a mission, so men today need responsibility. They need space to be heroes, to take risks, make mistakes, and get up and try again. What they don't need is women taking away that responsibility, claiming that men are inept and not up to the task. "For men, there's nothing but responsibility," Jordan Peterson notes in one of his lectures. Take away that responsibility, that meaning in life, and the male is unmotivated to do anything, resulting in listless, emasculated men and frustrated, overwhelmed women who wonder why men never step up to the plate.

Today's men also need friendship. And their friendship needs aren't like the girly chats that women hold in coffee shops. No, their friendship is much more action-oriented, and often plays out in teams. Author Anthony Esolen explains.

“Boys and men fight, in teams. Without such teams, forget about civilization; human survival itself would not have been possible. The hunting party is a male team. The defenders of the village are a male team.” Unfortunately, we have done a lot in recent years to destroy these male teams, discouraging male-only clubs or activities and insisting upon equality and the inclusion of females. ([Holmquist, 2023](#))

Morality and Religiosity

Studies of male and female personality and socialization reveal that women are more moral and ethical than men; they have inherently different traits and values which devolve into distinct moral orientations ([Ward & King, 2018](#)). Women are characterized by communal traits, such as helping others and creating harmonious relationships, whereas men are typified by agentic traits, such as assertiveness and competitiveness. Women are more sensitive, other oriented, and more likely to obey rules, whereas men are more rational, individualistic, and likely to break rules. Women are more altruistic than men, other oriented, empathetic, act in less overtly selfish ways, and are more willing to tell lies that harm themselves a little but help others than men. Furthermore, there are societal expectations of each gender that reinforce these traits – women are supposed to be warm, unselfish, and sensitive to others, whereas men are expected to be assertive, competitive, and independent ([Ward & King, 2018](#)). Feminists would point to stereotypes that “force” people in male or female roles, but it seems to be the other way around – men adopt male roles and women adopt female roles because of their biological predispositions, and male-female stereotypes develop from that reality.

Psychologists have struggled with how to measure morality and in some cases have concluded that women in some circumstances may be just as unethical as men. The difficulty in measuring this is complicated by two other gender differences: 1) Women are more prone to provide socially desirable answers than men, which can distort survey results; and 2) The lower degree of female assertiveness means that women demonstrate more passive unethical behavior

than men ([Bossuyt & Kenhove 2015](#)). Nevertheless, women seem to be more moral, and so encourage men to a higher standard. There is substantial evidence from organizational studies which implies that compared with men, women have lower intentions to engage in morally questionable actions that provide personal or professional advantages (such as lying during negotiations, bending rules, etc.) and view such acts as less permissible. Moral judgments and the associated behavior are influenced by personal emotions; guilt proneness, shame proneness, and empathic concern are linked to moral decision-making. Consistent with feminine gender roles are higher degrees of guilt and shame, whereas men place less emphasis on social bonds and instead are agentic and competitive. Therefore, men may be more tempted to view situations that offer personal or professional gain not as moral quandaries but as opportunities for achievement ([Ward & King, 2018](#)).

Research has shown that women are more interested than men in communal goals that benefit others ([Moulton-Tetlock et al., 2018](#)). They are also more empathic, which along with more proneness to guilt and shame, affects their moral decisions. Women's higher degree of emotionality also contributes to increased morality. Suppressing emotions can lead people to overlook aversive consequences of moral dilemmas and instead focus on utilitarian outcomes, so the male tendency to suppress emotions may lead them to ignore aversive emotions when considering moral dilemmas. Women experience stronger reactions to causing harm in moral dilemmas, possibly leading them to postpone or avoid utilitarian decisions ([Ward & King, 2018](#)). For example, female executives do less insider trading than male executives, and feminist researchers blame this on discrimination against women, e.g., ([Inci et al., 2017](#)). However, the real reason is probably the greater morality of women as well as the fact that males are more overconfident and less risk averse than females.

Research on the topic of jealousy reveals significant difference between the sexes. Displays of jealousy can be positive for relationships, igniting passion and signaling commitment, but can also be destructive, leading to verbal attacks, physical violence, and homicide in extreme cases. In one study participants were told to imagine that their spouse became interested in someone else and answer the question: “What would upset you more: imagining your partner forming a deep emotional attachment to that person or imagining your partner enjoying passionate sexual intercourse with that person?” The results were dramatically different with 60% of the men choosing the partner’s sexual infidelity as more upsetting, whereas only 17% of women made that choice. Conversely, 83% of women indicated that emotional infidelity was more distressing, compared to 40% of men ([Buss, 2018](#)).

Polls show that women are more religious than men. Among Christians in the U.S. 72% of women say religion is very important in their lives, compared with 62% of Christian men. Around 80% of Christian women say they are absolutely certain God exists and that the Bible is the Word of God, compared with 70% of Christian men. Christian men and women in the U.S. also differ in their devotional habits; 74% of women say they pray at least daily, compared with 60% of men. Even among those not affiliated with a particular religion, women tend to be more religious than men. For example, around 33% of unaffiliated women say they are absolutely certain God exists, compared with 23% of men. Likewise, roughly 25% of unaffiliated women say they pray at least daily, compared with 15% of men ([Fahmy, 2018](#)).

Crime Rates and Aggression

Males are much more likely to be the perpetrators of violent crime as well as crime in general than females. For example, the prison population in Australia is only 8% women ([Sarre](#)

[& al, 2021](#)). Both sexes are almost equally the victims of violent crimes, but women are much more likely to be victimized by sexual, family-oriented, and domestic violence ([Statista, 2023](#)).

It was once thought that as societal influences push females into becoming more male, that they would take on masculine behavioral characteristics, including the negative male propensity to crime. Freda Adler and Rita Simon postulated that as females increasingly adopt male roles, their attitudes and behavior would be increasingly masculinized, and women would become as crime prone as men ([Adler, 1975](#)). Alternatively, increased participation in the workforce meant that women would have more opportunities to commit job-related crimes. But these hypotheses turned out to be incorrect because male-female arrest rates and crime levels have not varied by more than five percentage points over the past 40 years. The sexes therefore have not fundamentally changed ([Walsh & Jorgensen, 2020](#)).

It is self-evident that males are more aggressive than females, which is primarily due to the impact of testosterone on the male brain. However, females can also be aggressive. Girl-girl fights used to be rare, but the feminization of society and the decline in public school discipline means that they have increased. But unlike males who fight each other directly, females typically use “cattiness” and indirect forms of aggression against opponents, such as social manipulation with the intention to harm the target person psychologically and/or socially. This takes the form of a planned circuitous attack on the target person through malicious gossip or manipulating social networks in order to lower the target’s standing in the social hierarchy or excluding her/him from a social group. Research indicates that males also use indirect aggression, but that it is not their preferred method. Indirect aggression requires that a certain amount of social intelligence be developed in order to manipulate others – strong correlations between indirect aggression and social intelligence have been found. Girls mature earlier than boys and are

innately more oriented to people and social activities, so they may develop social intelligence earlier than boys ([Bjorkqvist, 2018](#)).

A large study investigating partner violence challenged the widely held beliefs that physical violence against partners in marital, cohabiting, and dating relationships is almost entirely done by men, that the major risk factor for partner violence is male dominance in the relationship, and that when women are violent, it is usually in self-defense. The study indicated that most partner violence is bidirectional – dominance by the female is as strongly related as dominance by the male ([Straus, 2007](#)). However, given the verbal advantage of women over men, female abuse of males is often verbal, whereas males more often resort to physical abuse, and that females then react in physical violence.

These results, in combination with results from many other studies, call into question the assumption that partner violence (PV) is primarily a male crime and that, when women are violent, it is usually in self-defense. Because these assumptions are crucial elements in almost all partner PV prevention and treatment programs, a fundamental revision is needed to bring these programs into alignment with the empirical data. Prevention and treatment of PV could become more effective if the programs recognize that most PV is bidirectional and act on the high rate of perpetration by women and the fact that dominance by the female partner is as strongly related to PV as dominance by the male partner. ([Straus, 2007](#))

Narcissism is a generally negative characteristic and narcissistic individuals, both male and female, are often more aggressive. But in studies that examined high aggression males vs. high aggression females, it was found that males were more influenced by leadership and authority aspects of narcissism, whereas females were more influenced by self-absorption/self-admiration aspects of narcissism ([Gumpel et al., 2015](#)).

Leadership, Goal-Setting, and Risk-Taking

It is well known that women remain underrepresented in leadership positions within organizations and in politics, with a greater gender gap at higher ranks of leadership. For

example, the proportion of women CEOs in the S&P 500 in America has not increased substantially from 5%. The U.S. has never elected a woman president, and women comprise just one third of members of the U.S. congress, and the gap remains despite the widespread adoption of affirmative action policies and programs ([Netchaeva et al., 2022](#)). Gender stereotypes are extremely persistent delineating how men and women should and should not behave: women should be warm, supportive, cooperative, and kind, but should not be controlling, demanding, or stubborn. Men should be businesslike, ambitious, and prone to lead, but should not be yielding, indecisive, or approval seeking. Male characteristics correlate with the role of leaders more so than that of females, and the prototypical leader is perceived to be masculine rather than feminine. Research also has shown that women self-stereotype to a greater degree than men and tend to view themselves as followers rather than leaders ([Netchaeva et al., 2022](#)).

Studies have found that men are more self-confident and overconfident than women; men find it more attractive to believe that they outperformed others, and they more readily engage in negotiation to achieve their goals ([Thaler, 2021](#)). Research done regarding goal setting shows men set more ambitious goals than women, both for private and publicly related issues. Men also perform better than women in achieving goals, especially if they are public-related ([Brandts et al., 2021](#)). A possible reason for this difference is that females are more cautious and risk averse than males and have a higher degree of nervousness and fear in anticipation of negative outcomes, and therefore set lower goals.

It has often been assumed that “gender inequality” or the “glass ceiling” will disappear when discrimination ends and women attain authority positions. But studies have found that female managers are evaluated less positively than male managers, with the result that women are largely concentrated at lower levels in chains of command. Thus, there are inherent gender-

related impediments to women attaining authority positions despite educational qualifications and work experience ([Stojmenovska, 2023](#)). Regardless of the many years of affirmative action programs by companies as well as government pressure, discrimination seems to be a minor factor. Rather, all of these issues could be explained by the brain-related and immutable male-female differences expressed in the sections above:

1. Women are more risk averse, more cautious, less competitive, less self-confident, and less willing to negotiate than men.
2. Women typically place family responsibilities over jobs and are less motivated by career, success, and money.
3. Women are more interested in communal goals rather than individual goals.
4. Women may resist making decisions in situations involving moral dilemmas due their greater empathy.
5. Women tend not to think of themselves in authority roles (Stojmenovska mentions the high number of part-time female workers in her country where both men and women tend to view authority positions in male terms).
6. Educational and work experience do not necessarily offset the above factors. For many years there have been more females graduating with both master-level and doctoral degrees than males ([Perry, 2021](#)), but there is no certainty that they would be better managers. An individual with a basic degree, either male or female, may be more suitable as a manager than an individual with a PhD.
7. Women may struggle in leadership roles because they are too empathetic and nurturant, or conversely because they are overly aggressive and harsh with subordinates in order to appear “male enough.”

Women in authority jobs are the most likely to report experiencing sexual harassment, bullying, and intimidation at the workplace ([Fischbach et al., 2015](#)), but that may be due to the fact that women in authority are treated more like men (men are generally tougher with other men than they are with women). Such women are also more feminist-oriented than other female workers, and therefore would tend to be more hypersensitive to anything that could be perceived as harassment. It is also reported that they have the highest probability of experiencing job

burnout symptoms, which may well be due to female gender role stress ([Fischbach et al., 2015](#)).

Thus, there is a “think manager, think male” bias in the thinking of both men and women.

Leaders are perceived in male terms and not in female terms – as being agentic and masculine rather than communal and feminine ([Fischbach et al., 2015](#)). Nevertheless, many firms have benefitted from the participation of female leaders who have injected the concerns of women for empathy and ethics to moderate the more competitive and success-oriented traits of males, e.g., ([Cuadrao et al., 2015](#)).

Dominance and Submission

In virtually all cultures, masculinity is associated with dominance and femininity with submission. In feminist scholarship, expressions of masculinity are sometimes characterized as “masculine gender role strain” meaning that masculinity creates personal and social problems for men. This implies that society would be better if men were less masculine and less dominant, e.g., ([McDermott et al., 2017](#)). Masculinity and dominance can certainly become toxic, but like many other gender characteristics it is also beneficial for women and society – for better or worse it is not going away because dominance is a biological characteristic of masculinity.

Dominance hierarchies are universal in human societies; dominance appears to be an attribute of the male role in all human cultures. As we have seen, male sex hormones are associated with an increased masculinization of anatomical and behavioral traits, including an increase in dominance behaviors. Furthermore, the attainment of rank, display of rank, skill, and achievement by men are commonly part of the human courtship ritual, and females appear to be attracted to dominant males ([Goldberg, 1993](#); [Gorelik, 2021](#); [Sadalla et al., 1987](#)).

The terms “dominant” and “submissive” can be confusing because we use them to refer to both character and behavior qualities as well as human orientations and stereotypes. Some

people are uncomfortable with the notion of exercising power over others, either from the standpoint of doing so or having it done to them. But it is impossible to ignore this issue, because in order to accomplish anything, someone will have to take charge. The question is not whether power will be exercised, but rather who will do it, and how it will be done. Everyone uses both dominant and submissive behaviors at various times and in various situations. Dominance and a take-charge attitude are especially necessary when organizing and leading groups of people – chaos results if the leader doesn't lead. This is equally true for running families as well as corporations. Submissiveness and humility are likewise needed to get along with others and smooth over conflicts.

Here we shall use these terms to denote orientation. A dominant in this context is a person who is naturally drawn to leadership and who desires to create and sustain an environment in which others live. A submissive in this context is a person who is naturally drawn to following the lead of another, and who prefers to operate in an environment that is established and maintained by another. As indicated above, when we associate dominance and submissiveness with gender, the former is typically associated with masculinity (being strong, virile, aggressive, etc.), and the latter with femininity (being soft, giving, nurturant, vulnerable, etc.) These associations are under attack in Western culture, but nevertheless they remain valid because they are rooted in human nature and biology. Male dominance is also the case for almost all species of mammals, but that argument is only relevant for Darwinists; here we limit our consideration strictly to *homo sapiens*, as universal common descent is a myth {Sorensen, 2020 #246}.

Most males are dominant to a degree, and most females are submissive to a degree ([Goldberg, 1993](#)). However, a man considered to be dominant may have and exhibit submissive qualities. In other words, he may be a take-charge type of guy but also be humble and able to

function well in both leadership and team member roles. Likewise, a woman who we would think of as submissive may at times take the lead and come across in a dominant fashion. Both may adapt behavioral traits associated with the other at times, but their basic orientation is unchanged. We see varying degrees of these traits in different individuals – for example, where some women are more dominant than some men. But the general rule is that men are more aggressive and dominant than women, and a general rule is not disproved by exceptions.

Many are tired of tiptoeing around male-female issues and are disgusted with the continual attempts to recast people into opposite sex roles. People are weary of the deception of our society that denies and degrades the positive reality of masculinity and femininity. What is stated here is obvious to any objective observer and it seems overly laborious to have to explicate what former generations would consider to be common sense. But with our culture steeped in gender feminism and attempting to force us toward androgyny, it is necessary to consider male dominant and female submissive (MDFS) relationships. Here are a few examples of dominance and submission in action in regard to males and females:

- Men enjoy playing aggressive, contact-oriented sports (such as football, hockey, boxing, etc.) much more than women do.
- Women enjoy caring for children and family more than men do.
- Males compete and sometime fight for females.
- It is the boy who typically puts his arm around the girl.
- The sexual act involves the surrender of a woman to penetration by a man.

These are just a few of hundreds of the ways that these orientations are demonstrated.

The most fulfilling and longest lasting male-female relationship for heterosexuals is MDFS marriage when those characteristics are rightly understood and practiced. It is fulfilling because a dominant man can best meet a woman's desires, and a submissive woman can best meet a man's desires. The force that drives men and women together into relationships is the fact that each has what the other wants. Men want sex and nurturance, which is what women have to offer. Women

want romance and security, which is what men have to offer. Therefore, the idea is to give the other what they want and need, so that they in turn will satisfy you. When this mutual satisfaction of desires takes place in an atmosphere of love and commitment, it can generate a deep intimacy between man and woman, which is the essence of what most people truly seek.

Dominance and submission within limits are not perverted or twisted – on the contrary, they are very normal, natural, and beneficial human traits, and most people naturally exhibit them. The feminist stereotype of a overly-dominant male is negative – an unfeeling puppet master who sits in a big chair and orders other people around, or a cruel man who gets his kicks from hurting other people. But the word “dominant” does not imply or suggest tyranny, oppression, or cruelty. Such a man can be very loving, and one who takes responsibility for himself and his family in a manner that could be termed “responsible patriarchy.” Likewise, the feminist stereotype of a submissive woman is also negative – a neurotic housewife who is incapable of deciding anything. The word “submissive” does not imply or suggest doormat, inferior, neurotic, worthless, or debased. Such a woman can be a joyful person who understands her mind and is fully able to think and speak for herself, but also prefers to be under the leadership of her man to some degree, as well as enjoying taking care of him and their children. In other words, the woman is submissive not because she feels trapped or is forced to be, but rather because she wants to be. She is the power behind the throne and is content to allow her man to take the lead, because she is secure in her own position and role. She may be superior to him in some areas of knowledge, intelligence, and/or wisdom, but she still allows him to lead, and she uses the benefits of her insight to complement his leadership rather than to challenge it. A good leader will recognize the skills of his partner and will defer to her in those areas, and

appealing to a leader is a much better way of being heard than opposing him, so the woman is more likely to obtain what she wants.

Masculinity is a compulsion for the average male that needs to be periodically reaffirmed; it is defined by several core characteristics if he is to be a “good man” ([Dahl et al., 2015](#)):

1. He behaves in ways that demonstrate power, status, and dominance, particularly relative to women – he should influence rather than be influenced, lead rather than follow, and control rather than be controlled.
2. He exhibits a degree of physical, emotional, and mental toughness – withstanding pain, tolerating difficult conditions, and not unduly expressing sadness.
3. He distances himself from feminine characteristics or appearing as gay – heterosexual men typically feel discomfort or repugnance at the appearance of those traits in males.
4. He may engage in aggressive actions to confirm his dominance, but if they are harmful or perceived as excessive, they represent a failure of dominance, because being a good man means that self-control must inform all actions.

A “good man” would therefore seek dominance over the woman, but in a positive manner that expresses his desires, but without doing any harm. This type of relationship orientation is sometimes referred to as “benevolent sexism,” which is the extent to which people believe women deserve to be provided for and protected by men ([Dahl et al., 2015](#)). The traditional courtesy of a man escorting a woman and holding doors for her is an example. A woman may not actually need to be protected and may very well be capable of caring and providing for herself, but having such a relationship with a man provides her with a sense of security and safety which is a core female desire. Research confirms the commonsense notion that women from various societies prefer dominant and masculine men who are good providers ([Goldberg, 1993](#)). Men are much less interested in a woman’s wealth than women are in the wealth of the man; the main factors that men seek in women are beauty, femininity, attractiveness, e.g., ([Lucas & al, 2004](#)).

Benevolent sexism is relatively appealing, and provides this sense of security and stability, because it presents an idealized and complementary version of gender roles in which women are “warm caregivers” and men are “competent providers.” Both men’s

and women's endorsement of benevolent sexism is also higher when they perceive that benevolent sexism is normative and generally endorsed by most men. Women's endorsement of benevolent sexism plays a particularly important role in maintaining gender inequality. For example, when women more strongly endorse benevolent sexism, they embrace their interpersonal rather than agentic qualities and hold relatively lower aspirations for independent success in education or career domains. They also view men's and women's societal roles as equally fair, which predicts relatively greater life satisfaction and a lower motivation to challenge men's higher levels of societal power. Thus, a key way that benevolent sexism functions to maintain gender inequality involves women adopting and endorsing it. ([Hammond et al., 2016](#))

Benevolent sexism and the associated gender inequality are therefore good and positive rather than bad and negative. Studies indicate that a woman dominating or besting a man potentially threatens his masculinity and may provoke backlash ([Dahl et al., 2015](#)). This is less true in work relationships where a man has a female manager and there is an expectation of an authority connection, but more so in intimate relationships. In the latter a man may react to domination by a woman in one of several ways:

1. If it is done in play and/or if the man has a secure self-image, he may ignore it.
2. If repeated and the man has a poor self-image, it may further damage his ego and he may become emasculated.
3. If he is less communicative, he may subliminate the event and seek revenge later, either by avoidance, abandonment, or acts of aggression.
4. If he is more communicative, he may immediately strike out in verbal and/or physically aggressive ways.

For most men, his authority over his female partner is core to masculinity ([Dahl et al., 2015](#)). Unless #1 above is true there will be negative consequences for both the man and the woman. Due to their hypergamy instincts, women typically choose men with a higher earning potential, so men with few skills and low incomes are less able to attract a female, and therefore more likely to lash out at women and society. Accordingly, if the wife's income, job status or educational level rivals or surpasses her husband's, the marriage is often weak ([Lucas & al, 2004](#)). Studies indicate that marriages in which wives outearned their husbands (and exercised

more overt power in the relationship) had a greater incidence of mental and sexual health problems, and couples are more likely to divorce when the wife earns more than the husband ([Tinsley et al., 2014](#)). Other studies have shown that dominant women create problems in marriages; couples in which a wife dominates decision-making or engages in dominance displays towards her husband have the lowest levels of marital satisfaction, and female-dominant married couples may well have sexual difficulties ([Lucas & al, 2004](#)). Far from being an evil, submission for women can be a blessing both for her and for her man – female submission makes sense.

As discussed, most men still want to be the king of their own castle and become uneasy when their woman challenges them for dominance. However, it is often said that husbands want their wives to work, and in many cases that may be so. But is generally true?

Husbands whose wives stay home are happier than those whose wives are employed outside the home. This was the finding of a study at Rutgers University. The men, ranging in age from 16 to 65 were divided into two groups: 208 husbands had wives who worked outside the home for pay at least 20 hours per week, and 408 husbands described their partners as “housewives”. The first group reported less satisfaction in their home and work lives than the second. This discontent crossed all age, income, and educational levels, and it was even expressed among the husbands who claimed to have positive feelings about their wife’s employment. ([Staines et al., 2021, p. 188](#))

A man secure in his masculinity will not usually believe himself suited to the female role, but he will respect the woman who assumes it and take pride in providing for her and their children. Such a man will afford his wife the security and affirmation that enable her to deal with the troubling aspects of her role, so that she can perform it with satisfaction. ([Graglia, 1998, pp. 150-151](#))

Men who prefer submissive women are accused of being misogynists, abusers, wife batterers, and slave drivers who want to keep women down and deny them freedom. They are also said to be insecure, violent, manipulative, controlling, and tyrannical; “The Patriarchy” is supposedly a long running conspiracy to keep women under their thumbs, ([Adams, 2021](#); [Rudden, 2022](#); [Tseelon, 1995](#)). While it is certainly true that some men are abusive, and that an abusive man would probably prefer a submissive woman (because a submissive woman may be

easier to abuse), many and probably most loving and non-abusive men also prefer feminine women who are submissive to a degree. In general, the above accusations are simply feminist mendacity.

The man must be willing to take the lead. This sounds rational and simple enough, but there are many men who may dream of being a leader, but in real life are too timid, too self-conscious, too embarrassed, too hung-up, too addicted, too unsure of themselves, or too lazy to do so. Unfortunately, feminism, government, and the public schools are trying to eliminate masculinity and de-masculinize boys, so they are no longer taught to lead and to cherish and protect girls; boys and men need to fight this propaganda. The words “determined,” “goal-oriented,” “self-disciplined,” “responsible,” and “caring” must be or become a reality for the man, and he cannot be lazy, passive, selfish, irresponsible, or undisciplined, and be a successful dominant. A man may fantasize a relationship with a compliant woman but have no clue as to what it will take on his part to cause a woman to submit to him on a long-term basis. Other men understand what it takes but are unwilling or unable to give up their lazy and selfish ways, and so cannot command the respect of their woman, which is necessary for her to want to submit to him and follow his lead.

The woman must be willing to accept the leadership of her man. Girls still like “bad boys” who are overtly masculine, but feminism seeks to de-feminize girls by teaching them to be independent, autonomous, aggressive, combative, and confrontational, all of which can be valuable for single people but can be corrosive in relationships.

Women want to be respected. In a passage by Steven Goldberg quoted on page 105-6, he points out that the rights and respect given to women are inversely correlated. In other words, in feministic societies where the roles assumed by men and women are equivalent, women are

given less respect (i.e., men tend to treat them as they would another man), and in traditional societies where there are significant differences in the roles of men and women, the latter are given more respect. Women may not receive respect from the society at large, but in an MDFS relationship the wife should receive a high degree of respect from her husband. A man who does not respect and cherish his woman is not a true dominant.

Taking Goldberg's insight one step further, we may ask, "In what relationships and situations is a higher degree of respect for women most desirable?" as well as the corollary question, "In what relationships and situations is male-female equivalence most desirable and the rights of women paramount?" The business world, by its very nature is, to a greater or lesser degree, impersonal. Therefore, submissiveness for women in a business environment is less important because the relationships between people are based on economic production and therefore are fungible. In other words, a person may move from one job or area of a company to another, and from relationships with one group of people to another, with relatively little adjustment or psychological impact. Submissiveness in the form of being able to compromise and get along with others is still important, and for many jobs it is essential for both males and females, but respect for women in a business environment is less needed. A woman can be "one of the boys." Rights are much more important, so that women will receive fair wages for their work, and not be harassed or taken advantage of. In home life, however, the opposite is true, because "home is where the heart is." Home life is intensely personal, and relationships are based primarily on intimacy and love rather than economics. Here, a woman typically desires a high degree of respect and appreciation from her man, and to receive it, she needs to adopt a more submissive orientation that will encourage him to cherish and romance her.

In other words, a woman may be a career wife and have one set of relationships and psychological dynamics at the office, and an entirely different set at home. However, this requires that she make mental adjustments depending on which environment she is in. A woman may find herself trying to nurture colleagues at the office and/or taking the frustrations of the work environment out on her husband and children, and treating them as she would a subordinate, co-worker, or boss. It is known that women are much better able than men to juggle different tasks and still keep their sanity, and this may work well for women. In contrast, a man who is confronted with a number of conflicting requirements for his time and attention is more likely to become extremely frustrated. To have a greater sense of unity, a woman may tend to gravitate to one end of the spectrum or the other, becoming more businesslike at home, or seeking to abandon the office and quit her job so that she can devote herself more to home life. These dynamics need to be carefully considered by couples in the construction of a solid relationship. Business and the production of income are essential, but for women, home-life is typically the most important focus.

Sexual Pleasure

Despite the gender feminist push to sexual liberation, psychology has long known that indiscriminate affairs lead to lower female satisfaction with sex, e.g., ([Bonaventura, 1996](#)). According to research, sexual satisfaction is increased by long-term emotional investment, and sexual exclusivity. People in a monogamous relationship are generally more satisfied with sex than those engaging in sex with one or more other partners. Married women are more likely than women in any other type of relationship (except single women who expect relationships to last a lifetime) to report emotional satisfaction with sex. Research also suggests that women with higher incomes tend to be less sexually satisfied, while religious involvement relates to more

satisfaction. Sexual satisfaction is positively affected by love, commitment, communication, and intimacy, and negatively affected by certain personal traits such as narcissism ([Liu, 2018](#)). In other words, the best sex is found in marriage, and women who want the best should ignore gender feminists and do the opposite of sexual liberation. Research also confirms the commonsense observation that women seek marriage (as opposed to affairs) from the assumption that they will get pregnant, and that pregnancy, childbirth, and the nurturing of children ideally requires a mate who will be faithful to protect and support her and the children ([Liu, 2018](#)). This again contradicts the dogma of gender feminism.

The feministic mindset has permeated sexual advice literature which typically states that women today are no longer submissive, and furthermore should not be so. One example of this is the book *Anne Hooper's Kama Sutra* which purports to be an update of several of the best-known ancient Indian and Arabian sexual classics.

Even though the outlook feels dated and perhaps even alien, *The Perfumed Garden* goes to the heart of the matter...but for them [i.e., for contemporary women], the primary goal is to cast off the passive role. ([Hooper, 1994, p. 108](#))

In addition to seeking an impossible standard of female beauty, Sheikh Nefzawi (author of *The Perfumed Garden*) looked for compliance and docility. ([Hooper, 1994, p. 127](#))

Hooper and others imply that human nature has changed since the original *Kama Sutra* was written, and that submissiveness is essentially unthinkable for today's women. She also has an interesting way of describing sexual positions in which a woman is placed in submissive postures – the positions are said to be “more highly erotic” ([Hooper, 1994, pp. 69, 113](#)). Another example is the book *In the Garden of Desire* by Wendy Maltz which discusses the sexual fantasies of women. Maltz indicates that the most prevalent female sexual fantasy is “about being the object of another's desire” (surprise, surprise!), but at the same time she feels a need to apologize for and downplay the fact that this is essentially submissiveness in action:

Although she's clearly passive in this fantasy, Judith said her imagined encounter feels "romantic."

Although this kind of fantasy might seem to perpetuate a sexual role of women being helpless, women sometimes describe an erotic power that comes from being the Pretty Maiden. ([Maltz, 1998](#))

The "Pretty Maiden" in the above quote is one of the terms used by Maltz to encapsulate what she says is the most common female fantasy, and the paradigm is essentially that of a sexually submissive woman. But being passive is clearly at odds with the feminist agenda, and therefore it is called "feeling romantic," and the notion of female helplessness and sexual submission becomes a "means to power." The reality is that submission is a means to power, but it is not power in a masculine sense, rather it is the power of surrender – the ability to influence, persuade, and win over the hearts of others. Sex is a means of establishing intimacy and pleasure for couples, by also involves dominance by the man.

What both man and woman wish to feel in the sexual act, is the essential force of maleness, which expresses itself in a forceful and absolute possession of the woman. Both man and woman exult in a certain degree of male aggression and dominance. ([Van de Velde, 1966](#))

Men are the sexual aggressors, and the issue in sex is really the issue of erotic power, dominance and submission... The impulse to dominate the female is programmed somewhere like a microchip implanted in the male brain - into the majority of male brains, at least. ([Bakos, 1995](#))

Consider a similar summary of the sexual act by a radical feminist:

Sexual intercourse is an act of possession in which... a man inhabits a woman, physically covering her, overwhelming her, and at the same time penetrating her... By thrusting into her he takes her over... this is taken to be her capitulation to him as a conqueror; it is a physical surrender of herself to him; he occupies and rules her, expresses his elemental dominance over her. ([Dworkin, 1987](#))

This above is a quote from Andrea Dworkin, who accurately expresses what the sex act typically consists of but is utterly repelled by and has contempt for its MDFS aspects. She presents this as what she thinks is completely repugnant to women, but this is essence of MDFS sexuality, and is attractive to both women and men. Sadly, Dworkin and gender feminists feel a

compulsion to trash what to many is the essence of their gender. If feminists hate men, then stay away from them rather than trying to spew their venom on everyone else.

In the past when the much-maligned “double standard” was in effect, society supposedly excused male philandering, and at the same time penalized females for doing the same thing. But the real significance of the standard was that it demonstrated the innate differences between men and women in their response to sexual desires. Males have an urgent and indiscriminate appetite to use women as sexual objects. But the reticence of women to be so used served them well in controlling men and getting them to commit to marriage and fatherhood. The woman became the man’s wife and lover, and the man became the woman’s provider and protector as in the anonymous quote: “Marriage is the price men pay for sex, and sex is the price women pay for marriage.” Ideally, both received what they wanted and therefore were happy. But feminism tells women that they should be like men, and that indiscriminate sex is a harmless and pleasurable activity. Many women are very uneasy with that position, because it treats something, which to them is of deep significance, in a trivial and shallow way. But even assuming that women agree that sex is trivial, it means that in the game of relationship she has played all of her cards and has nothing left to bargain with. As Robert Wright put it, “If it is harder to drag men to the altar today, one reason is that they don’t have to stop there on the way to the bedroom” ([Wright, 1994, pp. 122, 146](#)). The result is that men are further encouraged to see women as disposable sexual targets. From a selfish man’s perspective, it’s better to just have sex and not get stuck with having to support her. He just needs to make sure that she took her birth control pills, or that his condom didn’t slip. But even if both were forgotten and she gets pregnant, that’s her problem. As he leaves, he looks back and says, “This was just for fun – no commitments, right?” Is this what

women really want? That is what feminism gives them, and hence the cultural support for abortion.

Sexual relationships with others that you don't really know or trust can provide release of sexual tensions, but little more. Such sex may very well leave one or both partners feeling cheap, dirty, and used, and it may lead to profound doubts, as the person contemplates the questions, "Why am I so unfulfilled? If all the TV shows and advertisements tell me that sex is so good, then why does it make me feel so bad?" "What do I look forward to now after I have found out that the one thing I thought would satisfy me is so empty?" If people want the best possible sex, that which is high and ennobling as well as erotic and sensuous, then marriage is the place to find it – a relationship between a lovingly dominant man and a caring submissive woman. This type of relationship will naturally lead to marriage for reasons that if not already obvious, soon become so, and it requires a traditional type of marriage for it to be fully realized. If the couple is already married it will strengthen and deepen their marriage.

Unlike cohabitation without commitment, marriage provides an environment of trust which is especially important to women who typically place a high value on security, so marriage seems to produce more satisfaction than cohabitation, e.g., ([DiDonato, 2021](#); [Huntington et al., 2022](#)), especially as related to pregnancy and childbirth ([O'Reilly-Treiter & al, 2020](#)). It also provides a socially accepted way that a couple can be entirely private and alone with each other. A married couple therefore has the freedom to create intense erotic pleasures for each other if they understand male-female differences, have a loving relationship in which each partner wants to please the other, and they choose to do so. Sex in marriage is thus the best possible sex and in the opinion of the author, it is the only kind that is even worth contemplating. See, for example

the book *Hot Monogamy* by Jo Robinson and Pat Love for more details ([Robinson & Love, 2012](#)).

This is perhaps less true for males because of their often-omnivorous sexual appetites, and their fixation on quantity as opposed to quality. But the quality of sex is important for men as well as women. Why would a man go back to eating cheap, greasy, overcooked hamburger that others have chewed on and tossed back, when he can have filet mignon at home for the asking, and which also costs a lot less? Furthermore, why would a man risk having his filet become hard and indigestible (i.e., turning his wife against him by having affairs), by going back to the greasy hamburgers? It is like the story of a man who searched for a diamond mine all over the country, wound up broke and depressed, and then discovered he had a diamond mine in his back yard.

The increased trust in the bedroom that comes with marriage can be nothing short of an aphrodisiac. “For women, commitment and familiarity often add up to better sex,” asserts Lonnie Barbach, coauthor of *Seductions and Going the Distance: Finding and Keeping Lifelong Love*. “They feel free to explore more deeply and experiment more safely.” Ever since the 50s, Barbach notes, sex surveys have revealed that married women are more orgasmic than their single counterparts.

Of course, there are plenty of single women who experience mind-blowing orgasms on a regular basis. But even their climaxes get an almost cosmic boost after a trip to the altar. “No matter how close, how loving, how safe you feel before saying ‘I do,’ marriage makes it more so,” comments Kimberly, a 27-year-old grad student from La Jolla, California. “That comfort level overflows into the bedroom. My husband and I sometimes get this sense of overwhelming awe of how much we love each other.” This type of emotion can turn a perfectly nice climax into something that feels like the Big Bang. ([Wells, 1999](#))

Of course, marriage doesn’t guarantee great sex – it only guarantees the possibility of it. Like other relationships, marriage requires effort, understanding, and patience. This underscores the importance for men to understand the female mind, and for women to understand males. Sadly, there are many married individuals who treat their spouse worse than they ever would treat a business customer. So, this means that the partners must focus on serving each other rather than themselves. Selfishness must be replaced by humility and a willingness to give.

We do have some control over our body to make ourselves look more beautiful or handsome, but we have more control over our attitudes. The encouraging thing is that attitude is more important than body shape, which is increasingly hard to maintain as couples grow older.

Erotic sexual techniques are not nearly as important to a man as the knowledge that his wife loves him, cares about him, and wants him sexually. The woman who does her best to meet her mate's sexual needs goes a long way toward making him immune to the allure of other women.

The husband who feels comfortable sharing his innermost fears and hopes with his wife will probably never feel right about sharing his bed with anyone else. Those moments of sexual surrender and orgasm at night are inseparably linked with all of the mutual shared experiences throughout the day. Once a woman understands this completely, she has a powerful weapon against infidelity. Conversely, the wife who refuses to give her husband sexual satisfaction is literally asking him to go elsewhere. ([Reuben, 1971](#))

Some would wonder how a wife could possibly compete sexually with a prostitute, who presumably knows much more about giving sexual pleasure. But the prostitute doesn't really surrender herself to the man as the wife can, and therefore she cannot provide the same level of psychosexual satisfaction. She may know well the mechanical aspects of sex but is not able to provide the psychological aspects that are the more emotionally satisfying ones. After the act is over the man has to pay her, get out, and then get himself checked for venereal disease. Nevertheless, to some people, an affair with a person other than their spouse is what they look forward to. The reason that affairs are attractive is that they can supply a newness and excitement that may be lacking at home. But third parties inevitably introduce many painful complications that often make the pleasure derived rather fleeting (deception, jealousy, feeling of betrayal, hostility, and eventually divorce). Therefore, a husband should romance and cherish his wife, and she should learn to think of herself not only as his spouse and partner, but also as his sex partner, thus obviating the need for third parties. Why not have an affair between husband and wife?

Some women who have had bad experiences with men that ignored or abused them have turned to lesbian relationships, as other women are typically more caring. But if a woman desires

security, protection, romance, and sexual pleasure, these can best be found in a relationship with a dominant and caring man. Feminists sometimes speak of the search for the “big O” (i.e., lengthy orgasms) and encourage women to be aggressive in sex. But that is usually counterproductive, because female orgasm comes from the act of surrender, and the more fully the woman surrenders the more powerful her orgasms will be ([Robinson, 1959](#)). Frigidity (the inability of a woman to experience orgasm) is usually caused by sexual inhibitions, or by a woman’s desire to “retain her dignity.” When a wife willingly abandons her dignity and totally surrenders, she may well start to experience orgasms on a regular basis and may find pleasure and satisfaction in sex that she never before dreamed could exist. A man’s orgasm lasts only a few seconds, but a woman’s pleasure can last for a long time and some women refer to these feelings as being in “subspace.” The submissive wife fully enjoys this pleasure, and when she is pleased, she has all the more incentive to give herself to her husband so that he will likewise be pleased. The following quote is by Marie Robinson, a doctor who specialized in female sexual issues from her book entitled, *The Power of Sexual Surrender*:

Orgasm in the woman requires an absolute trust in one’s partner. In sexual intercourse, as in life, man is the actor, woman is the acted upon and passive one. Giving oneself up in this passive manner to another human being, making yourself his willing partner to such seismic physical experiences and allowing yourself to be sexually conquered, means one must have complete faith in him. There can be no crossed fingers about such yielding and no reservations in such a submission. There must be a sensual eagerness to surrender, because in the woman’s orgasm, the excitement comes from the act of surrender.

There is a tremendous surging physical ecstasy in the yielding of itself, in the feeling of being a passive instrument in the hands of a man. Your body is stretched out supinely beneath him, delighting in his dominance and responding in further surrender. You give your body and will over to him and are taken up by his passion as leaves are swept up before a wind. One woman described it as “a sensation of such beauty and intensity that I can hardly think of it without weeping.” Another said, “it’s like a mounting symphony, rising in tremendous and irresistible rhythms till your whole being feels as though it has been swept away.”

The untrusting woman is frightened of the totality of such an experience, mistrusts her husband’s love, and has to feel that she is “in control” all the time. The trouble with that position is that in a real orgasm, a woman must be out of control, and must willingly,

delightedly desire to be so. With his pleasure in mind, she now seeks out more and more those things that please him, and her exploration leads inevitably to the discovery that what pleases him most, outside of his own sensations, *is her pleasure and the giving of herself to him.* In other words, he is most pleased when she is most fully surrendered and given over to him and actually desires to be so. This mutual spiraling of feeling ultimately climaxes in her decision to give him the greatest psychological pleasure of all, the total surrender of her body to him and the delights that it can bring. [italics, mine] ([Robinson, 1959, pp. 216-219](#))

Here is how some women have described the experience:

I feel as if I am trembling in my belly. It feels like electric shock going around my body – very sweet and pleasurable. When it finishes, I feel as if I would faint.

I feel as if I am losing all consciousness, and I seem to love him most intensely at that moment. I tremble all over. My vagina contracts strongly, and I have a feeling of great joy. Then I relax all over, and I am so happy to be alive and to be married to my husband.

I feel like I am losing consciousness, it is such a strong feeling. I hold on to my husband very, very tightly, and if the baby fell out of bed, I would not be able to pick it up. ([Lightfoot-Klein, 1989](#))

Women should not be afraid or ashamed of orgasm or losing control. Rather they should seek to renew those feelings of pleasures, which will increase her sexual appetite and allow her to better meet her man's desires. A caring husband will want his wife to experience orgasm, not only because of the intense pleasure it gives her, but also because at that point she is most fully surrendered to him.

One of the most beautiful sights in the world is a woman you love in the throes of an orgasm which you have induced in her. There are few things in the world that can so fill a man with a sense of power and joy as seeing his beloved female yielding herself helplessly to him. ([Norman, 1974, p. 76](#))

Research has confirmed the commonsense notion that women report more frequent and earlier-timed orgasms when mated to masculine and dominant men who are naturally aggressive and possessive in sexual encounters ([Puts et al., 2012](#)). One study indicated the disconnect between psychology and reality on this issue:

Sexual arousal by dominance and submissiveness was long considered a pathology... The Diagnostic Manual International Classification of Diseases considers even consensual BDSM to be a mental/behavioral disorder... but surprisingly, approximately

half of respondents were excited by their partner's submission [mostly male] or their own submission [mostly female] which is related to hierarchical disparity between partners... Thus, sexual arousal by dominance and submission is likely to represent an important mechanism in human mating strategy and indicates a biological basis for these sexual preferences. ([Jozifkova, 2018](#))

If a man understands that his woman is dedicated to giving herself to him, and the woman understands that her man is dedicated to cherishing her and her alone, both can appreciate the totality of the investment and the sacrifice that the other has made for the sake of their relationship. This can lead to a deep sense of gratitude for the other, and a thorough appreciation of how special and unique their partner is. It also potentially results in the treatment of each other (and other family members as well) with much more grace and humility. As the relationship continues and these characteristics become more a part of the couple's personality, it results in a deep sense of satisfaction and peace.

Summary of Male-Female Differences

Some of the gender differences discussed above have declined since the 1970s, reflecting primarily the impact of workplace feminism as related to the academic and occupational choices opened to women. However, differences related to the capabilities of the sexes show less change. In articles on male-female differences in which males are superior to females (for example, STEM occupations, leadership, and aggression), the frustration of feminists is often revealed. They fulminate over the "persistence of patriarchy," the "persistence of gender norms," and "why after so much time, money and resource have been expended in the effort to create androgyny do these differences persist?" The answer, of course, is that male-female differences are biological rather than social. The notion that sex can be willfully separated from gender was not a result of scientific proof, but more a result of persistent propaganda. There are hundreds of ways that the sexes continue to differ, and these are primarily the result of brain-related

distinctions, e.g., ([Cholerisa et al., 2018](#)). Following is a summary of general male-female differences:

Characteristics	Man / Husband	Woman / Wife
Core Desires	Respect	Security
	Competence	Beauty
Mind and Thought	Logical (Better understanding of things)	Intuitive (Better understanding of people)
	Doing	Being
	Analytical	Emotional
	Focus on things	Focus on people
	Hierarchical (affiliates upward to rank and power)	Relational (affiliates downward to children and the weak)
	Earning money	Developing relationships
	Sex	Romance
Appearance	Linear	Curved
	Hard	Soft
	Rugged	Tender
	Bearded and hairy	Smooth
	Strong	Sleek and Supple
	Handsome	Beautiful
Attitudes	Competitive	Cooperative
	Striving	Peaceful
	Lead	Cooperate and follow
	Aggressive	Compliant and nice
	Active	Passive
	Risk inclined	Risk averse
	Dominant	Submissive
Actions	Command	Organize
	Direct	Adapt
	Compete & fight	Nurture & care for
Sexuality	Testosterone	Estrogen
	Penetration via the penis (sword, gun)	Receptivity via the vagina (sheath, receptacle)
	Compulsive	Relaxed
	Ejaculation	Orgasm
	Hunter	Prey
	Firm	Pliant and supple
	Capture	Yield
	Conquer	Surrender

It must be emphasized that the above list represents the *average* and *typical* male and female characteristics; there is a spectrum of differences, such as some women being more competitive and career-oriented than some men. Environment certainly does play a factor in personal characteristics as well as sexual identity, and it is impossible to disambiguate the biological from the environmental factors that are unique for each individual. Nevertheless, the biological factors seem to be the most significant, which is in direct contradiction to feminist ideology. We have free will, but that is not enough to free us from the way that we are made. Patriarchy, the rule of society generally by men, is thus inevitable and a biological reality:

Patriarchy is universal. For all the variety that different societies have demonstrated in developing different types of political, economic, religious, and social systems, there has never been a society that has failed to associate authority and leadership with men. No anthropologist contests the fact that patriarchy is universal. Indeed, of all social institutions, there is probably none whose universality is so totally agreed upon.

Male dominance refers to the feeling acknowledged by the emotions of both men and women that the woman's will is somehow subordinate to the male's, and that the general authority in dyadic (i.e., individual male-female couplings) and familial relationships, in whatever terms a society defines authority, ultimately rests in the male.

Male dominance does not necessarily mean that males will achieve their goals more often than females will achieve theirs. Indeed, the women of every society possess the emotional skills to "get around" men and to "get their way" despite the male's superior aggression. However, a woman's feeling that she must "get around" a man is a hallmark of male dominance.

As was the case with patriarchy, male dominance is universal; no society has ever failed to exhibit the fact that it is the male who "takes the lead." Every society socializes its children accordingly, *because it must*. [italics in original] ([Goldberg, 1973, pp. 26,30-33](#))

It would seem from the above list and quote that men have the advantage over women, but appearances can be deceiving – the major fact of life is the compulsive sexuality of men and the sexual superiority of women. In all societies throughout history the social customs of sexuality involve the woman giving herself to the man in return for harnessing his energies on her behalf (i.e., societal sexual customs all involve some form of marriage). To create

civilization, women transform male lust into love, channel male rebellion and thrill-seeking into jobs, homes and families, link men to specific children, change hunters into fathers, and provide the tenderness, the sexual satisfaction, and the legacy that men crave. The power of women is completely counter-intuitive – they win seemingly by losing, and they conquer by surrendering.

The feminist Camille Paglia commented,

Woman is the dominant sex – men have to do all sorts of stuff to prove that they are worthy of a woman’s attention... Men have sacrificed and crippled themselves physically and emotionally to feed, house, and protect women and children. If civilization had been left in female hands, we would still be living in grass huts... None of male pain or achievement is registered in feminist rhetoric, which portrays men as oppressive and callous exploiters... One of the most startling discoveries of my career was when I realized that the strongest women in the world are not lesbians but heterosexual women, who know how to handle men. ([Paglia, 1991](#))

Women intuitively understand themselves and are more at ease in their own skin than men are, more intrinsically stable and at home with themselves. Women take pleasure in “being” – being beautiful, loving, peaceful, etc. more so than men. They are sometimes puzzled by male unease, and by continual male attempts to prove manhood, which leads women to have a degree of impatience with men. Women may wonder, “Why do men so often need to prove themselves and seek power? Why does he resent it when she makes more money than he does? Why can’t men just be men and relax?” The answer is that unlike femininity, relaxed masculinity is a limp emptiness and men often feel incompetent if they don’t achieve anything. Masculinity without drive and accomplishment is emasculated, and manhood can only be validated and expressed through action. This compulsion drives men and often denies them the ability to be at peace to the degree that women can. Nothing comes to a man simply by waiting or “being.” Male sexuality is a physical drive and a psychological compulsion, so the desire for sex is a test of identity and not simply a quest for pleasure. Camille Paglia and George Gilder summarize this:

A woman simply is, but a man must become... Masculinity is risky and elusive. It is achieved by a revolt from woman, and it is confirmed only by other men. Manhood coerced into sensitivity is no manhood at all. ([Paglia, 1991](#))

In virtually every known society, sex is regarded as a grant by the woman to the man, or an object of male seizure. In most societies, men have to pay for it with some form of gift or service. This difference between the sexes gives the woman the superior position in most sexual encounters. The man may push and posture, but the woman must decide. He is driven, she is restrained... But in a world where women do not say no, the man is never forced to settle down and make serious choices. If a woman does not force him to make a long-term commitment, in general he doesn't. His sex drive only demands conquest, driving him from body to body in a hunt for variety and excitement in which much of the thrill is the chase itself. ([Gilder, 1986](#))

Man has traditionally ruled the social sphere; feminism tells him to move over and share his power. But woman rules the sexual and emotional sphere, and there she has no rival. Victim ideology, a caricature of social history, blocks women from recognition of their dominance in the deepest, most important realm. ([Gilder, 1986](#))

The implications of this for society have been understood for millennia but have seemingly been forgotten.

Every society, each generation faces an invasion of barbarians. They storm into the streets, schools, businesses, and households of the land, and unless they are brought to heel, they rape and pillage, debauch and despoil the settlements of society.

These barbarians are young men and boys, in their teens and early twenties. Every society must figure out ways to bring them into the disciplines and duties of citizenship. He becomes law abiding and productive, in essence, because he discovers that it is the only way he can get sex from the woman he wants... It is the sexual constitution, not the legal one that is decisive in subduing the aggressions of young men.

Society thus has a much larger stake in employing young men than in employing young women. The unemployed man will often disrupt society, but the woman may do more good without a job, as it may spur new efforts to induce a man to work, supporting her role as a mother. ([Gilder, 1986, pp. 39-40](#))

If young women in large numbers continue to abandon their historic role of civilizing young men, our society will continue to be plagued by the pathologies described in detail below. Some social scientists believe we can correct these problems by radically transforming and androgenizing society along feminist lines. But given the fact that gender is biological, human nature will not support the changes that they propose.

What is there about these so-called social issues that leads substantial majorities of voters to violate and vote against the considered views of perhaps 90 percent of the American intelligentsia? The answer is that these issues directly impinge on sensitive psychological terrain involving sexuality, children, and the family. Unlike many intellectuals whose lives are devoted to legal and scientific abstraction, most of the people still instinctively recognize that the preservation of the sexual constitution may even be more important to the social order than the preservation of the legal constitution. They recognize that no laws can prevail against the dissolution of social connections and personal motivations that sustain civilization... Perhaps the most disabling flaw of mainstream social science is its blindness to the depths of human resistance to its vision of a better world. ([Gilder, 1986, pp. 105, 162](#))

In other words, people are realizing that many of the purveyors of these ideas may possess advanced degrees but are completely lacking in common sense about the most intimate and fundamental issues of life and society.

The impression that our general populace is better educated depends on an ambiguity in the meaning of the word education, or a fudging of the distinction between liberal and technical education. A highly trained computer specialist need not have any more learning about morals, politics, or religion than the most ignorant of persons. All to the contrary, his narrow education... can cut him off from the liberal learning that simpler folk used to absorb from a variety of traditional sources. ([Bloom, 1987, p. 59](#))

This accounts at least in part for how out of touch Washington D.C. is with the rest of the country on many social issues.

Today such repressive and perverse societies are extremely rare [those that do not affirm patriarchy, religion, and private property]. There is, in fact, only one fully documented case surviving in the modern world of a tribe so abjectly retarded, or so mystically impervious to its own nature, that it simultaneously rejects and tries to abolish all three of these human characteristics – sex roles, religion, and property rights. That group, not strictly speaking a tribe, is, of course, the community of social science scholars in America.

The contemporary liberal would wish to banish male bias. Assigning to “society” the duties not only of “general production” but also of reproduction, the new dreamers would extend to women as well as men the life of a British country squire. Liberating both sexes from the restrictive roles and moral codes, the dream would bring a new spirit of sharing – of jobs, bodies, vocations, and pleasures. People would be full “human beings” rather than oppressed men and women.

There are two serious problems with this arrangement, and unfortunately both are fatal. The first problem is that except in an abstract sense there is no such thing as “society.” Both production and reproduction will be left to particular human beings. The second problem is that there are no “human beings,” just men and women. Since the nature of things assure that men will do most of the production and women most of the

reproduction, we are back to where we started from. ([Gilder, 1986, pp. 163-165](#))

The song "Whatever Happened to Old Fashioned Love?" by B.J. Thomas poses arguably one of the most important problems of our times:

We live in the modern age where love is fast like a turning page in a magazine, we've hardly seen.

The friends we used to know, they disappear, they come and go like the times we've had – it's kind of sad.

For now, the tenderness has been replaced with something less, and it's hard to find what we left behind.

Whatever happened to old fashioned love – the kind that would see you through – the kind of love my Momma and Daddy knew?

Whatever happened to old fashioned love - the kind that would last through the years - through the trials, through the smiles, Through the tears?

As discussed above, social science in general and gender study programs in particular typically ignore the reality that sex differences are primarily biological rather than environmental ([Moir & Moir, 1999, p. 16](#)). According to Lynne Segal, a feminist theoretician, "Academic feminist thinking is increasingly skeptical of *any* generalization about women" ([Segal, 1995, pp. 248-249](#)). Feminists thus employ postmodern principles in order to establish their beliefs. As discussed in the definitions below, postmodernism assumes that knowledge is constructed, and that truth is self-determined as Noretta Koertge states in her article *How Feminism is Now*

Alienating Women from Science:

Feminists add a new twist to their old litany of repudiations of academic reasoning by claiming that the standard norms and methods of scientific inquiry are sexist because they are incompatible with women's ways of knowing.

Scientific evidence that contradicts their narrative is thus "too male" so they "value intuition as a safer and more fruitful approach to truth." ([Koertge, 1995](#)). Nevertheless, the truth hasn't changed.

If the biological differences between men and women make it inevitable that every society will be patriarchal, that male behavior will always be more aggressive than female behavior, that males will always predominate in filling the non-maternal roles of authority and status, that males will be dominant and females nurturant in marriage, family and parental relationships, that socialization and stereotypes will always conform to these realities, and that the physiological basis of male and female cognition is such that men and women will forever see reality in different terms, then what is left of feminist theory?

I believe that women in general do not see themselves as inferior to men (as feminists would have them believe) and that they follow their own physiological imperatives. Therefore, in general, they choose not to compete for the goals that men devote their lives to attaining. Women have more important things to do. Men are aware of this and that is why in American as well as every other society, men look to women for gentleness, kindness, and love; for refuge from a world of pain and force, and for safety from their own excesses. In every society a basic male motivation is the feeling that women and children must be protected. But women cannot have it both ways; if she wishes to sacrifice all this, what she will get in return is the right to meet men on male terms. She will lose. ([Goldberg, 1973, pp. 233-234](#))

We are now in a position to consider the most salient questions of our day concerning gender:

1. Is gender binary or nonbinary? In other words, are there only two genders or is there a spectrum of gender differences?

The feminist answer to this question is “nonbinary” because they consider gender to be socially constructed and determined by the environment.

The non-feminist answer is “mostly binary” because there are only two genders – male and female – and the gender is mostly determined by brain wiring and therefore is biological. True hermaphroditism (i.e., the absence of gender) in humans doesn’t exist and the vast majority of the population (around 99%) is binary – either male or female ([ClevelandClinic, 2022](#)). The 1% of intersex-from-birth individuals have a gender identity from their brain wiring that in varying degrees doesn’t correspond to their body due to genetic or hormonal abnormalities, a condition that is termed “gender incongruence.” Intersex babies can be said to be truly nonbinary. Individuals may develop doubts later in life about their gender as a product of life experience and can later choose an intersex orientation and so consider themselves to be nonbinary. But even gender transition therapy or surgery will not change an individual’s brain – his or her original neurological gender and its original binary or nonbinary bias will remain.

2. Is it possible for gender identity to be chosen and altered?

The feminist answer to this question is “yes” for the reasons stated above.

The non-feminist answer is “mostly no” also for the reasons stated above.

3. Is it desirable and beneficial for gender identity to be chosen and altered?

The feminist answer to this question is “yes” because, as discussed in more detail below, they want women to become like men and men to become like women. In a feminist world it can no longer be said what a man is, what a woman is, or even whether stable sexual identities are linked to our bodies. We now disagree whether marriage should be limited to a man and a woman, who can use which bathrooms, what pronouns we should use, and whether mothers should take care of children ([Yenor, 2017](#)).

The non-feminist answer is “usually no” because the overwhelming majority of people are heterosexual and have no desire to change. The only time where this may make sense is for intersex individuals, and they may experience regret after transitioning (see the [Homosexuality](#) section below).

The bottom line is that far from being equivalent, men and women are dramatically different, and in many ways opposite from each other. This seems to indicate teleology – that the distinctions are purposeful and are meant to complement one another. In male-female relationships one supplies what the other lacks, and the strengths of one compensates for the weaknesses of the other. One sex is not better than the other – rather each is better at certain things, and those things are what the other sex needs and desires. Therefore equity (i.e., making adjustments to correct imbalances perceived by feminists as unfair) between the sexes is impossible, regardless of how deeply some may wish it to be. As stated in books such as *When Wish Replaces Thought*, Western society has unfortunately created movements which have attempted to “replace what works with, what to them, feels good.” Statements such as “men are like this” and “women are like that” can therefore be generally and fundamentally accurate rather than being condemned as sexist or misogynistic ([Goldberg, 1991](#)).

We need to preserve opportunities for women that the feminist movement has won for them so that women are free to choose their path, but at the same time encourage women to return to their traditional homemaking and maternal roles which are their natural strengths, especially when they have young children. This is the balance that needs to be restored – that

traditional femininity should be viewed in positive terms, as a strength and a benefit, rather than as a weakness. It is unlikely at this point that psychology and sociology will reverse course, but as women begin to realize the problems that feminism has caused, hopefully there will be a groundswell of rejection and/or moderation of it. Alfred Lord Tennyson's 1847 poem "The Princess" is a model:

Man for the field, woman for the hearth,
Man for the sword, woman for the needle,
Man with the head, woman with the heart,
Man to command, woman to obey,
All else confusion.

Homosexuality⁶

In rare cases homosexuality occurs in nature in both humans and mammals. Some individuals are born with homosexual inclinations as discussed below; natural or biological homosexuality in humans is due to abnormal conditions during fetal development. Therefore, it may be “natural,” but it is not “normal,” and that is an important – but unfortunately a rejected – distinction. In the words of the feminist academic Camille Paglia,

Homosexuality is a challenge to the norm... Nature exists whether academics like it or not, and in nature, procreation is the single relentless rule – that is the norm. Our sexual bodies were designed for reproduction... Homosexuality is an adaptation, not an inborn trait. ([Paglia, 1991](#))

In 1993 researchers indicated that they had discovered a “gay gene.” ([Hamer et al., 1993](#)). However, that finding has been disputed and current science generally rejects the idea that genes directly control sexual orientation ([Lambert, 2019](#)). However, as with many things human, the situation is complicated. One of the most comprehensive studies ever done involving the genetic data of 470,000 individuals from the U.S. and UK, found that:

There are a handful of genes clearly connected with same-sex sexual behavior... But variations in these genes cannot predict whether a person is gay... However, these variants may partly influence sexual behavior. ([Bever, 2019](#))

Another possible genetically related basis for homosexuality is a rare condition when a mother’s immune system has a negative reaction to the fetal male-specific proteins associated with the Y-chromosome during pregnancy. This potentially causes the male fetal proteins to be treated as a foreign pathogen and attacked, resulting in a miscarriage if the reaction was strong enough, or a lower birth weight and a homosexual orientation of the baby ([Skorska et al., 2017](#)). Seemingly in contrast to those results, a number of studies have shown that brains of homosexual

⁶ The word “homosexuality” will sometimes be used herein as a catch-all term to denote same-sex attraction for both genders in the same way that the term “gay” is used. But it will also be used at times to denote specifically male same-sex attraction as opposed to lesbianism which is uniquely female.

males have a number of similarities to females where genetics was not necessarily involved, and indicating that homosexuality is not genetic ([Allen & Gorski, 1991](#); [Allen & Gorski, 1992](#); [LeVay, 1991](#); [LeVay & Hamer, 1994](#); [Swaab et al., 1995](#)). If a gay sexual orientation is not determined by genetics, then what accounts for children with homosexual inclinations? The main factor seems to be intrauterine testosterone levels during pregnancy.

Biological Precursors to Homosexual Inclinations

The development of the fetal brain and the impact of the male hormone testosterone was discussed above. There are known conditions that can cause higher levels of testosterone to be present in the womb for a female fetus or lower levels for a male fetus, resulting in the mis-sexing of the infant brain if it occurs during the critical period of brain wiring. These conditions causing mis-sexing (the term “intersex” is typically used) are known as DSDs (disorders of sex development) with the most common being CAH (congenital adrenal hyperplasia) in girl babies and AIS (androgen insensitivity syndrome) in boy babies ([Walia et al., 2018](#)). CAH generates additional testosterone in the womb causing girls to be born with partially masculinized genitalia. This usually can be corrected with surgery, but these girls also have a somewhat masculinized brain and typically display tomboy tendencies – they are more aggressive, prefer to play with boys, avoid dolls, and are more interested in competitive sports. Many of them become lesbians later in life ([Dittmann et al., 1992](#)). Likewise, AIS in boys is generated by a testosterone deficiency and will cause them to be effeminate to varying degrees. They are more attracted to males than to females, similar to the female attraction to dominant males. However, these abnormalities are rare affecting around 0.005% of the population ([Witchel, 2017](#)). They are not the only drivers to homosexuality but are an indication of its biological origin in children in some cases. Other abnormalities include polycystic ovary syndrome (PCOS) in women which

generates or is accompanied by high levels of androgens. A study on female-to-male transgenders found a high proportion (39%) of PCOS in these patients ([Baba et al., 2007](#)). The cause of this condition is not known but it is more prevalent in cases of obesity. Genetic studies have also identified particular variants of the testosterone and androgen receptors in the brain correlating with an increased incidence in intersex individuals ([Fernandez et al., 2018](#)).

A study of heterosexual vs lesbian women indicated that the former were characterized by significantly higher scores in tests measuring femininity whereas the latter showed a more pronounced masculine gender role orientation ([Waldis et al., 2020](#)). This seems to indicate a biological connection for lesbian orientation. A study of male homosexuals born to mothers with low intrauterine testosterone levels showed that 70% preferred girl-type play as children, such as desiring the company of girls, cross-dressing, and other female-specific activities ([Freidman & Downey, 1993](#)).⁷ Other studies have confirmed that tomboy girls, like boys, have better spatial abilities than normal girls, as well as better hand-eye coordination. Lesbian women often hear like men and have a male type of inner ear structure ([Kimura & al, 1998](#)). In the same vein, it has also been shown that homosexual men's throwing ability was poorer than heterosexual men, and similar to that of women ([Hall & Kimura, 1995](#)). Hormones acting on sex-specific sites in the brain influence many aspects of social behavior, such as reproduction, mate choice, social interactions, social cognition, and aggression. It is not yet understood how hormones influence the expression of gender, but it is clear that they play a role in gender incongruence especially when the individual's brain has been mis-sexed.

Another possible issue is environmental contaminants and/or drugs given to pregnant women. There is evidence that marijuana smoke (specifically THC Cannabis) during pregnancy

⁷ The author of the study noted that parents on occasion took such children for psychiatric treatment seeking to correct their sexual orientation, and these families then became a source for the studies.

may cause altered sexuality and other brain-related fetal problems; a study has determined that to be the case in rats. This has become more likely as marijuana has been legalized, the use of marijuana by pregnant women has increased, and marijuana often contains higher amounts of THC Cannabis ([Sandini & al, 2023](#)). Pesticides such as atrazine have been shown to demasculinize male babies in utero, which is especially concerning for agricultural workers in plant and fruit harvesting where that pesticide has been used ([Wetzler, 2011](#)). Exposure to endocrine disruptors and xenoestrogens such as bisphenols may cause mis-sexing ([Fujiwara et al., 2018](#)). It is alleged that the drug DES (diethylstilbestrol, a nonsteroidal synthetic estrogen which has been prescribed to prevent miscarriage) causes sexual abnormalities in both male and female infants ([Kerlin, 2021](#)). The female hormones estrogen and progesterone have essentially opposite effects, and there has been a proliferation of drugs for women that are either estrogen-related (to improve sex drive or prevent miscarriage) or progesterone-related (to prevent conception and as an abortifacient). These drugs may very well have negative side effects on a developing fetus and/or on the woman. This is reminiscent of the thalidomide scandal of the 1950s and 1960s in which the drug thalidomide was prescribed for anxiety, tension, and morning sickness. It was eventually discovered that it caused birth defects and was responsible for over 10,000 babies to be born with a range of deformities ([Kim & Scialli, 2011](#)). Thalidomide has been called “the largest man-made medical disaster in history.”

All of this indicates that the primary cause of intersex children is biological and pre-natal rather than environmental, and this is becoming an overwhelming conclusion, e.g., ([Soh, 2020](#); [Sullivan, 2019](#)). As one researcher who studied the global incidence of homosexuality stated, “Societies do not create homosexuality any more than they create heterosexuality... The implications of a finding that the incidence of homosexuality is similar in all societies and that it

remains stable over time is, of course, of considerable theoretical importance. In short, we are led away from social-structural interpretations toward the view that homosexuality is, for whatever reasons, a constant element in the spectrum of human sexuality” ([Whitam, 1983](#)). See ([Soh, 2020](#)) for more contemporary confirmation.

Regardless of the inability to find a “gay gene,” the inclination to homosexuality may be influenced by genes, possibly caused by genetic aberrations. Studies of homosexuality indicate that it can run in families and be heritable, e.g., ([Pillard, 1998](#)), but that may be due to the heritability of conditions in females that affect intrauterine testosterone levels during pregnancy discussed above. As discussed above, there are medical, dietary, and/or drug-related conditions that add or subtract intrauterine pre-natal testosterone; this seems to be the most significant factor causing mis-sexing of the fetal brain, resulting in an intersex child, e.g., ([Walia et al., 2018](#))

There is no definitive test to determine whether a child is biologically normal or intersex, and if the latter, the degree to which a child is “gender incongruent,” just as we cannot externally examine the brain to determine what an individual is thinking. This can only be seen by the child’s behavior as they mature and show their preferences in dress, activities, relationships, and play. This is discussed in greater detail in the section on [Gender Incongruence and Dysphoria](#) below. However, children often show an interest in activities that are not stereotypical of their gender, such as girls playing rough sports, which was less true in prior generations. But that is not necessarily an indication of a child being intersex – gender incongruence is NOT indicated simply by cross-gender activities. Rather, it is an inner conviction and identification with the opposite gender, requiring a degree of maturity within the individual. Given the proliferation of gender incongruent advertisements, video games, internet content, community programs, government directives, school policies, and social media in Western culture, it is not surprising

that more kids seem to be attracted to cross-sex activities – we tend to get and become more of whatever is promoted and incentivized. Western culture is actively trying to create gender incongruence, as that is one of the goals of gender feminism.

Environmental Drivers to Homosexual Practice

According to the International Conference on Gay and Lesbian Studies, “Homosexuality is not inherent in an individual, but constructed” (1989). However, the information above regarding the primarily biological nature of gender is a rejection of the assertions that gender is separate from sex and that a homosexual orientation is environmental. However, as we shall see, homosexuality in practice may well have environmentally related causes or overtones. In other words, we need to separate homosexual *orientation* and *inclinations* from gay *behavior*. Even though the mis-sexing of a person’s brain and therefore his or her childhood bias to homosexuality seems to be largely a result of biology, adopting a gay lifestyle may be caused or influenced by environmental factors. Therefore, if the number of gays in society is increasing, there may well be an increase in environmental drivers towards homosexuality, as discussed below.

As with other human characteristics, the factors that result in an adult preference for homo as opposed to heterosexual expression are complex. Many intersex individuals chose a hetero lifestyle – for example, in the case of CAH women discussed above, the majority were married with a heterosexual orientation ([Dittmann et al., 1992](#)). Lesbianism is typically twice as frequent among women as is homosexuality in men, e.g., ([Remafedi, 1992](#)), likely because females may be attracted to the generally more caring and sensitive nature of other women rather than to men. Female-to-female attraction may thus have much less of a biological basis and may become a lifestyle for a biologically non-intersex woman; this may explain lesbianism’s

increased prevalence vis-a-vis male homosexuality. Unlike male homosexuals, lesbian women can move much more easily from homo to hetero relationships ([Gilder, 1986, pp. 74-75](#)).

Lesbian couples often adapt a “traditional hetero” pattern with one being the “butch” who is more dominant and masculine, and the other being the “femme” who is more submissive and feminine, e.g., ([Berier, 2020](#)). Therefore, same-sex attraction among women is very different from the male version and has long been and is currently viewed as more “natural”; it lacks the degree of social stigma and repugnance associated with male homosexuality. Given the biological differences between the sexes, it is easy to understand why lesbianism is less stigmatized.

Men, unlike women, are sexually compulsive, and unless a man exercises self-control, his sexual desires (homo or hetero) can become an addiction and override all sense and reason – hence the incidence of homo or hetero rape by men, e.g., ([Gilder, 1986, p. 70](#)). The male’s natural dominance, his inclination to view sexuality in terms of “conquest,” and the compulsiveness of his sexual desires means that another male would be dominating and conquering him, which is anathema to hetero males, but attractive to homo males and hetero females. A recent global study on attitudes toward gay males and females in 23 countries, both Western and non-Western, found that gay men were disliked more than lesbian women in every country that was studied. It was also noted that homosexuality is illegal in 70 countries (especially for males), and that men are more likely to be both the targets and perpetrators of sexual prejudice, which is to be expected given the greater degree of natural male aggression ([Fitzsimons, 2020](#)). Compounding the revulsion felt towards male vs. female homosexuality is the fact that homosexual men often have many more partners – a survey in San Francisco reported that 28% of male homosexuals reported having had more than 1,000 partners and 75%

said that had had more than 100 partners. In contrast only 2% of lesbians reported over 100 partners ([Cherfas & Gribbin, 1984](#)), and 50% of lesbians have had only one partner ([Karlen, 1971, pp. 572-606](#)). Being female, lesbians resemble other women in their desire for intimacy and monogamy. This is not to say that there are no monogamous male-male pairings; some gay men form long term relationships, and the average numbers of male partners may have declined due to AIDS. Nevertheless, monogamy is much less the case among gay men than among gay women; “cruising” is the norm for the many gay men who do not have sufficient self-control. This involves short-term, intense, and sometimes violent sexual encounters which have little or no emotional involvement and therefore tend to be squalid and sordid ([Gilder, 1986, p. 71](#)). Homosexual behavior thus mirrors the basic differences between the sexes, and female homosexuality has little to do with the male version, e.g., ([Gilder, 1986, p. 72](#)),.

So, the question remains, “To what extent does an individual’s environment impact his or her choice to be gay regardless of their biology and pre-natal environment?” There is an intense debate on whether children who eventually chose a gay lifestyle were raised in more dysfunctional homes than straight children, and likewise whether straight parents are better for children than gays, e.g. ([Jaslow, 2012](#)). Complicating the debate is the fact that there is more dysfunctionality in general in American society – more divorce, more female-headed households, more depression and suicide, etc., so that many more straight families could be considered as dysfunctional than in the past, e.g. ([Asher, 2013](#)). Research into the psychological and family characteristics of homosexuals was discouraged following the 1973 decision by the American Psychiatric Association to no longer treat homosexuality as a pathology ([FamilyResearchCouncil, 2004](#)). However, some research has found that boys who eventually become gay often had controlling mothers and distant fathers ([Siegelman, 1974](#)), and in the

words of another study, “overly involved, anxiously over-controlling mothers and poor father-son relationships... This association has been observed in nonclinical as well as clinical samples”

([Byrne & Parsons, 1993](#)). Yet another researcher stated,

In summary, then, it would seem that the family pattern involving a combination of a dominating, overly intimate mother plus a detached, hostile or weak father is beyond doubt related to the development of male homosexuality. ([Brown, 1963](#))

There is also strong evidence that being sexually abused during childhood plays a significant role in gender identity confusion and cross-gender behavior.⁸ A study found that 46% of abused men, as opposed to 12% of non-abused men, defined their sexual orientation as either bisexual or homosexual. It concluded,

Given these findings, it appears that being sexually abused as a child may affect the propensity of adult men to fantasize about young men... validating previous research regarding the sexual orientation of children who have been sexually abused. ([Bramblett & Darling, 1997](#))

Being sexually abused as a child therefore seems to increase the likelihood of eventual pedophile behavior after the child becomes an adult. Another similar factor may be childhood sexual seduction episodes with homosexual adults.

There are a number of factors that occur in childhood which appear to be related to the development of homosexuality in adults. Such conditions as prolonged segregation of the sexes; specific, intensely exciting, and gratifying homosexual experiences in childhood; seduction by adult homosexuals; threatening and painful experiences in connection with sex play or relationships with the opposite sex; these and related factors in childhood and adolescence are correlated with the occurrence of homosexuality in adulthood. ([Brown, 1963](#))

This may have been a factor in the homosexual orientation of individuals such as Greg Louganis, the gold medal diver who was named the best diver in the world in 1980. He was given up for adoption but had a difficult time with his subsequent adoptive parents. He was teased and provoked by peers despite his gymnastic and diving skills, and he battled substance

⁸ There are subgroups of homosexual men that have sought to lower the age of consent in order to prey on young boys (e.g., NAMBLA – North American Man-Boy Love Association).

abuse and thoughts of suicide. The only person who expressed love to him was a gay male relative who got him involved in homosexual activities at an early age. Louganis eventually contracted AIDS ([Simon, 2022](#)).

A significant driver to homosexuality is gender feminism – to bisexualize men in the belief that males can and should become like women: be more cooperative, more sensitive, more caring, and more in touch with their female side, and to masculinize women. The problem of course is that due to the biological nature of gender, most men don't have very much of a female side, so this caricature of the new man is largely a feminist fantasy. Nevertheless, academia and the media has been forced into a feminist mold – the standard handbook for avoiding bias in language (*Guidelines for Bias-Free Writing*, and the Task Force for on Bias-Free Language of the Association of American University Presses) requires the elimination of words such as *husband*, *wife*, *spouse*, and *marriage* which must be replaced with gender-neutral terms such as *domestic companion*, *longtime partner*, and *primary relationship* ([Moir & Moir, 1999, p. 26](#)). Children are viewed as dragging women down, and the reality that women are the only sex capable of giving birth is therefore distasteful – the term *mother* is to be replaced by *birthing person*.

The homosexual and transgender lobbies have the same agenda – assuming that everyone's sexuality is a mix of male and female and is merely a result of social pressures and influences. These lobbies attempt to normalize gay behavior, and one of the main ways they do so is contending that a relatively large percentage of the population is homosexual. Activists have historically claimed that 10% of the American population is gay which is a number derived from the Kinsey Report in the study of male prisoners ([Kinsey, 1948](#)). The proportion is a significant issue because it affects the general acceptance of homosexuality in society in both positive and

negative ways, e.g., ([Jacobs, 2017](#)). But Kinsey's percentage has been discredited – the reality is much lower. In dealing with statistics and percentages of homo vs. hetero in populations, it is important to disambiguate what is being measured:

1. Intersex individuals whose brain wiring does not conform to their body and thus are considered to be “true homosexuals.” This is around 1% of the population ([ClevelandClinic, 2022](#)).
2. Adolescent or adult individuals whose lifestyle is gay. This is in the range of 1–5% depending on how it is defined, e.g. ([Hamer & Copeland, 1996, p. 66](#); [Newport, 2015](#)). For example, the number of bisexuals among women as discussed above is high, whereas bisexuality among men is low ([Shelton, 2016](#)). The percentage of active homosexuality seems to be relatively stable among all populations ([Whitam, 1983](#)).
3. Gender incongruent or dysphoric individuals which includes children and teens who are confused about their sexual identity and orientation, but who may become comfortable their birth sex after reaching adulthood.

Americans routinely overestimate the percentage of LGBTQ+ as being much larger than it actually is – some millennials and younger women estimate it as high as 35% due to continual gay and transgender advocacy and the prevalence of gay pride marches and events ([Earls, 2019](#); [McCarthy, 2019](#)).

Biological Inclination and Environmental Choice

Two main factors seem to be operative here: 1) the degree to which love and acceptance is expressed by parents and other significant family members to children regardless of parental sexual orientation ([Bregman et al., 2013](#)), and, 2) the presence of both mother and father in the home, or close substitutes for them, e.g., ([Johnston, 2018](#)). Regardless of the assertion that gay

parents are just as good as straights, there is overwhelming evidence from many studies that families with a married father and mother are the ideal for raising children:

Reams of social science and medical research convincingly show that children who are raised by their married, biological parents enjoy better physical, cognitive and emotional outcomes, on average, than children raised in other circumstances... Researchers have been able to make a strong case that marriage has causal impacts on outcomes such as children's schooling, their social and emotional adjustment, and their employment, marriage and mental health as adults. ([Ribar, 2015](#))

Another researcher's analysis echoes the theme of biological inclination and environmental choice as a driver to homosexual behavior. David Bem from Cornell University in his article "Exotic Becomes Erotic" states his theory of erotic/romantic same-sex attraction. He holds that biology does not dictate sexual orientation per se, but it does affect childhood temperament which influences a child's preferences for sex-typical or sex-atypical activities and associations. Those with sex-atypical preferences lead them to feel different from their peers and to perceive same-sex relationships as exotic. This, combined with the natural tendency toward experimentation and rebellion against parents and other authorities which contributes to other teen pathologies such as alcohol and substance abuse, produces heightened arousal that subsequently gets eroticized into homosexual behavior, especially in our current environment of cultural relativism and its promotion of gender fluidity. A child's experience of being "different" from peers of the same gender leads to a reaction of physical same-sex attraction which then later in life becomes translated into sexual arousal. "A gender-nonconforming boy who is taunted by other boys at first has strong negative feelings, but with repeated encounters over time, the fear and anger habituate and the opponent process becomes the conditioned, dominant affect. He thus emerges into late childhood or adolescence experiencing positive affective arousal to males, an arousal ready to be eroticized" ([Bem, 1996](#)). Male homosexuality may also begin as a "circle jerk" – a form of group masturbation – and proceed from there to more intense interactions. After

a number of homosexual interactions the individual may feel as if he were born gay, and like any compulsive or addictive pursuit, homosexual behavior gains a momentum of its own. One of feminism's effect on society has been to make boys more tentative and unsure of their role, resulting in many frustrated and insecure "beta males." A boy or a man who feels rejected by women but nevertheless still has raging hormones may well be drawn into homosexual behavior. Meanwhile the media, sex education programs in high schools, and college courses in psychology and social science continually proclaim the myth that homosexuality is immutable, thus conveying the message that homosexuality may be the only alternative to such males. A boy may thus be unmasculine from birth and/or may be socialized into unmasculinity.

Debates over homosexuality are often presented in terms of a false dichotomy – supposedly a person is either born gay or chooses to be gay. In some cases, the individual may have a biological inclination to homosexuality and for the most part, people do not choose what sexual feelings or attractions they experience. Each of us does, however, choose the sexual behaviors in which we engage as a result of those feelings, so homosexual activity is a choice, regardless of whether the inclination toward it was "biological" or the result of repeated experiences that have conditioned the individual. As noted above, the latter seems to be especially true for lesbians – Bem noted that "some women who would otherwise be predicted to have a heterosexual orientation might choose for social or political reasons to center their lives around other women. This could lead them to avoid seeking out men for sexual or romantic relationships, to develop affectional and erotic ties to other women, and to self-identify as lesbian or bisexual" ([Bem, 1996, p. 331](#)).

Similarly, the sociologist George Gilder posited that some instances of homosexuality are related to intersex conditions, but there are also societal and environmental drivers pushing people in that direction:

It seems likely that some homosexuals... suffer from a profound predisposition... But an enormous number of homosexuals have clearly been recruited from the ranks of the physically normal. There are many males who under the wrong conditions are open to homosexuality. A frequent catalyst is self-abasement. Failure in love or work may so deject a man that he feels incapable of rising to a relationship with a woman. He becomes fixated on his own physical limitations and begins worshipping the male members of others.

To have a woman, a man must, to some extent, feel himself a man. A man who does not feel like a man may seek to give himself to a man. Men who feel abased may enjoy the idea of a specific enactment and affirmation of their abasement. Homosexual activity does not require confidence or male identity or a face-to-face self-exposure. It does not require money and may often be a source of money. It can even be managed without an erection. It is an inviting escape for the fallen male ([Gilder, 1986, pp. 70-72](#)).

Changing Sexual Orientation from Homo to Hetero

The BBC television comedy series *Avoidance* profiles a beta male who struggles with his masculinity – regarding his marriage his sister tells him, “You just kind of fall through life – you must realize how impossible you are to live with.” It essentially poses the question, “How much we can change our fundamental nature?” The answer perhaps is “somewhat,” depending on the degree of biological inclination and the degree of environmental indoctrination.

Therefore, another intensely controversial question is whether it is possible to change the sexual orientation of individuals from gay to straight. On the one hand, sexual orientation is biological, so even if a person undergoes transsexual surgery their brain remains the same; it is impossible to change one’s brain wiring. Therefore, it would be impossible and morally unacceptable to systematically turn homosexuals into heterosexuals or vice versa, e.g., ([Lafsky, 2009](#)). On the other hand, homosexual inclinations do not necessarily generate or result in

homosexual behavior, so if a homosexual is sufficiently motivated and receives help, he or she may successfully transition to living a hetero lifestyle, and many have done so, e.g., ([Shlemon, 2012](#)). As indicated in Shlemon's article, "You may have seen the slogan, 'Some people are gay – get over it!' But another statement should be added, 'Some people used to be gay – get over that!'" Psychiatrists have reported changes from homo to heterosexuality in as many as one-third of all patients that were motivated to do so, with a greater length and degree of homosexual behavior making the change increasingly difficult ([Karlen, 1971, pp. 572-606; 1978](#)).

Most men recover from sexual setbacks without an episode of homosexuality. Even fully-fledged homosexuals often return to the pursuit of women. Psychiatrists report change to heterosexuality in as many as one third of all motivated homosexual patients. But when insecure males give themselves up to a homosexual environment, their passage spurred by drugs, alcohol, and failures with women, normal young men can suddenly realize an almost physiological change and feel as if they were born gay. Like any compulsive or addictive pursuit, homosexuality gains a momentum of its own. It overmasters conscious resistance, impelling its victim into behavior that he somehow feels he watches more than he wills, that seems beyond his conscious control. ([Gilder, 1986, pp. 70-72](#))

Homophobia and Repugnance Toward Homosexual Behavior

Studies of anti-gay violence typically conclude that aggression by heterosexuals against gays be interpreted in Freudian terms as "attempts to repress their natural male bisexuality" ([Patel & al, 1995](#)). For example, "It was presumed that [the attackers] victimized this group of men ... because they themselves were homosexual and could stamp out the fire within themselves only by the use of violence against obvious gays" ([Moir & Moir, 1999, p. 28](#)). The term invented for anti-gay sentiment is therefore "homophobia" meaning "fear of man" or "fear of sameness" and "transphobia." The choice of the word "phobia" was deliberate in order to cast opposition to homosexuality as an irrational fear response, so the negative reactions to homosexuality are supposedly dysfunctional and are primarily an individual aberration rather than a reflection of cultural values ([Herek, 1991](#)).

This implies that any repugnance that straight men have for gays is a psychological disorder. However, anti-gay sentiment is actually a natural revulsion that many heterosexuals have for same sex acts, especially between men as explained above. Heterosexuality is the norm for sexual attraction, and one of the most comprehensive studies ever undertaken on sexual orientation (34,000 American high school students) found that 99.2% of males were exclusively heterosexual by age 18. In other words, less than 1% were exclusively homosexual and only 2.8% had ever engaged in homosexual acts ([Remafedi, 1992](#)). The National Survey of Man found that among American males only 1.1% were exclusively homosexual and only 2.3% (which includes the previous figure) had even participated in a homosexual sex act.

Studies of straight male attitudes towards gays reveal a huge percentage are negative towards gay males, in one case a total of 92% ([Siegelman & al, 1991](#)). Some gay males are just as macho and aggressive as the most aggressive straight males, and gay aggressiveness and in-your-face actions in the form of pride events and overt displays of gay sexuality are an additional factor in straights disliking gays, e.g., ([Kim, 2023](#)).⁹ Anti-gayness is therefore not “irrational and dysfunctional,” or an “individual aberration”; rather it is a common feeling among straights. The study mentioned above concluded, “Harboring prejudicial attitudes toward sexual minorities is part of the social construction of what it means to be a man,” ([Fitzsimons, 2020](#)) although it must be emphasized that this does not mean opposition to individuals, but rather to their behavior. However, it is not only straight men who are averse to homosexual behavior. A study of American attitudes among suburbanites revealed that they were tolerant on most issues with the exception of male homosexuality, which was characterized by terms such as “abnormal,”

⁹ Gay pride month in June, 2023 was celebrated at the White House with President Biden replacing the American flag with the gay pride flag. Some women were topless and others naked as has also been done in gay marches and demonstrations.

“immoral,” “sick,” and “unhealthy” ([Wolfe, 1998, p. 46](#)). Another study reported that 60% of adults felt that homosexuality was not wrong but was still “obscene and vulgar.” ([Schwanberg, 1993](#)).

When experts deny the danger of gay pride and its possible threat to society, they assume that an aroused man is a reasonable individual. They also deny the darkness that sometimes masquerades as innocent sensuality. The sex business, both hetero and homo, flourishes because males pursuing sex are often beyond sense or self-control. They risk robbery, disease, and self-loathing for a few minutes with a whore or a “rentboy.” Politicians, businessmen, priests, and pastors have risked their reputations, careers, and lives, less because they want sex, but because they can’t help themselves. Even after the AIDS epidemic was in full force, many gays were still engaging in unprotected sex ([McKusick et al., 1985](#)). Robert Bauman, a conservative congressman from Maryland who was married with children and had repeatedly denounced gay liberation, was caught soliciting sex from a 16-year-old boy. He confessed to desperate binges in homosexual bars and was arrested for pederasty, which ended his career. The press savaged him with charges of hypocrisy, but his condemnation of gay rights was probably made in all sincere passion from his regret over repeatedly giving into temptation, and the relative ease with which gay liberation had enabled him to do so ([Kelly, 2008](#)).

Heterosexuality is normative and is true of 95-99% of humanity. The research on attitudes toward gay males and females mentioned above stated:

[Attitudes are based on gender norms] which are widely shared societal and cultural beliefs distinguishing personality traits, behaviors, and interests as appropriate and desirable for either men or women but not both... [Gender norms] prescribe behaviors that fuel a heteronormative system – that is, men and women conforming to norms are seen as complements to one another, and this makes heterosexual coupling seem necessary and normal. ([Fitzsimons, 2020](#))

The acceptance or perhaps the toleration of gay men has grown in recent years, but homosexual males still regularly experience bias in their social relationships. A study sought to determine the nature of the bias of straight men toward gay men and determined that it came primarily from the threats to the masculinity of the straights ([Wellman & al, 2021](#)). In other words, when heterosexual men felt more confident in themselves, and when gay men did not seek to evangelize or proposition them, heterosexual men were less likely to be negative towards gays and more likely to “live and let live.”

When anything said or perceived to be against gays is criminalized as hate speech, it will be much harder to determine people’s true feelings. Nevertheless, the repugnance that straights and especially straight men feel for gay behavior is natural, and even though straights may become more overtly tolerant of gays, their covert feelings of revulsion will continue despite efforts to eradicate it.

Prevalence of Depression and Suicide

Possibly the most critical issue in homosexuality is the assertion by transgenders that trying to negatively counsel or stop an individual from transitioning from straight to gay by parents or others may result in suicidal impulses, and that the process of “coming out” as gay will liberate the individual and make them feel more at home in their own skin. This has been true for some, but are gay people actually gayer and happier?

The rates of depression and suicide (suicidal thoughts, plans, and attempts) are higher for gay adults, so they have more morbidities than heterosexuals and thus have lower levels of happiness and satisfaction ([Mikulak, 2021](#)). It would seem by the preponderance of gay pride events and the explicit, in-your-face nature of gay activities that they “doth protest too much.” The real reason may well be an underlying insecurity which causes a compulsion to act out – a

cry for help or at least for understanding. Given the fact that homosexuality is often accompanied by comorbidities, the word “gay” with its implication of a state of happiness is an oxymoron and an unrealistic synonym for the word “homosexual.”

However, is the depression, and potentially suicidal behavior that homosexual individuals feel, actually caused by straights mocking and abusing them as activists assert, or it instead caused by internal conflicts about gender and sexuality? Americans in general are alleged to have too much anti-gayness, so it may be difficult to disambiguate those effects. The European countries have long been more tolerant of homosexuality. A huge study from Denmark,¹⁰ published in 2023, spanned 40 years and involved almost 7 million Danes. It found that transgender individuals were 7.7 times more likely to attempt suicide and 3.5 times more likely to die of suicide. The non-suicide death rate was also 1.9 times higher. All of the figures were likely an undercount as the only individuals considered as transgender were those who had registered as such with the government ([Erlangsen et al., 2023](#)).

A similar study done in Sweden determined that transgender individuals were 4.9 times more likely to attempt suicide and 19.1 times more likely to die of suicide. It also found that transgender individuals were more likely to commit and be convicted of both violent and non-violent crimes after sex reassignment. The study concluded:

Persons with transsexualism, after sex reassignment, have considerably higher risks for mortality, suicidal behavior, and psychiatric morbidity than the general population... Our findings suggest that sex reassignment, although alleviating gender dysphoria, may not suffice as treatment for transsexualism. ([Dhejne et al., 2011](#))

These European studies reveal that contrary to the notion that sex transition helped people feel better about themselves, suicide risk and other pathologic behavior actually increased

¹⁰ Denmark is considered one of the most transgender-friendly countries in the world by the International Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Trans & Intersex Association.

among transgenders after surgery even in the more tolerant and accepting European milieu. This implies that perhaps the major reason for depression and negativity inclining a homosexual individual toward suicide is not due to the rejection and censure of others, but rather is a result of their internal doubts and feelings of confusion related to their gender identity, and possibly regret for changing their gender if they attempted to do so. This comes out in interviews with individuals who transitioned but later de-transitioned – they experienced what could be termed a “theological crisis” of feeling that they had abandoned and potentially destroyed the original purpose of their lives ([Pederson, 2023](#)). If those doubts and feelings could be reduced or eliminated by counseling and care prior to transition attempts, the need for hormonal drugs and surgery could be lessened.

Many teens who identify themselves as gay face despair and anguish; they become objects of scorn by classmates. Yet many teens experience anguish and difficulty relating to peers for reasons having little to do with sexual orientation. In fact, alienated teens with no homosexual proclivities are targets for gay activists. The activists will embrace these youngsters while offering them an identity by claiming – without credible scientific evidence – that the teens were probably born gay, and then suggest that their alleged homosexuality explains their adjustment problems. For a vulnerable teenager struggling for acceptance, this pitch can sound quite therapeutic.

But what came first, the chicken or the egg – the teenager’s social alienation or his homosexuality? One study of Minnesota teens found that as many as 10 percent were uncertain of their sexuality until their later years. Absent pressure from gay recruiters, many of these teens “straighten out” and begin to relate to the opposite sex. But many others are recruited by gay activists while still vulnerable.

Once brought into the homosexual fold, these teens are then plugged into a network of dysfunctional relationships that are, by nature, destructive of self-esteem. They are furthermore introduced to an array of dangerous behaviors, including anal intercourse, sado-masochism, sexual promiscuity, and substance abuse. These pathologies are an integral part of the homosexual lifestyle regardless of the social environment, whether a conservative Bible Belt city like Nashville or a homosexual haven like San Francisco, where the threat of societal disapproval or personal “homophobia” is minimal. Therefore, blaming mainstream heterosexual society for the woes of homosexuals is not simply disingenuous, but overlooks the wealth of research data that demonstrates that homosexual behavior itself is far more hazardous to a teen’s health than so-called social homophobia. ([Gilder, 1986, pp. 70-72](#))

Gender Incongruence and Dysphoria

In discussing gender incongruence and dysphoria we are returning to the issue of gender orientation and inclination as opposed to gay behavior. Prior to the 1980s it was almost unheard of for a child or adolescent to declare themselves as transgender. But over the intervening years gender incongruence and dysphoria has exploded. To the extent that it was previously an issue, it was primarily middle-aged men that engaged in cross-dressing and other cross-sex activities; as of the 1960s over 90% of trans and dysphoric people were male ([Sánchez, 2022](#)). But from 2004 to 2016 in Canada the number went from nothing to over 1,000 and 80% were young females. The Gender Identity Development Service in the UK reported a 4,400% increase in the number of gender dysphoric girls within a decade, and by 2018 more than 70% reporting were female ([Sánchez, 2022](#)). This phenomenon has been termed “Rapid Onset Gender Dysphoria” (ROGD), and the question is, why this astronomical increase over a relatively short period of time? If it was caused by a greater awareness and/or acceptance of people who feel mis-sexed, there should be a similar increase across all demographics, including middle-aged women. But that is not the case, so it seems that ROGD among young girls is generated by social contagion.

This, of course, is hotly denied by psychologists, academics, and transgender activists. When Lisa Littman originated the ROGD term in her 2017 article *Parent Reports of Adolescents and Young Adults Perceived to Show Signs of a Rapid Onset of Gender Dysphoria*, she was heavily criticized by because by implication it challenged the transgender belief system. For example, “The ROGD paper was not funded by anti-trans zealots, but it arrived at exactly the time people with bad intentions were looking for science to buoy their opinions” ([Kesslen, 2021](#)). The quote above is rather mild, but transgender advocacy is both mendacious and vicious. Debra Soh, a neuroscientist and sex researcher, began noticing a large number of mainstream

one-sided news stories that presented children as young as age 3 transitioning to the opposite sex and advocating the use of drugs and/or medical procedures to do so. As in the case of abortion, kids may be encouraged not to discuss this with parents (“So kids are minors, can’t vote, and can’t drive. But they can decide to choose irreversible gender transition, and the parents can’t even object. This is madness!!”) ([Pederson & Grossman, 2023](#)). When parents were engaged and expressed concerns, they were attacked as being transphobic and bigoted; they were told that their child would likely commit suicide and they would be the cause. People were afraid to respond: As Dr. Soh began publishing articles about the neurobiology issues discussed above, she was relentlessly condemned (e.g., as a “Nazi c*nt.”). She writes,

In the internet age, activists and allies are not content at seeking justice. They seek to punish heretical thought. They want your head on a stick, for you to die in a fire, or preferably both... While there is much backlash whenever the political right tries to meddle with sex science, when the political left starts suppressing science people look the other way. ([Soh, 2020, pp. 3, 7](#))

Instead, activists say that the existence of transgender children in increasing numbers is due to fact that we now have a more tolerant, humane, and open society. Transgender adults are said to finally be emerging from the shadows, having bravely fought for their human rights to gender identity and for adequate, non-judgmental health care. Therefore, we must now work for the same rights for children and adolescents ([Kessler, 2021](#)). A related explanation is the increased availability of medical professionals treating homosexuals. As the prominence and social acceptance of LGBTQ+ in Western culture has increased, and as more are aware of gender incongruence, they may see themselves as having this condition and seek treatment. As mentioned above, some mistakenly believe that the percentage of gays in society is as high as 35% - seven times higher than it actually is.

According to previously cited research, it is true that a small number of people are intersex from birth being primarily due to biological causes. Such individuals have “gender

incongruence” (i.e., feel that that they are mis-sexed), but their incongruence may or may not cause them to become “gender dysphoric” (i.e., undergo varying degrees of psychological trauma due to gender incongruence). Also discussed above is the fact that homosexuality *in practice* often has environmental causes. Studies of transgender individuals relate a number of comorbidities: family conflict, parental mental illness, anxiety, depression, separation, and bullying, making it difficult to separate cause from effect, e.g., ([Kozłowska & al, 2021](#)). Autism rates are higher among transgenders; gender incongruence may interfere with psychological development, thus causing dysphoria in autistic individuals. Alternatively, autism and the accompanying social problems might make it difficult for children to develop a sense of gender, so cause and effect may again be confused ([Furlong, 2021](#)). There is also evidence that children born via caesarian section may be more likely to be autistic and have attention and behavioral problems such as ADHD, although there is no evidence of direct gender issues ([Galvin, 2019](#)).

Nevertheless, it is well documented that the number of adolescents coming to clinics with complaints of dysphoria has increased considerably. This is particularly true of girls, with a lesser increase in boys and in adults of both sexes, e.g., ([Graaf et al., 2018](#); [Indremo et al., 2021](#)). The trauma associated with gender dysphoria may be severe, and individuals suffering from it are certainly in need of sympathy, care, and therapy. Truly (i.e., biologically) dysphoric individuals express their sense of *being* the opposite gender. Rather than determining or deciding their gender, they just “know” what their gender is, as everyone does, but feel helpless to change. Therefore, it is entirely understandable that trans individuals desire acceptance in society as who they are. Gender for these people as for the rest of us is not a matter of choice, and sheer willpower probably cannot overcome true gender dysphoria. But why the sudden increase, and are all of these individuals truly gender dysphoric?

Gender is difficult to define because it is entirely self-reported – there are no objective criteria for assessing it. Furthermore, it bears repeating that just because an individual has preferences that don't conform to stereotypes of his or her sex, does not mean they are nonbinary or transgender, so it is important to understand the possible treatments for gender dysphoria and their impact, risk, limitations, and degree of effectiveness. Drugs are given first (puberty blockers in younger children, and then hormones), with “top” and “bottom” surgery being the final option. See the [Steps in Gender Transitioning](#) section below for information on the procedures involved.

Surgery may help some with dysphoria but has been disastrous for others. Consider the case of Briana Ivy, a biological male who underwent transgender treatments and surgeries to become female, and in the process, in his words, he was, “deformed and mutilated.” He had early feelings of effeminacy and felt alienated from other boys but was comfortable with girls. Influenced by the cultural directives such as the media reporting of Jazz Jennings, he felt uncomfortable with his body and told his parents at age 14 that he was transgender. He was soon taken to a gender clinic and after a 30-minute discussion with a social worker, was sent to a doctor for hormone blocking drugs and female hormones. He eventually located a surgeon that he found through TikTok, and by age 19 he had already undergone two transgender surgeries. Doctors tried to turn Ivy's penis into a vagina with some of his stomach lining. The aftermath was “searing pain” that he still deals with today at age 22. According to him, his genitals “Don't resemble those of either sex... I had a catheter in for about a month, attached to a bag, and I could feel it every second.” In the meantime, he remembers the intense fascination that the hospital staff had with the procedures, “I remember nurses and residences at the hospital, various people there, would come in, look at me and tell me, ‘This is cool, we've never seen someone as

young as you having this done’... I couldn’t walk, I couldn’t move, I was in so much pain.

People just came in and it was like a science class.” In explaining the post-op procedure Ivy said:

You also have to dilate when having this procedure – there are large objects [what appear to be sex toys] and you have to put them in and keep them in for 30 minutes at a time. It felt like a knife inside of me, but I was terrified to miss a second because then all of this would be a waste. Every single day the pain was worse, and the bleeding was worse. I would bleed all over the bed every time.

When he said things didn’t feel right and complained about the pain, the surgeon told him to just continue with the dilation exercises. “I couldn’t,” he said, “I just felt shredded inside.”

The doctor eventually told him that he needed another surgery to fix complications from the first surgery, but two different doctors told him there was too much trauma and refused to do any further surgical procedures. After explaining this to his original doctor by voicemail he never heard from him again. Through tears he said, “I was only 20. Everything that they had told us was a lie. And that’s why I get frustrated... I see so many people now, in this year, advocating for the exact process I went through.” Ivy has also found it difficult to move forward with legal recourse for what was done to him, and discovered access to his medical records has seemingly been removed:

I have tried legal possibilities, but it’s really complicated because for a lawyer to take up the case, a board of other surgeons have to decide if [the procedure] was experimental or not. If the doctors believe it’s not experimental, then I have no case... I tried to go back in and access what was on my file. All the dates are listed of every day I was in that hospital, from the first day to the last, and it was blank. I keep trying to contact people and I’m just getting denied or have to call back.

Ivy said that his mental health was destroyed during this process but added that recently feeling God’s presence has helped him tremendously ([Prestigiacomo, 2023b](#)).

According to some studies, the mental health of dysphoric individuals improves after either hormonal or surgical transition and after the necessary healing has taken place ([Bränström & Pachankis, 2020](#)). But in some cases, even surgery does not fix feelings of dysphoria, and the

individual is forced to live with a medically altered body that is impaired in various ways as in the case of Briana Ivy above.

A few transitioned individuals have committed suicide while others seek to detransition and reverse the medical procedures they had undergone ([Exposito-Campos et al., 2023](#); [Jorgensen, 2023](#)). For other video accounts of kids who reportedly went through agony and back, see Billy Burleigh ([Burleigh, 2020](#)), and ([Herron & Bell, 2023](#)). Detransitioning is becoming a significant issue ([Baron & Dierckxsens, 2022](#); [Vandenbussche, 2022](#)) and is a dilemma for the treatment of dysphoria, if for no other reason than some of these individuals are suing the counselors, doctors, and/or medical facilities that have allegedly butchered them. This has become a significant problem in the UK where there are a number of lawsuits pending against the Gender Identity Development Service (GIDS). It is claimed that the service is overwhelmed and that providers are unable to adequately judge a patient's suitability for treatment. Former GIDS employees and others have compiled a book to protest perceived inappropriate services provided by GIDS ([Moore & Brunskell-Evans, 2019](#)). Heather Brunskell-Evans, one of the authors stated:

There is a circularity to the logic of transgender doctrine which makes inescapable the view that transgenderism is a self-fulfilling prophecy: 1) children self-identify as possibly transgender; 2) there is no physical test or objective diagnostic criteria for detecting gender variance that could develop into adult dysphoria, so reliance is placed on the child's "inner sense of knowing"; 3) the gender identity services confirm and intensify the child's self-diagnosis; 4) parents, teachers, and educational professionals are coerced to treat gender non-conformity as evidence of transgenderism's "truth" and to collude with social and medical intervention because it is believed that the earlier the child's dysphoria is addressed "the more comfortable and happy the child may be as an adult." ([Brunskell-Evans, 2019](#))

The guidelines for transitioning discussed in the appendix below are good, but they are only guidelines and have not always been followed. Promoted by gender feminism, there is clearly a culture of transgender affirmation seeking to make converts and get others to follow.

Chloe Cole is another such individual, a teen girl who had feelings of gender incongruence, and with the encouragement of online “friends” went through hormone therapy and a mastectomy in order to become a boy. Her parents were told not to oppose this because otherwise she would probably commit suicide, and the process was done without counseling and with the encouragement of her medical advisers. After transitioning she realized that she really wanted to be a girl – to get married and have children, but at this point that is probably impossible for her. After doubts about what she had done and her ultimate decision to detransition, her “friends” abandoned her and became very hostile – accusing her of transphobia ([Pederson, 2023](#)).

Teens often have rebellious streaks in which they question society and their parents, and this questioning extends to their gender identity. Normal adolescents may flirt with notions of transsexualism, so gender incongruence is one possible aspect of the normal maturation process in teenagers. After puberty and the end of adolescence, feelings of dysphoria disappear for most teens; most assume a heterosexual orientation, with a few having same-sex attraction but without the distress of dysphoria ([Singh et al., 2021](#); [Steensma et al., 2011](#); [Wallien & Cohen-Kettenis, 2008](#)). This is known as “desistance” and is one of the major reasons given by individuals who detransitioned back to their birth sex ([Littman, 2021](#)). This raises further questions about how gender dysphoria is diagnosed and treated. What is the difference between those who desist and those who persist? If it is possible to distinguish them, the desisters could then be spared from irreversible gender treatments, while the persisters – those who are truly dysphoric – could possibly be helped by transition ([Karrington, 2022](#)).

In another study related to desistance, 53 adolescents with gender dysphoria were considered, 24 of whom had ultimately desisted; the research question was to determine what, if any, differences there were in their upbringing that related to their psychosexual development. Both

groups were similar before puberty with no evidence of dysphoria up to age 5 (other studies have found dysphoria at younger ages) but they started to identify with the opposite sex around the age of 6 or 7. Differences between the desisters and persisters became apparent at puberty, starting at around the age of 10. For persisters, the dysphoria intensified, while the same changes in the desisters resulted in a dissipation of dysphoria. There was also a difference in the sense of gender of the two groups before reaching puberty. Those who persisted asserted that they *were* the opposite gender, whereas those who desisted *wanted to be* the opposite gender. A follow-up study found that dysphoric intensity was greater in the persisters ([Steensma et al., 2011](#)). However, other studies have not confirmed those results, so it remains unclear how reliably persistence or desistance can be predicted ([Karrington, 2022](#)). Perhaps this is an indication that the persisters were biologically intersex, while the desisters were not. Given the fact that most children with gender dysphoria will desist, childhood transitioning will result in altered individuals who may ultimately have desisted.

Another serious concern with dysphoria treatment in children is the question of consent. The brain undergoes a large degree of development in adolescence as hormone receptor sites in the brain are activated, which have a profound impact on behavior. The prefrontal cortex, responsible for cognition, does not mature until late in adolescence. Transitioning guidelines indicate that consent is essential, but can a prepubescent or even a teenager understand well enough who they are, what the transitioning process will involve, and what the final consequences will be (including loss of normal sexual function and fertility, and other possible complications), so that truly informed consent can be given? Some would therefore suggest that dysphoric children wait until after puberty or after adolescence before transitioning is

considered; some states such as Florida have passed legislation discouraging surgical transition below the age of 18.

Echoing the biological vs. environmental discussion above, the evidence seems to indicate a biological cause for true gender dysphoria (i.e., intersex individuals who feel that they *are* the opposite gender) and environmental causes for gender incongruence and milder forms of dysphoria (i.e., individuals who *want to be* the opposite gender). Unfortunately, this does not provide an empirical method of testing to determine if they are truly gender dysphoric; despite their gender incongruence, biologically intersex individuals may not be distressed enough to desire transition and may want to remain as they are, while others may experience higher levels of distress. But this hypothesis offers a possible framework for clarifying one's understanding, as well as providing a rationale for the huge increase in gender incongruence/dysphoria which is related to the corresponding increase in transgender-related social media.

Self-perception is very malleable, and teens are especially open to being led by peers and others that they look up to. Psychologists have described a “looping effect,” where the repetitive naming of a popular condition (such as gender dysphoria) results in an increase in the number of people interested in and ultimately identifying with that condition. That in turn increases the number of institutions and experts who seek to deal with and profit from it ([Yarhouse, 2020](#)). Based on desistance reports, it has been strongly suggested that many adolescent girls claiming gender dysphoria were not truly dysphoric and were led into it by social media connections and internet content ([Littman, 2018](#); [Shrier, 2021](#)). Adolescents who feel isolated or rejected can readily find online communities where social media influencers may convince them that they are trans, and various websites are devoted to supporting LGBTQ+ adolescents. The information may be helpful in cases of true dysphoria, but it is typically accompanied by advocacy.

Psychologists and even the homosexual community are raising concerns about the indiscriminate transitioning of youth ([Soh, 2020](#); [White, 2022](#)). As stated above, sex transition surgery may ultimately make a person feel worse because the individual still retains their original gender identity from their brain wiring.

Another rarely mentioned but significant factor in the growth of both gender feminism and dysphoria, is the dramatic increase and current prevalence of feminist and gender-bending advertising known as “femvertising.” Depending on an individual’s internet, phone, and television consumption, the average American sees hundreds of ads per day. Most of them are unnoticed and ignored, but nevertheless are subliminal in conveying content, especially the longer running TV ads. Forced by the women’s movement, many advertising agencies, like academia, have become increasingly leftist and intolerant of any deviation. Ads have become increasingly feministic since the #MeToo movement in a concerted effort to empower women and depower men. Femvertising shows females defeating males, driving fast cars, playing contact sports such as football, doing construction work, and other male-typical activities ([Iqbal, 2015](#)). Males are often depicted either as behaving stupidly (e.g., “Why Gillette’s toxic masculinity ad is annoying both sexists and feminists”) ([Tiffany, 2019](#)) or being passive and taking care of kids. The message this is sending to boys is that men are or should be weak jerks, fawning over women. To girls, the message is different and goes along with gender feminist mantra – to be successful you must act and become like a male, and all of this is done in the glowingly positive terms of female empowerment. However, if a girl absorbs this, gets the same feedback from social media and her friends, and then starts listening to transgender advocacy, she may very well develop feelings of gender incongruence. She learns that she must be strong and tough so that she can beat males whose only alleged purpose is to use and discard her. But

how does that square with the fact that girls are naturally feminine and not masculine? Therefore, it is not surprising that ROGD has occurred in the same timeframe as the growth of femvertising. Gender feminism is thus a large source of transgender angst and seems to be creating gender dysphoria, especially in girls.

Everyone has a need to belong and to feel that they are a part of something larger than themselves. Many people and especially teenagers feel an obligation to their tribe or group in whatever way they have defined their tribe/group to be. This obligation can often become a religion for them or have religious overtones, even if the group is entirely secular. One is reminded of the 1970 Vietnam War protest song “Almost Cut My Hair” by David Crosby in which feelings become all important and create a group affiliation:

Almost cut my hair - it happened just the other day. It was gettin kinda long; I could-a said, it was in my way. But I didn't and I wonder why - I feel like letting my freak flag fly. I feel like I owe it to someone.

Once a person has “put his or her hand to the plow” and endured gender transformation surgery, it is difficult to turn back and admit that they may have been misguided or wrong. A related factor that westerners may have difficulty understanding, is that suffering becomes a way of joining or relating to a group, like an initiation rite for a gang. The above may be reasons why some transitioners, despite their sufferings, continue to support the transitioning of themselves and try to evangelize others, especially as they realize that their group will turn on them if they decide to detransition.

Some countries are going to extreme totalitarian measures to eliminate dissent and criminalize opponents of transgender therapy. For example, the Scottish National Party is trying to pass legislation so that any parent who refuses gender change for their child is sent to prison for seven years. They are also seeking to outlaw “conversion therapy” ([Sanderson, 2024](#)).

Canada is similar and America starting to adopt such policies. The militant zeal and the quasi-

religious nature of some transgender individuals was displayed in the 2023 shooting of students at a Christian school in Nashville, Tennessee by a MtF transgender. Her diary had been withheld by police for months undoubtedly due to the fact that its content was in direct opposition to the political narrative, but it has recently been leaked. The diary indicated that the shooter was “consumed by leftist racial hatred and targeted whites [because they are supposedly] privileged.”

The shooter wrote,

Kill those kids!!! I wish to shoot you weakass d—ks w/ your mop yellow hair, wanna kill all you little crackers! Bunch of little f—gots w/ your white privileges. I hope I have a high death count. Ready to die haha. ([Rosiak, 2023](#))

Violence by transgenders is on the increase and the trans community is weaponizing people. Consider the following statement by Oli London, who underwent 32 MtF procedures over eight years, but then detransitioned and has endured intense hatred from his former friends .

The trans movement is pushing more and more extremism each day. They recruit people, indoctrinate them and pump them full of propaganda until they become filled with hate and rage. ([Phillips, 2023](#))

“I changed my bone structure. I got hair extensions, changed wardrobes, started wearing makeup, and had my hair removed. I did it because I thought it would make me happy. I felt happy at the time, but after a period of reflection, I felt I was chasing happiness. Being a woman is not for me. I am no longer trans and have gone back to living as a man.” Immediately following this announcement, London received intense scrutiny and backlash in the form of immense hatred from transgender advocates (“I am vilified by the media and left-wing people”) which he has gotten used to. He speaks of what he refers to as “the hypocrisy of the trans community.” ([Mendelson, 2022](#))

LGBTQ+ and their leftist allies are uniting in their attempts at confrontation as sometimes expressed by crowds at gay pride events, “We’re here, we’re queer, and we’re coming for your children.” Gay choirs have sung, “We’re converting your children” ([Rahman, 2023](#)).

Charlie Kirk, founder of Turning Point USA, wrote, “When they tell you who they are [and what they want], believe them,” and in response, Rep. Marjorie Taylor Greene stated, “This movement grooms minors to have mastectomies and castration and fuels a multi-billion-dollar medical child abuse industry.” The Department of Health and Human Services Assistant Secretary Rachel

Levine, a MtF transexual, has stated that “gender-affirming care” is “necessary” for transgender youth, but with no scientific evidence to back it up. The HHS was only able to provide marketing material in response to inquiries, leading to the criticism, “This is why trust in government health officials has evaporated” ([Rosiak, 2024](#)).

Under the influence of the National Education Association (NEA) and other agencies, American public education has become increasingly leftist with all of the negative aspects of Marxism – anti-America, anti-family, anti-marriage, anti-Christian, pro-feminist, and pro-LGBTQ+. The educational establishment is actively and, in some cases, militantly promoting this agenda and attempting to indoctrinate kids at all levels ([Prescott, 2021](#)). In regard to gender transition, laws in several states such as Washington have been passed to allow schools to transition kids without parental notification or consent.

Washington state now appears to allow minors to undergo life-changing gender reassignment surgery without parental consent. Under a new law, health insurers must cover “gender-affirming” care, including surgical treatments that were previously denied coverage. Democrats rejected a proposal to apply the new law to only patients over 18 years old.

It’s one in a series of new laws that, taken together, allow children as young as 13 years old to make serious health care decisions. The consequences are immense.

Last year, via SB 5889, Washington Democrats forced insurers to cover gender dysphoria treatment and gender-affirming care for minors between 13 and 17, without parental consent. It mandates that insurers deal directly with the patient without requiring the policyholder’s authorization.

It builds on SB 5904, which provides outpatient mental health treatment without parental consent for the same age group. All communication must go directly to the patient. The insurer may not disclose the patient’s medical information to outside parties, like the policyholder, unless given permission. The policyholder, in this case, is the parent. ([Rantz, 2023](#))

As of 2023, around 6,000 U.S. school districts comprising 3.2 million kids hide the gender status of children from parents ([Christenson, 2023a](#)), and teachers promoting transsexualism are engaging in gay evangelism. For example, a teacher in Washington supported

state legislation disallowing parents from opting their children out of Pride Month curricula and worked to implement such policies. Along with the principal, she assembled a slide show for other teachers indicating that the policy was mandatory, and implying that if teachers didn't comply, they could lose their jobs and be arrested. She would pull girls aside to talk and convinced at least one girl that she should transition to become a boy because the girl was shy and had complained at one point that "her dress was itchy." The teacher eventually stood with the girl at the front of the class and told them that the girl had changed her identity, name, and pronouns, but that no one outside the school could be told. A series of emails between the teacher and the girl were eventually leaked, which included, "Make sure this email is deleted when we are done because otherwise when your mom looks, you will be outed instantly"; "I kept emailing you but I was worried your mom interfered before you saw my messages"; "I was also serious. I would take you into my own home anytime you need." After finally learning what the teacher had done with their daughter, the parents, who were from India, reportedly left America to return to their home country ([Torres, 2024](#)).

Under the influence of gender feminism, western culture has fundamentally changed over the past few decades from shunning homosexuals and gender dysphorics to the point where homosexuality and sex change are celebrated and forced on us. We have moved from hiding homosexuality to the place where a gay pride flag is hung from the White House replacing the American flag. All questioning of the legitimacy of gender dysphoria are met with vehement opposition and attempts to criminalize it, and parents and the public are told that any attempt to stop a child or adolescent from considering transition will result in the individual committing suicide. We need to have a balance where gender incongruence is not stigmatized or pilloried,

but at the same time it can be questioned and discarded rather than assumed to automatically require transitioning.

In 1818 Mary Shelly wrote her famous novel *Frankenstein*. The premise of the book is that modern science, stripped from the constraints of ethics and nature, will end up creating monsters. Trans-affirming doctors are the post-modern version of the book's protagonist, Dr. Frankenstein... No matter how advanced trans pharmaceuticals and surgeries become, the biological reality of man and woman cannot be abolished, and the natural limitations of God's creation cannot be transcended. The attempt to do so may elicit the same heartbreak and alienation captured in Mary Shelley's novel where the monster, filled with despair, drifts off into the ice floes. ([Rufo, 2023](#))

Summary and Conclusions on Homosexuality

When the DSM (the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders maintained by the American Psychiatric Association) first appeared in 1952 homosexuality was unfortunately classified as a “sociopathic personality disturbance.” In 1968 that classification was changed to “personality disorder” and in 1971 the APA, under pressure from gay rights groups, held a meeting entitled “Gay is Good” and changed the designation to “gender identity disorder.” In 2013 it was removed from the DSM entirely ([McHenry, 2022](#)). Therefore, views of homosexuality over the past 70 years, the era of increasing feminism, have gone from one extreme to the other – from “pathological” to “desirable.” Balance in society often seems to be difficult to achieve, but we need a balanced view where homosexuality is not persecuted, but at the same time is not encouraged.

LGBTQ+ is a mixture of groups with different agendas that don't necessarily see eye-to-eye with each other. Some tout biological origins and gender while others espouse an environmental origin; lesbians consider themselves to be distinct from homosexual men, and some LGBT individuals have concerns about transgender. But they all have a common set of

enemies that they target, and “The enemy of my enemy is my friend.” The enemies are religion, heterosexuality, family, marriage, and the associated morality.

Where a sense of psychological well-being is the purpose of life, therapy supplants morality – or, perhaps better, therapy is morality – and anything that achieves that sense of well-being is good. ([Trueman, 2020, p. 360](#))

Several overall conclusions regarding homosexuality can be drawn:

1. Homosexuality in some cases may have biological roots and incline an individual toward it. The biological nature of sexual orientation means that it is impossible to fundamentally change it by means of legislation, education, advertising, or social media.
2. Teens naturally go through a phase of questioning many things including their sexual orientation. Gender incongruence should not necessarily be interpreted as a call for gender transition, and instead should be a call for love and understanding.
3. Homosexual practice and lifestyle may be stimulated by biological causes, but often seems to be related to a negative childhood environment of abuse, neglect, and/or early sexual experiences. The degree of nature vs nurture therefore seems to vary on a case-by-case basis and in general cannot be determined.
4. A biological or environmental inclination to homosexuality does not necessarily result in practicing homosexuality, and it is possible for motivated gay individuals to become straight in their behavior and lifestyle.
5. The feminist psychologists and sociologists, liberal journalists, pandering politicians, overly compassionate churchmen, and value-free sex education professionals are the ones who have effectively promoted homosexuality and are the ones who are responsible for its negative effects on society. Efforts should be made to promote marriage and heterosexuality without harassing, persecuting, or denigrating homosexuals.
6. The current direction of American culture toward transsexualism is very dangerous.

The History of Feminism

Philosophical Background

History has clearly shown that human nature has not fundamentally changed over the centuries, but our internal psychology and view of self has changed dramatically. In particular, people have moved from a mostly *mimetic* to a mostly *poietic* view of self. In other words, we have moved from seeing the world as having a given order and meaning outside of self, with our duty being to conform to that order and meaning, to the point where we now see little or no innate order and meaning, and our duty instead is forge our own meaning and purpose because the world supposedly does not provide it ([Trueman, 2020, pp. 39-41](#)).

Capitalism and technology have enabled this to a degree: a large middle class has been created; people are wealthier and have more leisure time; many diseases have been conquered through medicine; machines have been invented to reduce manual labor; agriculture has improved; cars and planes have made travel much easier and the world smaller; computers, phones, and the internet have made communication instantaneous and provide information at our fingertips; and so on. The economic and technological improvements have enabled us to be more self-determined, but we are still flesh and blood, subject to injury, disease, and death. As Abraham Maslow wrote in his hierarchy of needs, many more people have moved far beyond the level of survival and toward self-actualization, but the point is that self-actualization is now much more poietic and self-defined; gender feminism could not have truly developed in a pre-capitalistic and a pre-technological world. However, it is not inevitable that things turned out the way they did – rather it is a result of choices made by societal elites to abandon theism and instead promote humanism.

For many there is therefore no longer any “sacred order” that can be appealed to as a source of truth and morality – all sources of authority are questioned. Our vision of self has gradually metastasized so that God – if He exists at all – is irrelevant and is merely an extension of self; morality is self-defined, feelings are all important, gender has been separated from sex, husbands no longer are leaders in the home, parents have lost authority over their children, and there is no overarching purpose or meaning to life outside of self. Thus, there is no longer any means of dialogue between those who still hold to a sacred order and those who reject it; the sides continually talk past and over each other because of a fundamental disagreement and disconnect on how truth and morality are defined. Works of art or pseudo-art such as Andres Serrano’s *Piss Christ* where a crucifix is submerged in urine are celebrated – “The sacramental is made into the excremental” ([Trueman, 2020, p. 97](#)). The debate over abortion is another example; those who hold to a sacred order are concerned that killing a child in the womb is inherently wrong, whereas those who reject it are concerned only with the rights and feelings of women. In the words of Carl Trueman, “There is no common authority on which they might agree to the terms of debate in order to determine exactly what it is they are debating” ([Trueman, 2020, p. 81](#)). Furthermore, the sides are no longer willing to listen to each other, so the result is continual cultural warfare that creates hatred and divisiveness. The abandonment of the sacred order has resulted in an increasingly cynical, predatory, and dystopian society where crudity and invective become part of normal conversation, and acts of violence against intellectual opponents are increasing. People more readily resort to violence because there are no longer any effective means of moral appeal, such as the trashing of the city of Minneapolis after the George Floyd incident, the violent actions of Antifa, and the January 6 hostilities at the U.S. Capital.

The presence or absence of a sacred order is the most significant source of divide in Western culture and explains the contempt that each side has for the other – both think that the other side is ignorant and evil because they either maintain or reject transcendence. A postmodern society which rejects transcendence and in which ethics are based entirely on self is inherently unstable. This helps to explain why leftists are totalitarian; each individual having his or her own truth potentially creates societal chaos, so the power of a dictatorial government is necessary to enforce a particular version of truth and morality. In postmodernism only might can make right.

These developments took a long time to mature as theology, philosophy, and metaphysics evolved from the eighteenth century to the present. There are obviously many developments in the history of thought – what follows are the most significant ones for gender feminism.

1. *Jean-Jacques Rousseau*. In regard to thought and belief, the intellectual roots of psychology in general and gender feminism in particular go back to Rousseau (born 1712, died 1778) and others of the same era such as Denis Diderot. In contrast to biblical teachings, Rousseau believed that people did not have sin in their nature and therefore were basically good. How do innocent children become selfish and even cruel? If evil doesn't come from inside people, where does it come from? According to Rousseau, evil comes from society, from private property, from the profit motive, and from the moral rules that society erects. He blamed all of his own vices, even placing his own five children in an orphanage, on what others had done to him (his father, his employer, his family, etc.) so he is also the founder of victimology. This is the basis of our current thinking of blaming society rather than the criminal and is at the heart of today's identity politics. Hence the transformation of moral directives, such as Ten Commandments which were intended to protect society from the individual, into the protection of individuals from society.

For Rousseau, the highest love was the love of self, which is also the essence of contemporary songs such as *The Greatest Love of All*. The purpose of education was not to train children about society and history; rather it was to insulate children from morality and from the past (i.e., from the source of society and what he viewed as evil) to make them "authentic individuals." These kids would then supposedly obey their conscience – their internal moral compass – and their hearts would be purified so that moral failures such as depicted in *The Lord of the Flies* would not be possible. Rousseau also glorified youth as a source of authenticity, which we see today in children lecturing adults, despite the former's almost total lack of knowledge about the world.

Rousseau exalted “noble savages” – groups that lived close to nature, lived in peace with the environment, had no societal rules, and were therefore supposedly uncorrupted by business and private property. Therefore, he sought to define a utopian society free of property rights, moral restrictions, and traditional religion – a heaven on earth where everyone was equal, all had everything they needed, there were no moral absolutes, and each lived out their authentic identities. Unfortunately, Rousseau lived before anthropology was developed and before the time when primitive societies were studied – it was discovered that contrary to his thesis, the same patterns of hierarchy, personal sinfulness, and property rights existed in all as well. It has proven impossible to eliminate personal property, and given the many differences between individuals, achieving equality has also proven to be unattainable. Nevertheless, many others have been attracted to Rousseau’s utopian visions, which are the foundation of victimology, socialism, communism, and today’s social justice movement seeking to implement Rousseau’s “heaven on earth.” Rousseau’s ideas were therefore the source of many of our current pathologies ([Davis, 1998](#); [Trueman, 2020](#)).

2. *The Romantic movement of the 19th century.* The catastrophe of the French Revolution of 1789 was a serious wake-up call for secularists. It was supposed to enshrine Liberty, Equality, and Fraternity by the destruction of religion and the church, but it did none of this. Instead, it led to hatred, massacres, and tyranny, and only ended after Robespierre, one of its founders, had his own head chopped off in a guillotine, and Napoleon took over as dictator.

Rousseau had been an enthusiastic supporter of the French Revolution, but died the year before it began, and so was spared its horrors. But in the aftermath, the leaders of the romantic movement, rather than seeing human sin nature as the problem and equality as being unattainable, unfortunately returned to the theology of Rousseau. These included poets and writers such as Wordsworth, Blake, Shelly, Goethe, and others. Shelly, for example, understood that the violence engendered by the French Revolution was destructive rather than liberating, nevertheless he wrote revolutionary poetry in the hope that a positive revolution, a utopia of equality and unfettered sexual liberation, could somehow be possible, like the current social justice movement. Preceding Karl Marx, the Romantics were the progenitors of desire for a political overthrow

The Romantics held that society and business were the source of corruption, and that rural life and a return to nature would purify us from our sins. This echoed Rousseau’s idea that people are naturally good, and that society is the source of sin. The romantic movement was also a reaction against the Enlightenment with its emphasis on reason and logic, and instead was characterized by a celebration of nature, a focus on individual experience, and the idealization of women. It was therefore an abandonment of books and reason, and a rejection of the “male” orientation of thinking and logic in favor of the “female” orientation of feelings, emotions, and experience. We obviously need both, but feminism generally rejects the former and enshrines the latter, setting the stage for gender feminists who use logic when that works for them but abandon it when it doesn’t. In the words of Shelley, “Poets are the unacknowledged legislators of the world.” He hated

Christianity and believed that it was evil and arrogated to himself and other humanists the place of God. The poets of the Romantic movement saw themselves as priests of a humanistic religion. ([Trueman, 2020, pp. 140-141, 148](#)).

This era was also when sexual restrictions and marriage began to be seriously castigated, with moral laws based on external authorities such as the Bible perceived as mere social constructs as is currently taught by postmodernism. William Godwin, Shelley's father-in-law, wrote that marriage was "the most odious of all monopolies" ([Godwin, 1793](#)). He believed that everyone should sexually share each other, children should be raised communally, and this would supposedly make us free. Shelly later wrote, "Religion and morality, as they now stand, compose a practical code of misery and servitude: the genius of human happiness must tear every leaf from the accursed book of God ere man can read the inscription on his own heart" ([Shelley, 1971](#)).

The romantic era was also when sympathy for criminals began, so that feelings, sympathy, and sentiment became a foundation for ethics, and morality became more of a matter of taste rather than truth. Sympathy for Satan was a characteristic of Goethe's famous novel *Faust*; the protagonist makes a deal with Mephistopheles, the Devil who is presented as a gentleman and a servant of humanity rather than the personification of evil. These nineteenth-century figures and ideas are some of the historical precedents for sex-ed, cohabiting, no-fault divorce, fatherlessness, female-headed households, and blaming society rather than the criminal. As Mario Llosa states, "The impoverishment of ideas is a driving force in cultural life. Today, images have primacy over ideas. For that reason, cinema, television, and now the Internet have left books aside" ([Llosa, 2012, p. 37](#)).

3. *Jules Michelet*. It was also during this period when the superiority of women over men was first stated. Jules Michelet, the frustrated French revolutionary, who was deeply involved in the occult, asserted that women are "natural sorceresses." In his influential book *La Sorcière* he stated that magic and the occult are the religion most natural to females. Michelet could thus be considered the inventor of "white witchcraft," which in the twentieth century blossomed into neo-paganism and Wicca. Ironically, Wicca was also founded by a man, Gerald Gardner, and did not come into existence until the 1950s. Many strains of magic have existed throughout history: hermeticism, kabbala, tarot, divination, Rosicrucianism, Theosophy, etc. But magic and the occult were historically the preserve of men – with a few exceptions women were typically involved in peripheral ways. Michelet attempted to demonstrate that the long traditions of magic were actually secret goddess worship rituals, performed by powerful women. These women were then supposedly persecuted by insecure men, who saw goddess worship as a threat to their dominance. Michelet was undoubtedly one of the main inspirations for later feminist writers, especially Matilda Gage in her 1893 book *Women, Church and State*, in which the nine million burned witches statistic was first concocted, one of the seminal feminist myths ([Davis, 1998](#)).
4. *Johann Jakob Bachofen*. One year before Michelet, the concept of matriarchal societies was first mentioned by Johann Jakob Bachofen who discussed the Amazons in his 1861

book *Das Mutterrecht* (the Mother-Right). The example of matriarchy, or rule by women, which he considered to be the most prominent was ancient Lycia, a territory located in what is now western Turkey. Bachofen's source was a quote from the Greek author Heraclides who wrote that "the Lycians were ruled by women." Unfortunately, Bachofen didn't realize that Heraclides was actually parodying, denigrating, and despising Lycian society rather than providing an accurate description. The status of Greek women at the time was very low, and Heraclides also wrote that the Lycians "had no written laws at all and lived by piracy and robbery." Bachofen's ironic conclusion was that female rule was an inferior condition which was later replaced by patriarchy and the rule of men, as that is more in line with human nature. Another defender of patriarchy was Charles Darwin in his book *The Descent of Man*. He observed that strong men capable of survival gain sexual access to women, and the women then nurture their children; this was the naturalistic basis for male aggressiveness and female passivity. Men provided for the family, while women specialized in caring for the children, which was the natural division of labor between the sexes. Similar ideas are also found in the thinking of Sigmund Freud, Georg Friedrich Hegel, August Comte, and others. All of them believed that women were less inclined to run for political office, to put a career before family, to pursue wealth, or be sexually promiscuous. The support of patriarchy by these has been forgotten but feminists still cite Bachofen's *Das Mutterrecht*. However, they publish only the first part of Bachofen's work known as "Bolligen Bachofen," so ironically, one of the seminal texts of feminism is an abridged version of a discredited book.

5. *Fredrich Nietzsche*. He is most famous for declaring that "God is dead." This does not mean that God literally died, rather that He has been rendered superfluous and unnecessary. For Nietzsche there was no intrinsic meaning to life and the universe. For example, to him there are no "laws" of nature because there is no lawgiver. Knowledge is simply a means of giving authority to useful ideas and ways of describing things, but after the rejection of God, everything is only the result of instinct and a struggle for power ([Trueman, 2020](#)). We are to make ourselves into whatever form we desire – to "Eat, drink, and be merry, for tomorrow we die."

Nietzsche also destroys the concept of "cheerful" atheism and alerts people to the implications and the danger of his ideas. Dispensing with God is not something simple like disbelieving in Santa Claus or the Tooth Fairy; it is the destruction of an entire world of metaphysics and morality, upon which society has been constructed. Like a wheel set spinning, those foundations continue to live on, but will ultimately stop and crumble as society conforms to his ideas. In Nietzsche's words, "The earth has been unchained from the sun" and humanity must take on the awesome task of being God and creating morality, which then becomes inherently less moral and more psychological as divinity is abandoned. Rather than deciding what is right and wrong, the new morality is all about who benefits and who is penalized. In his autobiography Nietzsche makes the statement, "I am no man, I am dynamite." ([Trueman, 2020, pp. 170, 192](#)) He was angry with God; anger became despair and he ultimately went mad from the consequences of his own ideas.

6. *Karl Marx*. He developed the theory that all of history consisted of economic warfare between social classes – between bourgeoisie and peasants, the rich and the poor. To Marx, all politics, economics and even ideas were simply instruments in the hands of the powerful to oppress the weak. His solution was the violent overthrow and restructuring of society so that the bourgeoisie are destroyed and the peasants take control.

Marx was perhaps the most prominent of Rousseau's intellectual descendants. Taking Rousseau's view of the basic goodness of humanity combined with the supposed evil of private property and capitalism as the cause for disparity between the poor and the rich, Marx developed the concept of socialism as a means of creating a utopian society. In his books *The Communist Manifesto* (1848) and *Das Kapital* (1867-1894) Marx proposed that utopia would be accomplished by a strong central government that would eliminate traditional religion and take resources away from the rich and give them to the poor to equalize everyone. Religion in Marx's view is "the opium of the people" – it was invented to keep people passive and uninvolved – to keep them "moral" so that they would not engage in a revolution to establish socialism. Religion is therefore a psychological sickness.

Like Rousseau before him, Marx's ideas are a classic case of starting with a conclusion and then seeking evidence to support it. When all one sees is a hammer, then everything looks like a nail, so all forms of social organization including family and religion are therefore seen as being part of the problem. Therefore, his concept of class warfare is attractive for those seeking simplistic answers for historical injustice and is foundational in the current debasement of colonialism and American history as simply power and oppression.

Marx's utopian concepts were adapted in many countries, sometimes in the actual belief that society could be improved, and other times by deceptive leaders as a means of achieving and retaining power. In Russia, Lenin had the strange idea that once socialism had achieved its goal of universal equality that government would somehow wither away. To the contrary, many dictatorial and repressive governments were created in Russia, China, Cambodia, Cuba, Venezuela, Argentina, and elsewhere, and many more people have been tortured and killed by government in such societies than by any other force in human history. The twentieth century was the bloodiest of all and the cause was overwhelmingly governmental implementation of socialism. To put this in perspective, socialism killed 1,000 times more people than Inquisition and all the witch hunts of history ([Stark, 2016](#)).

Marx saw two events that would usher in utopia: 1) the collapse of capitalism; and 2) the rise of a proletarian army to crush the bourgeoisie. There were occasional problems with capitalism, but neither of those events took place in a way envisioned by Marx. Despite this failure of theory, leftists were still enamored with his utopian concepts and began applying them to social justice concerns. So Marxism is an ideological source of the feminist desires to destroy patriarchy, marriage, and family.

7. *Charles Darwin*. In his 1859 book *The Origin of Species* Darwin stated his concept of organic evolution (also known as macro-evolution and universal common descent) ([Darwin, 1859](#)). Darwin's main contribution was not simply that organisms change to adapt to a changing environment, which is a universally accepted fact of biology. Rather, it was his theoretical extension that higher species have evolved from lower ones – bacteria into fish, fish into reptiles, reptiles into mammals, mammals into apes, and apes into humans; all life has supposedly evolved from non-life. According to Darwin, humans are therefore the end result of the evolution of pond scum. Darwinism has been strongly criticized and challenged as having numerous holes, e.g., ([Behe, 2006, 2007](#)), but is still accepted by many scientists.

However, the acceptance of Darwinism is not because it is true, but rather because of its irresistible appeal to psychology, politics, humanism, and feminism. It eliminates the need for God and any corresponding moral accountability, divorcing them from any theological constraints such as guilt, and theological restrictions, such as the Ten Commandments. One can then create one's own religion and moral standards, and the notion of humans descended from apes provides a justification and an excuse for animal-like sexual desires. Darwinism's further appeal to feminism is that male and female nature were accidental rather than being purposeful and teleological. If human nature was simply an inadvertent product of time and chance, then presumably it can be altered to better suit gender feminist desires. However, accepting Darwinism means that humans are simply advanced animals, and if we are only intelligent apes then there is no inherent basis for any moral law – that is the ultimate consequence. The Western acceptance of Darwinism can be seen in our abandonment of morality.

There are so many fallacies and faults with Darwinism that if it were a theory in another branch of science it would have been discarded long ago ([Sorensen, 2020](#)), but like the belief prior to Copernicus that the sun goes around the earth, it forms an axiomatic and unstated background to current thought and therefore is an intellectual necessity.

8. *Sigmund Freud*. Freud and his followers were significant in that they transformed sex from an activity into being fundamental to identity; his ideas are the foundation of today's sex education and thinking about gender. His theories about psychology have generally been rejected, and his methods of psychoanalysis which he considered to be highly significant are attacked as being useless (see the paragraph on psychotherapy in the [Counseling Modalities](#) section below), so the pervasiveness of his influence is surprising. But like Darwin, truth is irrelevant because his ideas fit so well with progressive thinking. The genius of Freud was that he was able to dress his hatred of religion and traditional moral concepts in scientific garb; morality becomes a subjective socially conditioned taste. Hence the current progressive disdain for religion as an infantile neurosis and a cultural defect – religious people are supposedly unintelligent, gun-toting, church-going fanatics. However, Freud did understand the darkness in humanity. He had read the pornographic works of the Marquis de Sade¹¹ which included rape, torture, murder, and child abuse; Freud grudgingly admitted that religion played a factor in restraining such evil. But he believed that psychoanalysis would be the cure, thus replacing faith with

¹¹ De Sade's works include: *The 120 Days of Sodom*, *Justine*, *Juliette*, and *Philosophy in the Bedroom*.

therapy and drugs.

For Freud, sex was not merely an activity – it was the pinnacle of human satisfaction, and a core element of everyone’s identity. He also believed that children are sexual from birth, and he described child development in sexual terms. In his thinking, if sexuality is the most significant aspect of existence, why should it be denied to children? Freud wrote, “Is it not true that the two main points in the programme for the education of children are retardation of sexual development and premature religious influence?” ([Freud, 1961](#)).

Later thinkers such as Wilhelm Reich, Herbert Marcuse, and Simone de Beauvoir adapted the Marxian idiom of class warfare and combined it with Freud’s idea that children and women are sexually repressed, supposedly by patriarchy and religion; it has therefore become a warfare against any form of sexual suppression. As sexual expression is supposedly an essential part of everyone’s identity, politics has become increasingly “psychosexual” and the government thus has an obligation to enforce sexual liberation on its citizens and to override the rights of parents to control the actions of their children. This also produced the idea of psychological victimhood, leading to our current obsession with victimology, hate speech, and microaggressions, such as the refusal to bake a cake for a homosexual wedding ([Trueman, 2020](#)).

Because philosophy, like morality, is more “caught than taught,” and the threads of gender feminism have resulted in a quasi-religious ideology of the self that many have unconsciously adopted from the surrounding culture. Following is a summary of how we have gotten to where we are now:

1. Rousseau challenged the notion of human sin – guilt became a figment of the imagination, and his ideas are the root of the “I’m OK, you’re OK” psychology. He also taught that private property – and by implication the male effort to attain it – is the source of evil in society. Rousseau’s ideas of humanity were essentially “sweetness and light”; the darkness in human nature was not explored and delineated until later.
2. The Romantic movement emphasized feelings over logic – that the female way of knowing is superior to the male way, so what you feel is more significant than what you think. The self (i.e., one’s inward feelings and psychology) is decisive in everything and is all important. Images and stories now have more power than ideas, and morality is largely determined by sympathy and empathy – the oppressed and the victim are always right.
3. Bachofen and Michelet suggested that history was originally matriarchal, with the implication being that the original and therefore the ideal and utopian society was a peaceful socialistic matriarchy, which was destroyed by evil patriarchs who invented

Christianity in order to suppress women and keep others in bondage.

4. Nietzsche taught that God is dead, and we must therefore be the exclusive captains of our fate. There is no intrinsic meaning, so all we can do is provide our own meaning. He was more thoroughgoing than the romantics and demonstrated that once God is abandoned, metaphysics are no longer possible and not even nature can provide any meaning or purpose. These ideas have created an environment of moral anarchy where feelings and desires become the new moral absolutes.
5. Marx taught that all of history is essentially class warfare and therefore everything is political – that the duty of all members of an oppressed class is to fight against and oppress their oppressors. He is also the main source of the overweening leftist desire for total equality; he championed socialism as the way to achieve it, and in the process to destroy capitalism, patriarchy, and religion.
6. Darwin proposed that nature was an accidental product of time and chance. Therefore, humans are not special or significant, there is no God, no divine teleology, no basis for morality, and thus no purpose to life other than to live for self. Morality is redefined as that which promotes happiness.
7. Freud and his followers normalized pornography, extra-marital affairs, homosexuality, and childhood sexuality. These are seen as normal and preferable, while traditional committed relationships are supposedly pathological because the dominance of men in marriage and the childbearing role of women renders the latter inferior.
8. Postmodernism and Critical Theory drew from all of the above; they stated that religious truth is self-defined; all grand narratives such as Christianity are subversive; politics and history are to be seen only through the lens those who have power and those who don't; the dominant Western narrative of truth is simply an ideological construct to preserve white male supremacy; and the goal is to tear all of that down, using the force of government to do so. Furthermore, it involves eliminating the rights and the free speech of those who challenge this process which is now happening on secular college campuses across America.

Gender feminism is likewise the adaptation of all of the above – people are naturally good; God doesn't exist; humans are a cosmic accident; patriarchy and capitalism are evil; marriage, family, and traditional sexuality are forces maintaining both capitalism and patriarchy so they must be eliminated; females are better than males and women should rule; feelings trump thought; limits on sexual expression are tyranny; equality and androgyny are the goal; the self is

all important; free speech and rights must be denied to challengers, and the force of government must be employed to implement all of this.

The First Wave – Workplace Feminism

Women and men throughout history have played different roles, and feminists explain this by claiming that since antiquity men have had more rights than women. However, they fail to note that men also had much more social responsibility – to provide all or most of the family income, to make many of the significant decisions about family survival, and to go to war when necessary. They also criticize patriarchy as holding women down but fail to acknowledge that women in general have always desired the role of mother and caregiver and therefore have always tended to focus on the home. Gender feminists tend to view patriarchy as a long running conspiracy to suppress women but fail to understand that male-female differences have and will always mean that men are the dominant sex. Patriarchy has thus been a mixed bag – it has sometimes been responsible for the abuse of women, but it also benefits women because most of the labor of men goes to support women and children. For women there is a serious divide with feminist pressure trying to make them like men but still wanting to be feminine.

The term “status of women” is a confusing phrase because it involves multiple factors, which usually boil down to the rights and respect given to women by the society in which they live. The problem is that there is an inverse correlation between the two, so that in societies in which women have much respect they tend to have few rights, and where they have rights approximating men, they have less respect. Women receive equality of rights in societies in which the female roles men are incapable of playing (i.e., motherhood and homemaking) are given relatively low respect.

The real lesson to be learned here is twofold: 1) males attain the positions of authority and high status no matter what rights are given to women, and 2) a reduction of the status given to the roles which only a woman can fill forces women who desire status to compete for it in areas in which male aggression is a precondition for attainment. This changes her situation from one in which the women cannot lose to one in which the women cannot win.

The meaning that this holds for the feminist movement and its attempt to improve the “status of women” by de-emphasizing and demeaning traditional female roles is manifold... Thus a decrease in the status accorded to the roles which only a woman can play will result in situations in which: a) there will be a net loss of status accorded to women; b) males will continue to be the attainers of status and positions of authority; c) the wives of such attainers will continue to be the highest status females; and d) other women will see their status lowered to that relegated to the roles that only a woman can play. ([Goldberg, 1973, pp. 68-73](#))

The Industrial Revolution

Feminism in general is directly rooted in and was the result of the wrenching changes and improvements in society brought about by the Industrial Revolution; this is generally held to have begun with the invention of the steam engine, which first came on the scene in 1690, but went into more general use after James Watt developed the first practical version in 1769. Society up to that time, and for a long period afterward, was for the most part rural and agrarian. Cities were smaller, stores were fewer, there was little division of labor, and each household produced many of the things necessary for life. Goods were generally handmade, children were educated largely by their parents, and most activities centered around the home. Husband and wife were each essential because survival required the application of both masculine and feminine skills. Life meant hard work for all, but there was often a deep satisfaction in such a life, because everyone was needed, and the roles were clear. Feminine traits and skills were highly valued and appreciated because they were necessary for the survival and prosperity of the family. Therefore, even though the lot of women was often hard (as was also the lot of men), their place in society as wife and mother was generally honored and held in high esteem. They had fewer rights than men did, but they also had a relatively high level of respect, echoing Goldberg’s quote above.

However, the Industrial Revolution changed all that. Transportation facilities developed and people who had once spent their entire life in one locale began to move. Men left their

homes and farms to labor in factories and offices. Formerly they had worked closely with their wives, but now their time was largely spent away from home, developing a separate work life.

Manufactured goods became common and many labor-saving devices were invented. Thus, the homemaking and handicrafts skills of wives were reduced. Public schools increasingly became the place where children were educated, in contrast to earlier times in which education was often done at home (in colonial times, it was assumed that when a child started school they already knew how to read, and the literacy level of colonial America was higher than it is now). Of course, these changes took a long time to fully sink in and were not completely realized until the twentieth century.

As the changes wrought by the Industrial Revolution took hold, women gradually woke up to find themselves dispossessed. A woman's economic significance was reduced, her role as teacher and moral guide to her children was increasingly taken over by the public schools, she no longer had a close working relationship with her husband, and both men and kids left the home to jobs and to schools respectively. The elements that had defined womanhood, that gave it worth and value, were therefore devalued in the eyes of many. Significantly, the feminist movement was launched in 1792 by Mary Wollstonecraft with her book *A Vindication of the Rights of Women*, twenty-three years after Watt's invention. Wollstonecraft is sometimes referred to as the "grandmother of feminism" and essentially was an early gender feminist in the vein of women like Margaret Sanger and Simone de Beauvoir. She hated men and also criticized women for being feminine – for being too emotional and feelings-oriented. In her short life (she died at age 38) she had affairs, an illegitimate child, and attempted suicide several times ([Godwin, 1798](#)).

It must be noted here that no one forced people to leave the farms and enter the cities. In contrast to the bucolic images of pleasures and simplicity of rural life which came from poets

such as Wordsworth, Thoreau, Keats, Blake, and others, life in the city represented an improvement from the poor hand-to-mouth existence of many people.

The 1800s also ushered in the Victorian era, which is remembered for its prim and proper behavior. But it also is remembered for its repressive attitudes toward women. Victorian sexuality was largely male-oriented, and at times denied that sex could be pleasurable for women. The Victorians had their own brand of feminism, which taught that sex was a woman's unpleasant duty. This served to exacerbate male-female tensions by encouraging women to remain chaste as a way of gaining moral superiority and control over men.

The American suffrage movement sought to give women the right to vote as well as tried to get them out of the house and into careers. Elizabeth Cady Stanton was one of the leaders, and in her 1868 speech "The Destructive Male" to the Women's Suffrage Convention she stated her hatred of men in typical gender feminist terms:

The male element is a destructive force, stern, selfish, aggrandizing, loving war, violence, conquest, acquisition, breeding in the material and moral world alike discord, disorder, disease, and death. ([Stanton, 1868](#))

Like other gender feminists Stanton was not interested in equality, but rather in superiority, and later revealed her rationale for these misandrist statements: "We are, as a sex, infinitely superior to men."

The rumblings continued through the early twentieth century, when World War I and especially World War II moved many American women out of the home and got them involved in wartime factory production. Finally, the sexual revolution of the 1960s, essentially a repudiation of Victorian ideas of sexuality, set the stage for widespread discontent with traditional femininity. But rather than trying to find ways of rebuilding the family and restoring the wife to a place of honor in the home, feminism took the opposite tack, instructing women

that femininity was bankrupt and had to be abandoned. They told women that to have any sense of worth, they had to become like men.

The Industrial Revolution also changed men – most of them left home for work in the cities. Previously payment for work performed was often “in kind” in the form of food or lodging assistance, but later came to be entirely in the form of money. As machines were developed the need for human strength declined. Muscle was replaced by money which is genderless, so the previous role of men was diluted, but less so than that of women because men are still the main providers of society.

The so-called “first wave” of feminist reformers (1850–1945), both male and female, criticized what they saw as the subordinate condition of American females. They established legal rights for women to own property, the acceptance of divorce, and in 1920 the 19th constitutional amendment was passed giving women the right to vote. But many women seemed to be uninterested in exercising those rights. First-wave feminists attributed this to what John Stuart Mill wrote in his 1969 book *The Subjection of Women*, “the whole force of education... enslaves [women’s] minds” to being mothers and wives. However, that began to change as during the first and second world wars men went overseas to fight, requiring many women to enter the work force.

Birth Control and Abortion

The key historical figure in the legalization and promotion of both birth control and abortion was Margaret Sanger, nee Higgins. She was a highly controversial woman who is celebrated by feminists for her significant role in creating the pro-choice movement, legalizing contraception and abortion, promoting sexual pleasure and freedom for females, and establishing the organization that eventually became the world’s leading abortion provider. But she is reviled

by others for her advocacy of killing babies in the womb, as well as her eugenicism, racism, and sex education which later resulted in an explosion of teen pregnancies. She is thus a hero to some and a villain to others – a “killer angel” in the words of one critic ([Grant, 1995](#)).

Sanger was born in 1879 into a large family, and to a father who was a violent alcoholic and abuser. Her mother was a frail woman who died from tuberculosis at age 49, and Sanger considered this to be due to the many pregnancies her mother had experienced and the callousness of her father who didn't provide for his family. She described her family life as “joyless and filled with drudgery and fear” ([Gray, 1979, p. 16](#)). Due to her mother's influence Sanger was a devout Catholic as a child but was mocked and teased by her atheist and abusive father. However, after leaving home for boarding school, she was introduced to suffragette feminism and came to despise her mother's Catholic faith.

Her father had been an ardent socialist and Marxist who had despised his wife's Catholicism, and like her father, Sanger blamed religion for her mother's weakness and death. Sanger likewise got involved in communist politics, union activism, and sexual affairs during her college years. After college she became an obstetrical nurse for a short period and observed what to her seemed to be the relationship between poverty and childbirth, particularly for black women. She was also angered about abortions that were botched either by back-alley abortionists or attempts at self-abortion and wanted to provide women with safe ways of having sex but eliminating pregnancy. Both contraception and abortion were illegal at the time, so she soon gave up nursing and dedicated her life to freeing women from the “bondage” of childbearing ([Grant, 1988](#)).

In 1900 she married William Sanger, a wealthy businessman with communist connections, and after meeting the militant utopian Emma Goldman, she became enamored with

Goldman's ideals of free love, anarchy, anti-marriage, anti-patriarchy, rebellion against social norms, and humanism. Goldman inspired Sanger to become an in-your-face activist.

Our living room became a gathering place where liberals, anarchists, socialists, and industrial workers of the world could meet. These vehement individualists had to have an audience. ([Grant, 1995](#))

Sanger started a newspaper named "The Women Rebel." The first issue stated: "Marriage is a degenerate institution, capitalism is an indecent exploitation, and sexual modesty is obscene prudery," and others contained statements such as "women should look the whole world in the face with a go-to-hell look in her eyes" ([Pokorski, 2013](#)). She surprised her husband by divorcing him and stating that she wanted:

Emancipation from every taint of Christianized capitalism and suggesting to him that they seriously consider experimenting with various trysts, infidelities, fornication, and adulteries. ([Grant, 1995](#))

Leaving her husband, she engaged in many affairs, with the most significant being her 30-year relationship with author, researcher, and sexologist Havelock Ellis. He believed that all sexual behavior was normal and acceptable, and also believed in euthanasia, selective breeding, and the "voluntary" sterilization of the poor. This was based on the teachings of Thomas Malthus, an early proponent of population control, who taught that babies from "inferior races" were a ticking time bomb threatening the existence of society. Malthus viewed missionary work, charity, and philanthropy as "counterproductive," as they only perpetuated the problems of the social classes. The poor, the sick, and the inferior classes had to be suppressed or eliminated in order for Western civilization to survive. In 1921 Sanger founded the American Birth Control League which was a parent organization to Planned Parenthood, which in turn was launched in 1942.

Sanger adapted eugenic ideas into her belief that sexual liberation through birth control and abortion were essential keys to preventing human misery. In Sanger's view, the teaching of

Christian values encouraged large families which were a burden to society rather than a blessing as they perpetuated “feeble-mindedness” and allowed for “defective stocks” to infect human populations. In 1919, she wrote: “I personally believe in the sterilization of the feeble-minded, the insane and the syphilitic,” and in 1921, “The most urgent problem today is how to limit and discourage the over-fertility of the mentally and physically defective” ([Grant, 1995](#)). In 1925, she wrote:

The government of the U.S. deliberately encourages and even makes necessary by its laws the breeding – with a breakneck rapidity – of idiots, defectives, diseased, feeble-minded, and criminal classes. Billions of dollars are expended by our state and federal governments and by private charities and philanthropies for the care, maintenance, and the perpetuation of these classes. Year by year their numbers are mounting. Year by year more money is expended ... to maintain an increasing race of morons which threatens the very foundations of our civilization. ([James, 2020](#))

Sanger believed that blacks were an inferior race, so in 1939 she began “The Negro Project” of locating birth control and abortion clinics primarily in black neighborhoods. Sanger’s apologists insist she wasn’t racist in her advocacy for eugenics, but her actions showed her true colors. For example, Lothrop Stoddard, a high-ranking leader of the Ku Klux Klan, served on the board of her American Birth Control League ([Smith, 2021](#)). Sanger wrote, “We do not want word to go out that we want to exterminate the negro population.”

Sanger and others of like mind were also instrumental in promoting early sex education to children in order to sexualize them at an early age. The sexologist Alfred Kinsey declared that children need early, explicit sex education throughout their school lives. According to him, children should be taught masturbation and both homosexual and heterosexual acts. He also encouraged pedophilia and stated that sexual abuse of children didn’t produce any serious damage to them ([Newman, 2020](#)). In the May 1954 edition of “Sexology,” which was a magazine claiming to be “the authoritative guide to sex education,” Kinsey wrote that it was possible to sexually stimulate infants as young as 2 - 3 months old ([Newman, 2020](#)). He stated,

“It was clear that the earlier children are started on [his brand of] sex education, the more chance they will have to develop adjusted personalities and wholesome attitudes toward sexual behavior.” Kinsey’s sex research involved pedophiles who sexually abused children in order to compile research data, and in the process hundreds of children were raped or molested to determine when the children would experience orgasm ([Newman, 2020](#)). Pedophile groups such as NAMBLA (North American Man-Boy Love Association) have acknowledged the importance of Kinsey’s contributions to their cause. In 1958 Kinsey’s form of sex education was tested in the inner-city public schools of Washington, DC. The education involved showing explicit films that featured details of “mating barnyard animals,” “animated drawings of male ejaculation,” and the use of torso models with male and female genitalia ([Newman, 2020](#)).

In 1964 SIECUS (Sex Information and Education Council of the United States) was launched to develop a sex ed curriculum for public schools. It was headed by Mary Calderone, a former medical director of Planned Parenthood, who proclaimed that SIECUS’s task was to “spread a new religion” under the rubric of “family planning.” The organization received funding from federal and private organizations including the Rockefeller Foundation in order to fulfill Kinsey’s vision ([Newman, 2020](#)). As the curriculum was deployed in public schools across America, rates of out-of-wedlock pregnancies soared along with the associated problems: increasing numbers of fatherless homes, an explosion in venereal diseases, and the pathologies associated with the welfare movement. However, for Planned Parenthood it became a goldmine – taxpayer funds were first used to promote an increase in out-of-wedlock pregnancies, and then the organization profited from the resulting demand for abortions. Unlabeled vans from Planned Parenthood would pull up at schools each week to take girls for abortions, after the required fee was paid ([Newman, 2020](#)). Planned Parenthood generated millions in revenue and then funneled

money back into political campaigns and lobbying efforts to keep the gravy train rolling and to seek taxpayer funding for all abortions.

The extreme bias of the leadership in sex education is legendary, with Jocelyn Elders being a good example. Prior to being appointed Surgeon General by President Clinton, Dr. Elders was the director of Arkansas' health department. Under her purview from 1987 until 1992, teen pregnancies in Arkansas rose 17%, cases of syphilis rose 130%, and HIV infections increased by 150% ([Whitehead, 1994](#)). It was reported that during her tenure 6,000 defective condoms were distributed to teens, and she explained her decision not to inform the recipients of the defects because, in her words, "It would undermine the people's trust in condoms" ([Whitehead, 1994](#)). Dr. Elders then went on to be the "masturbation" czar on Clinton's team (she was forced to resign due to her public support for teen masturbation). During her brief tenure she tried to kill abstinence-based sex-ed legislation (Title XX) which at that time was receiving a paltry \$1.6 million in contrast to \$50 million for Title X funding for the family planning services supported by Elders and her Planned Parenthood constituency. Congress instead raised Title XX abstinence funding to \$6 million in 1995, but also increased Title X Planned Parenthood allocations to \$193 million. Not surprisingly, in every school district where Title X sex education curriculum was used, the rates of teen pregnancy and abortion increased ([Whitehead, 1994](#)). In speaking to an audience at Western Michigan University, Elders told them, "Anyone wanting to be an obstetrician-gynecologist should be trained to perform abortions and, those who choose not to perform abortions should not be an OB/GYN professional" ([Carnell, 1995](#)).

In 1973 the Roe vs. Wade case was argued before U.S. Supreme Court, and the landmark decision made access to abortion a federal right. Norma McCorvey, the "Jane Roe" of the Supreme Court case, was a victim of abuse, financial hardship, and drug and alcohol addiction.

In describing herself she said she was “a simple woman with a ninth-grade education” ([McCorvey & Thomas, 1998](#)). She had sought to abort her pregnancy which she first claimed was due to rape, but later admitted that “it was through what I thought was love.” After the Roe vs. Wade decision, she worked for an abortion clinic but became increasingly concerned about post-abortion problems experienced by many women. Eventually, she did a complete reversal and became a Roman Catholic activist for the pro-life movement, stating that her involvement in the case was “the biggest mistake of my life.” McCorvey believed that she was the victim of her attorneys, Linda Coffee and Sarah Weddington, whom she accused of exploiting the predicament of her unwanted pregnancy to achieve a victory for abortion rights ([Langer, 2017](#)). In 2004 she sought to have the Supreme Court overturn Roe vs. Wade, claiming that now there was evidence that the procedure harms women, but the case was dismissed in 2005 (it was overturned 2022).

McCorvey wrote:

I kept seeing pictures of tiny, 10-week-old embryos, and I said to myself, that’s a baby! It’s as if blinders just fell off my eyes and I suddenly understood the truth—that’s a baby! I felt crushed under the truth of this realization. I had to face up to the awful reality. Abortion wasn’t about the “products of conception.” It wasn’t about “missed periods.” It was about children being killed in their mother’s wombs. All those years I was wrong. Signing that affidavit, I was wrong. Working in an abortion clinic, I was wrong. ([McCorvey & Thomas, 1998](#))

The viewpoints of Sanger and McCorvey who were central to the abortion debate, encapsulate the seemingly unbridgeable difference in perspective between pro-choice and pro-life.

The Second Wave – Gender Feminism

Simone de Beauvoir

The years 1950 to 1980 were the period of feminism’s “second wave” and the genesis of gender feminism. It began with Simone de Beauvoir who in 1949 wrote *The Second Sex* which

many consider to be the foundational work of feminism. During WWII as France was under Nazi occupation, Beauvoir worked as a sound director for Radio Vichy which collaborated with Hitler and the Nazis. She was also a Marxist and a defender of Stalin.

But she is mainly known as the mistress of the existentialist French philosopher Jean-Paul Sartre. She was in an open relationship with him, never married, never had any children, and “became Sartre’s slave” ([Vâlsan, 2014](#)). Even though she remained with him for life, he had numerous affairs with other women, and often had her arrange them for him. His ultimate humiliation of her was to leave her as his “sexually-retired, pseudo wife” and to legally adopt another mistress in order to make the latter his sole heir and literary executor. Beauvoir wrote her books out of the frustration and emptiness of her life ([Vâlsan, 2014](#)). Marie Robinson a doctor whose life work has been the treatment of sexual frigidity in women, commented on Beauvoir’s work as follows: “I was saddened to see such clarity and brilliance in the service of such a mistaken cause” ([Robinson, 1959](#)).

Beauvoir was bisexual and like Sartre was attracted to sex with young girls; she groomed them for Sartre to take their virginity, and along with him sought to lower the age of consent so that they could engage in pedophilia together. Beauvoir would sometimes select a girl from her pupils in order to form a trio with Sartre. The girls were lovers with Beauvoir, then with Sartre, and finally were cast away as Sartre and Beauvoir lost interest and moved on to the next girl ([Vâlsan, 2014](#)). This warped woman became the founder of gender feminism.

Beauvoir believed that the female personality and being was an artificial construct, that women were forced into the roles of dependent wife and sacrificing mother. Women who allow themselves to be thus defined manifest what Beauvoir called a subhuman “immanence” ([Vâlsan, 2014](#)). The traits of immanent women resulted not from biology or brain wiring, but rather from

pervasive and continual social indoctrination and socialization. She identified how immanence is taught and reinforced in hundreds of different ways, such as preparing women to be passive and tender, and for men to take the initiative in sexual relations. Likewise, the male characteristics of strength, competition, and aggression were also said to be socially constructed by encouraging sports for boys, whereas girls were taught to be meek, timid, feminine, and maternal. According to her, society creates and celebrates male promiscuity and sexual desire, while females are seen as objects of sexual desire; men are taught to take women and women are taught to dream of being taken. Girls are taught sexual shame and modesty, while boys are taught confidence and eroticism. Trained to be passive, women accept their allegedly subordinate roles as mothers and housewives. All of this was supposedly the product of social conditioning, so Beauvoir encouraged what she termed “transcendence,” the idea that women must struggle to free themselves from the socialization that has forced them into a mold of sexual passivity, motherhood, marriage, and stagnation. Men are supposedly taught to be transcendent whereas women are taught to be immanent. Therefore, women must throw off the bonds of society in order to be transcendent and career-oriented like men. With the availability of contraception and abortion women must learn to shun sexual modesty and domesticity, so that they can be sexually adventurous, promiscuous, and use “female on top” sexual positions. They must be re-trained that the use of birth control is honorable, necessary, and an exercise in social responsibility to avoid the stigma and the bondage of pregnancy. Like Freud, Beauvoir mistakenly believed that passive women are sexually frigid, and that a women had to take the lead in order to experience orgasm. For Beauvoir male initiative in sex was an essential element of patriarchy and therefore had to be eliminated. But like Sanger, her major hostility was for mothers and motherhood:

The psychic attitude evoked by menstrual servitude constitutes a heavy handicap... The mammary glands that develop at puberty have no role in the woman's individual economy: they can be removed at any moment in her life. ([Beauvoir, 1949, p. 43](#))

She saw clearly that the reality of male-female differences and the thousands of ways that these differences play out in shaping what it means to be a man and a woman all had to be attacked and destroyed.

Children's books, mythology, stories, tales, all reflect the myths born of the pride and the desires of men; thus it is that through the eyes of men the little girl discovers the world and reads therein her destiny.

I think that the family must be abolished.

Women will not be liberated until they have been liberated from their children and by the same token, until children have also been liberated from their parents.

Women's work within the home has no direct benefit to society...her work produces nothing, and the housewife is therefore subordinate, secondary, and parasitic. ([Beauvoir, 1949](#))

Like Sanger, Beauvoir is a hero to some and a villain to others, and her intellectual descendants carried on from where she left off. Years later in a discussion with Betty Friedan, Beauvoir stated her views on mothers who stay home to care for their children:

In my opinion, as long as the family and the myth of the family and the myth of maternity and the maternal instinct are not destroyed, women will still be oppressed.

No, we don't believe that any woman should have this choice. No woman should be authorized to stay at home to raise her children. Society should be totally different. Women should not have that choice, precisely because if there is such a choice, too many women will make that one. It is a way of forcing women in a certain direction. ([SaturdayReview, 1975](#))

Here we see clearly from the founder of gender feminism its totalitarian nature and its desire to force society into its mold; it is truly misogynistic in the original sense of that term. Many women then and now still prioritize motherhood and value loving relationships within marriage much more than sexual liberation and work. When choosing a career, women still tend to enter the caring professions such as nursing, child-care, and social work. Feminists are more misogynistic than men.

The Disciples of Simone de Beauvoir

Despite a century of struggle to achieve no-fault divorce, abortion, and other freedoms, those were not enough to make women equal – they still lived too passively and dependently on men, so more drastic action was necessary. Feminists therefore began the process of attempting fundamental cultural reformation to destroy the patriarchy, teach social construction of gender, and force women into shedding their maternal and wifely personalities. Beauvoir named Betty Friedan, Kate Millet, Germaine Greer, Shulamith Firestone, and others as her successors in the war to create a world without gender. The writings of these women echo the same themes:

The housewife is a parasitic creature. ([Gilman, 1966](#))

The family, as that term is presently understood, must go. ([Millet, 1969](#))

[To be happy in a traditional marriage], a woman must be slightly ill mentally. ([Bernard, 1982, p. 51](#))

[The woman who devotes herself to home and family] lacks selfhood since she fails to act in the public domain. She is a female impersonator, simply fulfilling the needs of others. ([Heilbrun, 1988, pp. 17, 130](#))

Why, despite the opportunities open to all women now, do so few have any purpose in life other than to be a wife and mother?... They are victims of a mistaken choice... not growing up but continually infantilizing... and living in a state inferior to their true capabilities... They are mindless and thing-hungry...and not people... They are trapped in trivial domestic routine and meaningless busywork... and by declining to pursue a professional career, evades a serious commitment through which she might finally realize herself. ([Friedan, 1984, pp. 153-155, 230-132, 243-145](#))

Love, perhaps even more than childbearing, is the pivot of women's oppression. ([Firestone, 1970, p. 142](#))

Kate Millett was one of the first feminists to separate sex from gender, following the research of John Money as described below. She advocated for a radical replacement of all scientific disciplines (biology, economics, psychology, history, etc.) to teach the social construction of gender and the destruction of patriarchy, and her desires have been largely realized by the creation of women's studies program at most colleges and universities. For her a

fully realized sexual revolution would abolish “the ideology of male supremacy and the traditional socialization by which it is upheld in matters of status, role, and temperament” ([Millet, 1969](#)). Individuality is all-important, and roles in both sex and child-rearing would fade and eventually disappear as parental roles became gender-undefined and fully androgynous. It would also require “an end to traditional sexual inhibitions and taboos, particularly those that most threaten patriarchal monogamous marriage: homosexuality, illegitimacy, adolescent, and pre- and extra-marital sexuality.” Restrictions on sexual activity reinforce ideas of monogamous romantic love, parental responsibility, economic dependence, and other cultural attributes that define traditional family life. All of these have to be eliminated so that individuals are allowed to express their primal human drives without any inhibitions. All forms of sex should therefore receive equal public approval, and this would mean changing our ideas about children, love, manhood, womanhood, and even the existence of those categories ([Millet, 1969](#)).

Germain Greer’s major contribution to feminism was the book *The Female Eunuch* in which she characterized history as the story of the oppression of women by men. Her thesis like that of Beauvoir was that the traditional nuclear family represses women sexually, drains them of meaning and vitality, and renders them “eunuchs” ([Greer, 1970](#)). Men supposedly hate women, though women do not realize it, and women are taught to hate themselves. According to Greer:

Women have somehow been separated from their libido, from their faculty of desire, from their sexuality. They’ve become suspicious about it. Like beasts, for example, who are castrated in farming in order to serve their master’s ulterior motives—to be fattened or made docile—women have been cut off from their capacity for action. It’s a process that sacrifices vigor for delicacy and succulence, and one that’s got to be changed.

Shulamith Firestone opined that women seem to be perpetually dreamy about love, emotions, and relationships, and this preoccupation holds them down while men pursue creative work. Women are “more monogamous, better at loving, possessive, clinging, more interested in relationships than in sex per se.” Therefore, women must be liberated by the development of

artificial reproduction (i.e., artificial wombs and cloning) and the creation of universal daycare services provided by the government for everyone. Parents rights must be eliminated in order to secure independence for women. Firestone further believed that the dependence of children on parents is an invention of patriarchy, designed to make women feel as if they are needed to raise them. Therefore, children should be removed from parents and be independent from the families, which would free mothers to pursue careers and economic independence. Childhood is thus a phase of life invented by society that creates expectations for how children should act – the abolition of gender requires the abolition of childhood. Echoing Kinsey, Firestone advocated that children be free to experiment with sex. She cites Beauvoir continually and describes her as “the most comprehensive and far-reaching” feminist theorist, one who related feminism “to the best ideas of our culture” ([Firestone, 1970](#)).

A crucial weapon in feminism’s arsenal has been the status degradation of the housewife’s role. From the journalistic attacks of Betty Friedan and Gloria Steinam to Jessie Bernard’s sociological writings, all branches of feminism are united in the conviction that a woman can find identity and fulfillment only on a career. The housewife, feminists agree, was properly characterized by Simone de Beauvoir and Betty Friedan as a “parasite,” a being something less than human, living her life without using her adult capabilities or intelligence, and lacking any real purpose in devoting herself to children, husband, and home. ([Graglia, 1998, p. 2](#))

The Invention of Gender

Dr. John Money, “the man who invented gender,” ([Pederson, 2022](#)) was a psychologist and sexologist who spent his entire career at Johns Hopkins University. In 1965 he established one of the first gender identity clinics. His main thesis was that gender was primarily environmental rather than biological, and therefore plastic, and he devoted his career to proving that gender was socially constructed. According to Money, heterosexuality is a superficial and societal concept ([Stanley, 2000](#)). Coming during the time when the second wave of feminism was on the rise, Money’s research made him a darling of the feminist movement.

He was very interested in obtaining experimental confirmation for his theories, and in 1966 the exciting possibility of doing so was presented to him. David and Brian Reimer were twins born in 1965. The boys were circumcised when they were eight months old, but in David's case the procedure was botched and most of his penis was burned off. His parents then saw a television program in which Dr. Money was interviewed, during which Money claimed that through surgeries and hormone treatments he could turn a child into whichever sex seemed most appropriate. He further claimed that such reassignments resulted in happy, healthy children. David's parents subsequently brought him to Money, who saw in David a unique opportunity to establish his theory, and the fact that David had a biologically male twin brother made this situation especially tempting for Money. So, when David was around two years old, he underwent sex reassignment surgery under Dr. Money's direction in which his testicles were removed. He was renamed "Brenda," given female hormones, and from then on raised as a girl. Money also suggested that the parents engage in further surgical procedures to create a vagina for Brenda, but this request was refused ([Colapinto, 2006](#)).

However, despite Money's assurances, Brenda did not become feminine. Instead, she tore dresses off, fought with her brother (she was more masculine and aggressive than he was), and wanted to play with trucks instead of dolls. Money conducted annual checkups on Brenda and despite the clear signs that she was rejecting femininity, Money continued his recommendations to feminize her, and proclaimed that the procedure had been a success. In 1972 when Brenda was seven, Money announced his triumph in a speech to the American Association for the Advancement of Science. His book, *Man & Woman, Boy & Girl* in which he explains the environmental nature of sexuality, was released at the same time, and he became the scientific face of the feminist movement ([Colapinto, 2006](#)).

Unfortunately for Money, his experiment actually demonstrated the opposite – that gender is primarily biological. At age 14 Brenda stopped living as a girl and refused further estrogen treatments. After being told the truth by her father, she/he took male hormone treatments, had a double mastectomy, underwent surgical procedures to rebuild a penis, and eventually married. But life was always difficult, and he experienced a number of marital and financial problems on top of personal pain, confusion, and depression. In 2002 Brian committed suicide possibly due to the confusion that Money had created. Two years later David also killed himself with a shot to the head. David and Brian's parents blamed their deaths on Dr. Money, but he never apologized or admitted any culpability ([Stanley, 2000](#)). Even worse, it was eventually revealed that as part of the process to feminize Brenda and to sexualize her, Money had Brian and Brenda perform sex acts on each other when they were children.

The realities of the David Reimer experiment were exposed by Milton Diamond and John Colapinto, the latter of whom published an article in Rolling Stone magazine in 1997, thirty years after the initial surgery and twenty-five years after Money had become a cause célèbre for feminism. Colapinto also wrote a best-selling book entitled *As Nature Made Him: The Boy Who Was Raised as a Girl*. This eventually created a firestorm of criticism – Money first attempted to have the criticism suppressed, and after that was no longer possible, he blamed it on “right-wing media bias” and “the antifeminist movement.” According to Money, his critics believed that masculinity and femininity are biological to “keep women on the mattress and in the kitchen.” He argued that children are born plastic and remain plastic for a certain time (18 months or longer). This process he termed “the development of gender” and stated that surgery and hormones can be used to “correct” their bodies and “finish” their genitals. Despite his academic

background and credentials, he ignored the huge amount of research demonstrating that gender development is biological, which completely contradicted his conclusions.

Money later wrote the book *Fuckology*, with the title being deliberately provocative in the tradition of Sanger and Beauvoir. In it he describes his penchant for orgies, and a distinction between “affectional pedophilia” and “sadistic pedophilia” with the former being more acceptable. He clearly understood the neurological aspects of fetal development, but rejected that approach in favor of his theory of the social construction of gender ([Waidzunus, 2016](#)).

Every PhD student in psychology is typically required to take a course in ethics. Ethical breaches involved in Money’s work include:

1. Having the children do sexual acts on each other.
2. Informing parents that the procedure would help their children, but instead it resulted in confusion, misery, mental illness, and ultimately suicide for both of them.
3. Continuing to claim that the recommended procedures were working when in fact they were not.
4. Publishing bogus results in order to secure fame and fortune, and never retracting or admitting any culpability.

Money’s research was thus probably the most unethical study ever undertaken in the history of psychology, and he is therefore referred to as “the monster who created gender” ([Pederson, 2022](#)). “Since his time, patient activism has shifted doctor-patient relationships to such a degree that Money’s practices seem unconscionable today” ([Waidzunus, 2016](#)). On the one hand, Money truly cared for intersex individuals and wanted to find ways to help them as discussed in the section on [Homosexuality](#) above, but on the other hand, his methods amounted to malpractice, and his concept of the social construction of gender led the way for second wave feminism. This experiment had a wide-reaching impact in that it helped provide scientific cover for the feminist movement. William Stanley writes,

But there is a far more remarkable and important question: how could David's case – a tragic and failed medical project – become the single-most important source of evidence to support the guidelines used by the American Association of Pediatrics for the past three decades to treat children born with ambiguous or damaged genitals? ... Introductory psychology and sociology textbooks soon began to refer to the twin's case as compelling evidence for the social learning theory of sexuality. ([Stanley, 2000](#))

Feminist Theology and Archaeology

In attempting to construct a comprehensive philosophical worldview to displace that provided by traditional religion, feminist writers such as Elizabeth Davis in *The First Sex*, 1971; Merlin Stone in *When God was a Woman*, 1976; Riane Eisler in *The Chalice and the Blade*, 1986; the anthology *Womanspirit Rising*; and others, created a theology (or “thealogy” as it is sometimes called) and a religion to embody their desires, in which “god” is replaced by “goddess.” Female goddesses have been around for millennia, but in most cases, they were subservient to their male analogs. However, the goddess of today, variously called “Isis,” “Ishtar,” or “Sophia,” supposedly supersedes any male god. Wicca, the feminist religion, was founded in the 1950s, and the genesis of goddess concepts coincided with the advancement of feminism. It has also coincided with the development of the homosexual movement, and a large percentage of Wiccans are also said to be lesbians. Mary Daly, a popular feminist ex-academic, insisted that a woman who refuses to engage in lesbianism is merely a “token woman” ([Daly, 1990](#)).

A history of mankind was developed to explain that the original human religion was the worship of a Mother goddess, and that goddess worship, along with women, have been savagely suppressed down through the centuries. According to this hypothesis, societies of the remote past were matriarchal, worshiped the goddess, and lived at peace with the environment. In some accounts, such as that of Davis mentioned above, the first males were mutants, and subordinate

to females. Women were said to have created all of the meaningful elements of civilization before men even arrived on the scene. Furthermore, these societies were socialistic utopias – there was no private property, no masculine competitiveness, and no social hierarchies. Everyone had what they needed, there was no hoarding of wealth, and all things were shared. But tragically, these societies were crushed by evil, male-led tribes who conquered the defenseless socialists and enslaved them. These malicious patriarchal groups, culminating in the Roman Empire, then invented Christianity as a means of denigrating women and holding them down. Through the centuries, the church has violently suppressed goddess worship, supposedly killing millions of witches, who, in reality, were innocent goddess worshipers, and keepers of the ancient flame. Today, these destructive forces are said to have run amok to the point that they are supposedly in danger of destroying the entire world. The crisis in western civilization is allegedly a sign that the male god's reign is ending, and the goddess is waiting to lead us into a New Age of peace and harmony. We must therefore jettison patriarchy and all of its supporting institutions: male-god religions, monogamous families, and all male-based hierarchies of power. If we fail to do this, we may be facing the end of civilization and life on the earth.

To be fair, many feminists (both women and men) do not have the above theological perspective. They may be Christian, Jewish, Muslim, Humanist, Atheist, or something else, and disagree with some or all of the above. Many would align themselves with workplace feminism because it has achieved positive things for women, such as equal pay for equal work and the opening of careers that were previously closed to women, for which neither sex had envisioned female participation. Nevertheless, that is not enough for gender feminists, and the above theology and its philosophical implications for social and governmental policies form the basis of their initiatives.

Significant efforts have been expended trying to ground the above theology in archaeology. But despite intensive investigations and huge research funding, hard historical and archaeological evidence has eluded feminist scholars. They have desperately searched for any scraps of evidence of ancient matriarchies in order to support the above theories. For a while, hope was placed on Catul Hayuk in Turkey, on ancient Malta, and on the Minoan society of ancient Crete, all of which were thought to be matriarchal. However, as these areas were more fully explored, feminist hopes were dashed, as it has turned out that these societies were much more patriarchal than our own ([Davis, 1998](#)). On Crete, for example, goddess devotees made much of a few pieces of artwork that seemed to depict males and females functioning in an egalitarian manner. The Minoans may have indeed treated women better than did surrounding nations, but there is a mountain of ignored evidence that the Minoan culture was actually a “chiefdom society,” led by men, with females being subordinate to males, as was typical in ancient times.

Like the Minoans, Celtic society was supposedly more egalitarian than others, but close examination reveals that in general, males had much more control over females than today, and the Celtic objects of worship were phallic rather than female. The Gnostic Cathars were also said to treat men and women equally, but the Cathar leadership positions were exclusively male, and Cathar women functioned more-or-less as nuns in the Catholic Church, without being cloistered. Thus, there is no evidence whatsoever for ancient female-controlled or even gender-egalitarian societies ([Davis, 1998](#)). The Venus of Willendorf figurine of a pregnant female and similar ancient objects have been touted as being Mother-goddess statues but no one knows for sure what they were. They may have instead been fertility figures, good-luck charms, dolls, or even ancient pornography.

As discussed above, J.J. Bachofen in his book *Das Mutterrecht* mistakenly believed that civilizations passed through a matriarchal phase before moving on to patriarchy. But anthropology has decisively shown that no matriarchies exist anywhere in the world, nor is there any evidence that any true matriarchies have ever existed in the entire history of humanity. Given the innate biological and psychological differences between males and females, it is highly unlikely that a matriarchal group could ever have begun or survived for any period of time. There have been matriarchal elements in some societies, such as the worship of female gods, and occasional powerful queens. Some societies and groups have “matrilineal” elements, such as inheritance and property rights being passed through the female side. Others have “matrilocal” elements where the location of the family is determined by the female’s clan or group. But a detailed examination of past societies reveals that men ruled and dominated women much more completely than in the western world of today. This was true even when a queen ruled, and when a goddess was worshipped. As the anthropologist Stephen Goldberg states in *The Inevitability of Patriarchy*, which was later revised as *Why Men Rule – A Theory of Male Dominance*:

There has never been a society that has failed to associate authority and leadership with men. No anthropologist contests the fact that patriarchy is universal. Indeed, of all social institutions, there is probably none whose universality is so totally agreed upon.
([Goldberg, 1973, pp. 31-32](#))

The degree to which women take power seems to depend on the extent to which men are absent ([Gilder, 1986, p. 21](#)). The next element that must be defended by feminist scholars is the concept of ancient, prosperous, socialistic utopias, free of property rights and male competitiveness. Absolutely no evidence of such societies has ever been found, and how a socialistic – female-led society – either ancient or modern, could ever have survived, let alone prospered, is never explained or even seriously considered. The study of socialism has demonstrated that, contrary to being utopian, all societies based mainly on socialistic principles

have been failures, from the early American experiments in Plymouth under William Bradford, which almost wiped out the pilgrim colony ([Pease, 2011](#)), to the communist/socialist tyrannies of Russia, China, Cuba, Romania, Cambodia, Zimbabwe, Tanzania, and others. The major products of these societies have been shortages, authoritarianism, oppression, misery, and death. The only place where socialism has truly succeeded is in the context of capitalism, when it is subordinated to a free-market economy. Juxtaposing the words “socialist” and “utopia” creates perhaps the ultimate oxymoron. It is ironic that the concept of ancient socialistic matriarchies was developed only in the comfort of contemporary American academia, for which all of the buildings were built and the salaries paid for by a free-market economy.

Finally, the assertion of a continuous thread of secret goddess worshipers who have existed throughout history, and have periodically been ruthlessly suppressed by evil, patriarchal Christians, must be addressed. This assertion was the source of the “nine million burned witches” myth, and as with other claims, this one is also a complete fabrication. There have been cultures that included the worship of goddesses as part of their religious milieu, but virtually all of these were ancient (e.g., Babylon, Assyria, and Egypt), and there has never been any sustained thread of goddess worship from the ancient past. Given the universality of patriarchy throughout history, the worship of female deities should be a relatively rare occurrence, and that is indeed what the historical and archaeological evidence demonstrates.

Feminist theology and history are thus fantasy and deception, with no religious, historical, or anthropological foundation. Philip Davis in his book *Goddess Unmasked* sums up the evidence against it:

Not a single [ancient society] provides clear evidence of a supreme female deity; not a single one exhibits the signs of matriarchal rule, or even of serious power-sharing between the sexes; not a single one displays social egalitarianism, non-violent interpersonal and interstate relations, and ecological sensitivity which we have been led

to anticipate. In each of these cases, the story of the Goddess is a fabrication in defiance of the facts. ([Davis, 1998, pp. 83-84](#))

One would think that goddess worshipers would be distressed that their religion is based on concocted fallacies and deceptions. However, these individuals “feel” rather than “think,” because thinking is largely logical, left-brained, and therefore male. Feminists subordinate thinking beneath feeling when there is a conflict between the two. As Davis concludes:

Virtually none of the Goddess books deals directly with factual challenges to their story. Instead, we are most likely to encounter one or both defenses to the Goddess: the irrelevance of men and their opinions, or the irrelevance of truth itself. ([Davis, 1998, p. 85](#))

Here we see the impact of postmodern philosophy where historical and theological truth are entirely self-defined, as well as the impact of Marxism where the study history is transformed from discovering the characteristics and the wisdom of past societies into resentment and a political weapon. Everything becomes political and thus it is impossible to view historical topics in non-political terms.

Despite this elaborate framework, and perhaps because of its indefensible nature, the feminist/goddess/Wiccan movement does not insist on agreement with all of its theological tenets. In keeping with its roots in Romanticism, people can believe whatever they want to believe – the important thing is agreement with basic feminist principals. Some worship the goddess Isis, others seek communion with “Sophia” (supposedly the World Spirit of Wisdom and Mother Earth), and yet others approach from a purely humanist/atheistic viewpoint, ignoring all gods, goddesses, and spirits. The latter engage in feminist worship rituals merely for the engendered feelings and associations. The movement also reaches out to those in the traditional religions of Judaism, Catholicism, and Protestantism, where goddess theology is dismissed out of hand, but where some have been instrumental in the production of gender-neutral Bibles, the

elimination of references to God as “He,” and the complete reinterpretation or dismissal of all biblical passages having to do with the submission of wives to husbands.

Politicians and media personalities of all stripes often lie. Robert Hutton, a political correspondent, wrote a satirical guidebook entitled *Would They Lie To You? How to Spin Friends and Manipulate People* in which he states the following:

The world can be divided into people who make complicated ideas seem simple, and people who make simple ideas complicated. Whatever area you choose, from finance to academia to the church, you’ll find that glory, money, and power flow more freely to the complicators than the simplifiers.

He also gave interesting examples for “rebranding” strategies to make the undesirable seem reasonable such as characterizing Henry VIII’s marital exploits as “Sustaining Families Through Wider Engagement,” and an explanation for Chernobyl as “Creating Critical Mass to Drive Demand for Safe Technology” ([Hutton & Parris, 2015](#)).

There are numerous examples of feminist lies such as the 9 million burned witches hoax, that domestic violence increases up to 40% during the Super Bowl, that 150,000 young women (aged 15 to 24) die every year of anorexia nervosa, that one in every four female college students are victims of rape every year, that the American society is a “rape culture,” that almost 40% of married women are emotionally abused and four million women are assaulted every year, that female desire for beauty is a myth perpetuated by the patriarchy, and so on ([Sommers, 2012](#)).

Sue Ellen Browder, a writer for Cosmopolitan magazine, wrote “fake feminist news” for the magazine for 20 years, although she characterizes it as propaganda. “Propaganda is very sophisticated – it’s half-truth, selected truth, and truth out of context. Propaganda is used, not only to sell ideas, but also products.” Her goal at Cosmo was to sell women on the idea that sexual liberation is the path to personal fulfillment along with the associated products: “When a young woman reads this magazine and thinks that she has to have perfume, cosmetics, hair

products, beautiful clothes, abortions, and contraception, then she's going to spend a lot of money," The turning point for Browder came when she and her husband aborted their third child, which was a very traumatic and haunting experience for her. She converted to Catholicism and sought the help of the church for healing and forgiveness. According to her she was part of the evil empire and wants to bring women back to a focus on marriage and first wave feminism ([Bolar, 2020](#)).

Thought and logic (i.e., evidence and arguments) that demonstrate the fallacies and deceptions of feminism are a-priori misogynistic and anti-female and can thus be safely vilified and ignored. Mendacity on behalf of feminism is tolerated and even encouraged because of the supposed overriding importance of imposing their vision on society; a future goal is for criticism of feminism to be criminalized as hate speech. As the feminist legal scholar Ann Scales stated, "Feminist analysis begins with the principle that objective reality is a myth" ([Scales, 1990](#)) and Monique Wittig, who wrote, "Remember. Make an effort to remember. Or failing that, invent." ([Wittig, 1992](#)).

Sex Education

Sex education is one of the main educational backbones in the proliferation of gender feminism. Restrictions in today's society, and sexual restrictions in particular, are treated either with scorn or with a sense of quaint amusement – perhaps like an adult who still believes in Santa Claus. Sex education is more or less universal in public schools, but it is much more than the teaching of biology or hygiene. It is the inculcation of the philosophy and moral standards of Freud, Kinsey, Sanger, Sartre, Beauvoir and feminism in general in regard to sexual activity, as well as applying the all-American mantra of choice to encourage early sexual expression. The typical implication is that kids should decide for themselves when they are ready, and that

parents will probably want to spoil their fun, so kids should avoid discussing sex and the content of sex education with their parents.

The inevitable corollary of early sexual interest is rebellion against the parental authority that represses it. Selfishness thus becomes indignation and then transforms itself into morality... What were once unconscious or half-conscious childish resentments become the new Scripture.

[The teenager] enjoys the liberties hard won over centuries by the alliance of philosophic genius and political heroism; he is provided with comfort and leisure by the most productive economy ever known to mankind; science has penetrated the secrets of nature to provide him with marvelous, lifelike electronic sound and image reproduction he is enjoying. And in what does this progress culminate? His life is made into a nonstop, commercially prepackaged masturbational fantasy. ([Bloom, 1987, pp. 74-75](#))

The alternative is not to abandon instruction in human biology that covers copulation and reproduction – far from it. Kids need to understand these things, but ideally, they should learn them from their parents in a context of love and acceptance, so that they will be incentivized to return to their parents when they have sexual issues or problems to discuss, as well as be encouraged to wait. Unfortunately, many parents are not providing this education, and public schools, under the influence of gender feminists, have forced their way into the gap. What is most troubling about the sex ed curricula is the philosophy on which it is based, and which it has clearly communicated to millions of American kids. The objectionable aspects are as follows:

1. Sex education is calculated to break down the natural modesty of students and to eliminate the reluctance that girls have to give themselves to boys in casual relationships. The goal is not education but indoctrination and sexual license. It is the inculcation of the feminist ideology of self, where free sexual expression is paramount and restrictions on self are evil.

”In Massachusetts, the Chelmsford School Committee and the Parent Teacher Organization, frightened by media reports about the HIV threat to teenagers, invited AIDS activist Suzi Landolphi to give a presentation called ‘Hot, Sexy, and Safer’ to a mandatory assembly of ninth and tenth graders. During the assembly Ms. Landolphi conducted a ‘group sexual experience’ to get her points across. She placed a condom over the head of a boy standing in front of his classmates and asked him to ‘blow it up.’ She also showed the students how to masturbate and she promoted bisexual sex as desirable because ‘you get less rejection that way.’ Some parents complained that they weren’t informed about the ‘group sexual experience’ or given the chance to withdraw their son

or daughter from this assembly on 'AIDS Prevention.' The U.S. District Court ruled that the school was justified in having the mandatory assembly and not informing the parents, and the decision was upheld by the U.S. Court of Appeals" ([Panzer, 1997, pp. 3-4](#)).

AIDS is a good example of how crisis can be turned into opportunity. As a homosexual activist stated, "AIDS is our strength." The above situation was from over 25 years ago, but the same curriculum is still being taught with the emphasis now on gender transition.

2. Sex Education assumes that kids will engage in sex at a young age and encourages them to experiment with other kids, as sexologists such as Alfred Kinsey recommended. Rather than telling kids to avoid early sexual activity and wait until marriage (which allows for the best and most fulfilling sexual relationship), educators are told to encourage even preschoolers to explore their body parts with games like "Simon Says," and to teach them about sexual intercourse. By third grade children should be instructed on wet dreams, masturbation, rape, and sex work, and high school kids are taught that gender is socially constructed. Popular websites such as "Go Ask Alice" inform kids how to buy adult products by phone, arrange threesomes, and stay safe during sado-masochistic sex play. The result is that 34% of girls are sexually active by age 15, and 80% by age 19, with more than 20% of them reporting 2 or more partners in the past year ([Grossman, 2009, pp. 8-9](#)).
3. Sex education typically avoids references to monogamy, marriage, and abstinence, but usually includes plugs for homosexuality, bisexuality, and other sexual kinks. It ignores the fact that teenagers are often confused and uncertain about themselves and their roles and jolts them with a heavy dose of sexuality at a precarious time in life when they are typically ill-equipped to deal with the emotional aspects and consequences.

"In attending a New Jersey Health Department seminar for AIDS education everyone received packets of AIDS information materials which included articles by Peggy Brick, a Planned Parenthood director. In one article, 'Ten Tips for Teachers,' Ms. Brick urges teachers, particularly those from elementary schools, to do an 'independent project' of 'attending an explicit sex show or pornographic film, or buy two or three pornographic magazines and read them'... I was attending a seminar for AIDS educators, and we were told to explore ways in which our own personal religious values might get in the way of communicating openly or honestly about AIDS. We were never asked to share how those same values may have *helped* us to deal with sexual issues... At one point we split up into discussion groups. Marie, a friend of mine, was told in her discussion group that since she didn't begin having sex until after college, she should seek counseling... One of the individuals in my discussion group was Amanda, an employee of Planned Parenthood. She shared how her parents never spoke about sex openly and how she felt they should have. 'We must talk about sexual acts but not about the values we attach to them. We must learn to say words like "penis" and "vagina" and teach students to do so. Besides,' Amanda said, 'marriage and the male being in the home and exercising family leadership is a Eurocentric bias.' I was dumbfounded by this statement. I asked, 'Don't men in Africa have a strong leadership role in their families?' Amada replied cluelessly that this role was 'bred' out of African males when they were brought as slaves to America... I

think of all of the students that she has taught and will teach, and I shudder” [italics in original] ([Panzer, 1997, pp. 9, 12-13](#))

4. Sex education discourages kids from talking with their parents, who may very well object to what the schools are teaching.

”In Newton, Massachusetts during a presentation on AIDS prevention for high school teachers, a health teacher objected to the use of the term ‘monogamy.’ In New York City an AIDS Education Review Committee rejected a curriculum stating that the reason for its rejection is that the curriculum points out that many people believe sexual intercourse should be reserved for a committed love relationship” ([Panzer, 1997, p. 4](#)).

5. Sex education has produced a plethora of new sexually transmitted diseases (STDs). In the past there were only two significant ones (syphilis and gonorrhea), but now there are more than two dozen including incurable viruses such as HIV which is fatal ([Grossman, 2009, p. 10](#)).
6. Sex education not only increases sexual activity in youth along with the associated pathologies; it also causes emotional problems such as depression, particularly in girls. It’s not clear if teen sex causes depression, or depression causes teens to have sex. Research suggests that both may be true ([Shi, 2023](#)).

“In my experience, students who have had a serious fling [with drugs and/or sex with multiple partners] – and gotten over it – find it difficult to have enthusiasms or expectations. It is as though the color has been drained out of their life and they see everything in black and white... They may function perfectly well, but dryly, routinely. Their energy has been sapped, and they do not expect their life’s activity to produce anything but a living.” ([Bloom, 1987, p. 80](#))

7. Sex education eventually metastasized into the women’s and gender study programs in universities discussed in more detail below.

Sex education teaches kids that they are weird and dysfunctional if they are not sexually active. Marriage and abstinence are considered ridiculous and oppressive, and those who teach it are wicked, stupid, or both. The bottom line is that sex education normalizes perversion and stigmatizes normalcy.

Miriam Grossman’s book, *You’re Teaching My Child What? A Physician Exposes the Lies of Sex Education and How They Harm Your Child* is a good resource for parents. Perhaps one of the reasons that parents are not more involved is that they are being told in various ways that

they shouldn't be, and that this job will now be handled by professionals and by the public schools which are the source of the associated pathologies. Another possible reason is that due to the breakdown of marriage, today's families are more dysfunctional. Parents are more consumed with their own issues and problems, and therefore have less time and energy to give to their kids. The government then steps in with the "solution"; the ignorance of parents regarding school-based sex education is appalling and depressing. Why is there so much sexual pressure placed on teenagers, who in many cases can't even take responsibility for getting their homework done? Some of it comes from the feministic bias of those involved, but more insidious is the connection with abortion providers such as Planned Parenthood, as discussed in the [Funding Feminist Ideology and Turning Disease into Profits](#) section below, which has direct financial incentives to increase the number of abortions. The bottom line is that given the detestable nature of school-based sex-ed and the fact that it is unlikely to change, parents and family should be the main source of sex education for their children.

Summary of Second-Wave Feminism

There are a number of intellectual threads common to gender feminists:

- A rejection of traditional religion in favor of postmodern philosophy, humanism, new age spiritism, and/or atheism.
- An attraction to the Marxist ideas of socialism, anti-capitalism, and class struggle, in this case the struggle of women against men.
- Viewing gender as being socially constructed rather than biological.
- Viewing history as the oppression of women by men.
- Viewing marriage as trap and a prison for women – as a way for men to gain hegemony over women so that a female would be forced against her will to serve male purposes.
- Encouraging women to become men – to have the same drives for career and sex, and encouraging desires for personal and sexual freedom without constraints.
- A disdain for families, pregnancy, childbearing, and motherhood, and the feeling that caring for children would interfere with the more important purpose of having a career and making money.

Throughout history abusive men have wounded women both physically and psychologically, often with impunity because authorities sometimes turned a blind eye toward such abuse. Some men are selfish pigs who do not honor or respect women, so that women are rightly repelled by the notion of submitting to such men or having anything to do with them. Battered wives are still a problem and pornography is used by some men to rationalize the view that women are purely sex objects who exist only to gratify male lust. But mountains of evidence demonstrating that the work of men has actually been for the benefit of women has been ignored. Beyond that, gender feminists advocate for the wholesale replacement of masculinity, femininity, and families in a variety of ways. This was essentially the kind of society that Aldous Huxley described in *Brave New World* where people have no parents and no one who truly cares for them, children are born in a test tube, are raised in a communal nursery by strangers, have no fixed gender, and have no possibility of romantic love ([Huxley, 1958](#)). This proposal is essentially an academic form of mental illness, which is how Mallory Millett characterized the life of her sister Kate, who was one of the founders of NOW (the National Organization for Women).

In 1969 I attended consciousness-raising sessions in New York City with my sister, Kate, where a group of 10-15 women sat around a long oval table and plotted the New Feminist Movement and the founding of NOW. The burning objective of Kate's "consciousness-raising" was "the destruction of the American family," as she deemed it "a patriarchal institution devoted to the oppression and enslavement of women and children." Their template was Mao's China and the group confessionals that were conducted in each village in order to "cleanse the people's thinking." [People like my sister] have clever formulas for ensnaring hapless souls into their deceptions. One of their slicker moves is to create a vocabulary designed to get around long-held beliefs, mores, taboos or fears. "Pro-choice" is their Newspeak euphemism for the casual murder of a human being; "Dreamers" means illegal immigrants; "Progressives" denotes a group dragging us back to the cave; "Sanctuary City" means a place where no actual US citizen is safe. The word "empowerment" makes me especially crazy.

How bizarre it is to have to argue the obvious; to have to prove over and over again what is self-evident – men are men and women are women. They are essentially different and designed for a natural division of labor. My thesis is this: when men ran the world and women ran society, we had a chance to conduct our lives in some semblance of balance,

but women have abdicated their running of society and thus, it has collapsed dramatically. Women forced their way into the running-the-world deal and now we have a world gone mad. And the beautiful society which we Western women built is in tatters. Moms decided they were the same as men, so they deserted the home and babies to grab their briefcases and rush out to run the world.

My sister Kate decided her contribution would be to establish Women's Studies courses at every U.S. college and university, which she efficiently executed. On examination, these courses emerge as nothing more than Marxism 101. Kate taught that the family is literally a slave unit with the man as the bourgeoisie and the women and children the proletariat. Two of her own books were required reading. In these classes young girls are conditioned into murderers who will dispense with their own precious unborn child as readily as a dirty Kleenex without a twinge because "it's my body." I can't hear of the 70 million Americans killed before birth without a catch in my heart over Kate's role in this. She taught girls to be an outlaw cuz all the laws were made by evil white men. "Be a slut and be proud of it!"

One day my counselor guessed it: "So, do you understand that you're trying to make your sister sane?" Kate's life story is a saga of our family desperately trying to have her involuntarily received into a mental institution where they may have helped her.

As I scan the wreckage of our beautiful America, knowing that my own sister was in great part responsible, I feel as if my heart has been kicked down the stairs. So, on pondering this question about the good and the bad of militant feminism, it reminds me of the joke in which the reporter asks, "Other than that, Mrs. Lincoln, how did you enjoy the play?" ([Tapson, 2018](#))

The following anonymous quote is an ironic summary of gender feminism: "Feminism is the idea that women are free when they serve their employers, but slaves when they serve their husbands and children."

The Third Wave – #MeToo and Transgenderism

By the 1980s, the second wave feminism of the 1960s had cooled off. Feminism had suffered severe criticism, and supporters realized that despite all of their impassioned rhetoric which championed lesbianism and characterized mothers as "parasites" and a "traitor to their sex." that women still wanted families and children. While bra-burning and continuing with the same message came to be seen as counterproductive, the third wave way of described and discrediting female opponents to feminism is that they are "internally misogynized" and

“brainwashed by the patriarchy” ([O'Neill, 2015](#)). The supposed decline of feminism was described in a forlorn and regretful manners in books such as Susan Faludi’s *Backlash* ([Faludi, 1991](#)). However, by this time feminists had fully infiltrated academia. Under the banner of “giving women their say,” women’s studies programs had been established and were preaching the sermons prepared by Beauvoir, Millet, Greer, Firestone, Friedan, and others, albeit in a more subtle and less overtly militant form. George Gilder in the introduction to his book *Men and Marriage* expressed it as follows:

The radical feminist movement, once a dominant force in the nation’s affairs, had suffered serious setbacks. The more obviously extreme figures no longer commanded serious attention. While Kate Millet’s *Sexual Politics* gained an almost unprecedented two-part rave in the New York Times, her subsequent celebrations of lesbianism were largely dismissed... So as a critique of the feminist movement and its politics *Sexual Suicide* [my former book] now seems less telling. But even though feminist politics and lesbian posturing have been rejected, American culture has absorbed the underlying ideology like a sponge. The principal tenets of sexual liberation – the obsolescence of masculinity and femininity, of sex roles, and of heterosexual monogamy as the moral norm... have become part of America’s conventional wisdom... even where [second wave] feminism seems increasingly irrelevant. ([Gilder, 1986, pp. viii-ix](#))

As Norman Mailer noted more succinctly, “The words of radical feminists, while extreme, and even extreme of the extreme, are nonetheless the magnetic north for women’s lib” ([Mailer, 1971, p. 4](#)).

Surveys of attitudes have highlighted some areas of commonality in the American public – over half of survey takers don’t think the U.S. democracy is healthy, with shared concern over elections and the accuracy or objectivity of the news media. But they dramatically disagree on the causes:

Republicans overwhelmingly pointed to partisan media, voter fraud, and President Joe Biden as the top threats to democracy. Democrats, in contrast, named former President Donald Trump as the No. 1 threat, followed by voter suppression and Republican officials. More than 9 in 10 Democrats surveyed said Republicans were very or somewhat more close-minded, with almost as many also viewing their partisan counterparts as very or somewhat dishonest and immoral. Republicans were just as damning in their judgments about Democrats, with similar percentages of Republican

survey takers saying Democrats were very or somewhat more close-minded, dishonest, and immoral. ([Lavin, 2023](#))

The differences are reflected in beliefs about why people are rich or poor. Republicans tend to feel that the main reason why individuals or families are poor is because of a lack of effort (38%) rather than circumstances beyond their control (31%), whereas Democrats have the opposite perspective – 18% and 69% respectively. Since 2005 the number of psychology articles per year on social justice has rocketed over 600% and social justice has become a major preoccupation of psychology ([Thrift & Sugarman, 2019](#)).

America is also deeply divided on the issue of gender. Feminists tend to be Democrat, and therefore have a victimology perspective – that women are the victims of an evil and largely white) male patriarchal conspiracy ([Dunn, 2018, p. 1234](#)). Many news organizations have almost totally abandoned any pretense of journalistic integrity and instead focus purely on advocacy, resulting in increasingly inflammatory rhetoric and the hardening of political positions. Following are a few examples of the extreme hostility and invective expressed by major media progressives:

A scholar and author who frequently writes about politics for the mainstream media in the U.S. and Europe, said that all supporters of the former president “are by definition white nationalist terror supporters” and that “this evil, racist scourge must be eradicated from society.”

A global affairs analyst for CNN and columnist for the Washington Post, said cable companies like Comcast should treat Fox News and other conservative media outlets like “domestic terrorists... who radicalize people and set them on the path toward violence and sedition.” Such conservative outlets, he said, should be removed from television if they don’t start promoting “impartiality and accuracy” in their news. [This, of course, makes no mention of the hypocrisy of mainstream media and their encouragement for other violent acts, such as the trashing of much of the city of Minneapolis by rioters].

A PBS business affairs principal counsel said prior to the election that if Democrats were to win, the Department of Homeland Security should locate Republican voters, “take their children away,” and then should put the adults “in reeducation camps.”

The #MeToo Movement

Most of feminist ideology has thus become part of the DNA of Western society, so the next focus became “female empowerment” and the #MeToo movement. This was the essentially a repudiation of the inherent female traits of giving and service and replacing them with a culture of dignified self-centeredness. Much of this flowed from the social justice movement’s preoccupation with rights.

The #MeToo movement is about feminist desires for women to become like men. They are still interested in children and families but also want to have the supposed male prerogatives of money, power, and independence, and to have men retrained to become househusbands and childcare workers. The intersectionality teachings of critical theory portrays women as inherently victims, and if they are black and lesbian, the level of victimhood is magnified accordingly. #MeToo is thus a consecration of “self” and a justification for an increase in female demands. It is the justification for and the sanctification of selfishness.

A significant aspect of feminism in general and #MeToo in particular is the criminalization of sexism. Females have perpetually been the target of male teasing, banter, jokes, suggestive conversations, harassment, stalking, and rape, going from the mild to the extreme. Eliminating boorish, crude, coarse, and abusive male behavior is a good thing and females should be able to feel comfortable in all contexts, and especially in the work environment. In the past, females who reported harassment were ignored or even persecuted, but it is now routine for companies to require periodic training especially for managers, to identify and avoid harassment. However, there are concerns even among women that things have gone too far, and that society is out of balance. Again, there is a huge divide – support on the one hand and condemnation on the other. Supporters of #MeToo discuss how sexual violence has been

trivialized and reduced to “victim shaming” while detractors have denounced #MeToo as a mob-ruled witch hunt against men where justice becomes a “trial by media” and replaces the principle of innocent until proven guilty by the assumption of guilt and public shaming, with little or no chance of redemption. Many of the #MeToo detractors are female, but are typically older, leading to the accusation that they were either outdated or complicit. The boundaries of romantic behavior are subjective, and given the biological nature of gender, the direction of propositioning will continue to be from male to female. When and how is that appropriate? As women become “bitchier,” why would men want such women?

In allegations of harassment there is a stated requirement that the woman must be believed, even though she may have exaggerated or lied – untangling the “he said/she said” dialog can be difficult and in the meantime the man may well be professionally and legally destroyed. Men may therefore avoid women in the work environment or be reluctant to deal with them, and there is a concern among women that #MeToo attitudes will mean that females will not be considered for positions, especially if she is perceived as overly sensitive or hostile to males. There is also concern from women that the men in their lives – husbands, brothers, and sons – will be falsely accused and harassed by the legal system, that they will lose their careers and be stigmatized by overly aggressive feminist co-workers, bosses, or HR departments

([Borysenko, 2020](#); [North, 2018](#)). The psychologist Chloe Carmichael states:

Women are just as capable of deception and manipulative behavior as men. I have worked with women who openly discussed thoughts of making false allegations as a strategy for revenge, advancement, or both. I’ve also worked with women who acknowledged having made false allegations in college or other situations earlier in life. Often, they admit retrospectively that they were actually avoiding taking accountability for having been unfaithful in a romantic relationship, or for other reasons that felt irresistible at the time. Women can feel extreme shame around this awareness [because of their deception] ... I’ve had women tell me that back in college they felt suddenly transformed from being in hot water from consensual-yet-regrettable sex to feeling almost intoxicated with wishes of support and attention, as they became a cause célèbre with counselors, friends, and others rallying around them. Being so young, they felt

swept away as the allegations took on a momentum of their own. Even women post-college have discussed in my private chambers that they are 100 percent cognizant that they could easily push the buttons of power by claiming they felt sexually victimized, and some of them have openly contemplated doing so... I contend that the “believe all women” mentality is well-intentioned but ultimately misguided and harmful to both men and women. ([Carmichael, 2021](#))

It has long been a feminist contention that men are the abusers, but studies have shown that females can be equally violent. Female violence is typically not as damaging as male violence but may be more prevalent than violence by men.

Several studies have found that men and women initiate violence against an intimate partner, and approximately at the same rate... Among violent relationships nearly half were characterized by reciprocal violence. Women reported a significantly greater proportion of violent relationships that were reciprocal versus non-reciprocal than did men... Among relationships with non-reciprocal violence women were reported to be the perpetrator in a majority of the cases (71%) as reported by both women and men. ([Whitaker et al., 2007](#))

Additional pushback against the attempts of feminists to criminalize men was a 2006 study entitled “Transforming a Flawed Policy: A Call to Review Psychology and Science in Domestic Violence Research and Practice.” The study noted:

For over thirty years the public policy response to the problem of domestic violence has been defined by activists as the socially sanctioned dominance of women by men. This view of patriarchy as the sole cause of domestic violence is the underpinning for a policy/practice paradigm that has dominated the regulatory, legal, and policy discourse of the United States, Canada, and other countries. It has influenced legal policy including arrest priorities, prosecutorial decision making, and post arrest intervention. During the same period researchers from a variety of disciplines have repeatedly found that domestic violence is influenced by a much wider range of factors... In spite of numerous studies identifying... psychological risk features for both genders... many US states and Canadian provinces remain rigidly locked into outmoded and poorly informed policies... Any practice that could be construed as psychological treatment is prohibited... Simply put, the evidence for theoretical patriarchy as a cause of wife assault is scant and contradicted by numerous studies... Women are more likely to use severe violence against non-violent men than the converse. ([Dutton & Convo, 2006](#))

Feminists attempted to demonize the authors of the study, but other studies have echoed these conclusions:

Other common risk factors for violence, such as stress on the perpetrator... couple’s negative interaction... are systematically excluded as excuses. Any violence perpetrated

by a woman is dismissed as either non-existent, self-defensive, or insignificant. ([Rizza, 2009](#))

It remains to be seen if and how policies will change. Eugene Kanin from Purdue University conducted a nine-year study entitled “False Rape Allegations” which was published in 1994. The study revealed that 41% of all rape reports were confirmed as false and of these, 56% served as an alibi to cover consensual sex, 18% were for attention seeking and sympathy purposes, and 27% were used as a means for the woman to exact revenge on a man who later rejected her ([Kanin, 1994](#)).

An unmarried female, age 41, was in post-divorce counseling, and wanted more attention and sympathy from her counselor because she “liked him.” She fabricated a rape episode, so he took her to the police station and assisted her in making the charge. She could not back out because she would have to admit lying to him, but she admitted the false allegation before being polygraphed.

#MeToo has also given feminist women a platform to tear down men that they disagree with, such as what was done to the Supreme Court justice Bret Kavanaugh during his confirmation hearings. The 2006 Duke University lacrosse team rape case also illustrates this issue. Boys from the team unwisely hired several strippers to perform, and one of them, Crystal Magnum, alleged that she was raped in a bathroom by several male students. These allegations were magnified by the fact that she was black, and the boys were white, which added a racial element to the alleged crime. She was drunk, changed her story several times, and another girl who had been present disagreed with her, but the political possibilities in prosecuting this case were too tempting to resist. Mike Nifong, the district attorney, saw a chance to advance his career, so he gave numerous interviews to reporters and stated his opinion that a crime had occurred and that it was racially motivated. He therefore sought the ruin and imprisonment of the Duke students for his personal enrichment. When the evidence was considered, it was revealed that Magnum had made up the story, but no action was taken against her for the false allegations.

The Attorney General of North Carolina eventually characterized the case as “a tragic rush to accuse.” As suggested by the Camichael quote above, Magnum was apparently encouraged by the positive attention shown her and by the possibility of attacking a white institution, especially because she had previously made a mess of her life, characterized by drugs, alcohol, theft, and indiscriminate sex. Seven years later she was convicted of murdering her then boyfriend and sent to prison (Wikipedia – Duke lacrosse case).

Women supposedly won’t lie, and whoever speaks on their behalf against men is often assumed to speak the truth. Looking into the future, some suggest that this is leading to the removal of desire from relationships – toward societal androgyny. #MGTOW (men going their own way), the “manosphere,” and the “red pill” movements are male responses to #MeToo. Blogs and websites have been devoted to this with advisors and writers such as Rollo Tomassi advocating the abandonment of marriage on the grounds that in the context of contemporary Western society any form of male commitment will result in the man getting screwed over by the woman ([Tomassi, 2013](#)). Negative male responses to #MeToo are dismissed by feminists as pathetic male posturing and as evidence of the misogynist nature of patriarchy; #MeToo is automatically viewed as “good,” while reactions against it are automatically viewed as “bad.” This doesn’t mean that men will change – it means that there will be more male attitudes of “f* women and forget ‘em” and “use her and dump her.” The anger and frustration of men in general and white men in particular is increasing, as the social justice movement constantly blames them for the problems in contemporary society. #MeToo has thus revealed the rift between workplace and gender feminism; it is a recipe for an increase in war between the sexes. It increases the likelihood that there will be more male aggression against females rather than less.

The Gender Pay Gap

It is abundantly clear that an earnings gap between males and females has historically been the case in all civilizations throughout human history, as women have typically devoted their energies to home, children, and family, whereas men have typically pursued breadwinning. Therefore, in the past the bulk of wages (or the equivalent in commodities) was largely generated by male effort. In former times this was viewed as a natural characteristic of male-female differences and as a natural division of labor between men and women. But feminism has taken the earnings gap as proof of the evils of patriarchy, and at the same time has ignored factors that explain this discrepancy but don't fit their narrative.

It is often alleged that discrimination against females is routine, especially in higher-paying jobs and occupations ([Acar & Sümer, 2018](#); [Cuadrao et al., 2015](#); [Lips, 2013](#)), etc. However, investigators have stated that male executives are typically fair minded and want women to succeed ([Lipman, 2015](#)), and that equal pay for equal work essentially has universal support. It was assumed that if discrimination were removed, equal outcomes for men and women would result. But there continue to be significant differences in the types of jobs that women and men do, the pay they receive, the hours they work, the skills they acquire, and their patterns of employment. These differences are largely the result of inherent male and female traits, so that females are inherently more or less suitable than males for various jobs. As discussed above there is a “think manager, think male” paradigm due to the perceived need for aggressiveness, decisiveness, and the corresponding high stress levels for managerial positions, and that women would be less committed to “doing whatever the job takes” ([Fischbach et al., 2015](#)). Women may well experience a conflict between managerial/leadership roles and their role as women (which would presumably require female leaders to become and be perceived to some

degree as “male”). The role stress and the attributes required may make such jobs less appealing to women. ([Fischbach et al., 2015](#)). Even though this research agrees with former studies (that women may desire less career commitment than men), it is assumed that women should be able to function in these roles, regardless of their inherent suitability or lack thereof. The fact that most managers are male is therefore seen by feminists as discriminatory ([Acar & Sümer, 2018](#); [Cuadrao et al., 2015](#)), etc.

The 1963 Equal Pay Act made it illegal to for employers to pay unequal wages to men and women who perform substantially the same work. However, there was criticism that this legislation had loopholes and was not sufficiently enforced, so the Fair Pay Act was passed in 2009. The Paycheck Fairness Act, much more sweeping legislation (considered below), has been repeatedly introduced but has not yet passed congress. President Obama often stated that women earn seventy-seven cents for every dollar earned by men, and Hillary Clinton made “breaking the glass ceiling” a centerpiece in her unsuccessful presidential bid of 2016.

According to some economic studies, the gap has been declining in recent decades, but is still quantified at 82-89% ([Aragão, 2023](#)). Social justice advocates therefore claim that the economic system in America and capitalism in general is fundamentally unfair to women and should be replaced by a government-controlled socialistic economy that enforces equality.

When the gender pay gap is investigated in detail it becomes apparent that the reasons are primarily related to the abilities and choices made by both sexes. Men on average work longer hours, remain at jobs for longer periods of time, and are often employed in more hazardous, stressful, and male-oriented occupations (such as engineering), whereas women most often select jobs that are traditionally female (such as nursing), work shorter hours, and take more time off for family concerns. When married couples move and job changes are necessary, it is typically

the man who will continue working because of his larger current and potential earnings. Other considerations include the fact that men typically ask and negotiate for higher salaries and are more likely to leave firms for higher pay elsewhere. In other words, men tend to maximize their earning potential much more so than women ([Beblo & Görges, 2018](#); [Miller, 2017](#); [Tinsley et al., 2014](#)), etc.

Nevertheless, there are crosscurrents. Since 2009, wives in one-third of dual-income households earned more than their husbands, and childless women between the ages of 22 and 30 earned more than their male colleagues in some American cities ([Tinsley et al., 2014](#)). The pay gap has indeed narrowed ([Aragão, 2023](#)). Despite this narrowing there is substantial evidence that a more traditional view of gender roles still predominates even as the pay gap shrinks. Tinsley, et al, studied what they term as “gender determinism – GD”, which they define as the extent to which an individual believes that gender categories dictate characteristics, which is another way of stating the degree to which an individual believes that gender is primarily biological rather than environmental. They concluded that: 1) women, more than men, prefer their spouses to be the primary breadwinner, even women with lower GD; and 2) despite differences in GD, traditional gender norms are persistent. They also mentioned other studies in which wives who outearned their husbands had a greater incidence of mental and sexual health problems, and where couples were more likely to divorce when the wife earned more than the husband ([Tinsley et al., 2014](#)).

It has long been known that there is a disparity between the genders regarding the time spent and the relative importance of earning money. For men this is typically a major focus in life, whereas women have tended to treat the care of children and family as being of more importance. While money is important to women, especially if the survival her family is at stake,

seeking it does not have the same motivating influence as it does for men, and women in general are less entrepreneurial ([Moir & Jessel, 1991](#)). Feminists would ascribe this difference to the supposedly negative consequence of patriarchy, and therefore cry discrimination. But results completely contrary to feminist dogma are seen when international studies are considered. For example, the “glass ceiling” is larger in feminist Sweden than in America, and there is evidence that the glass ceiling is actually created by feminist policies there ([Hakim, 2007](#)). There is little evidence that egalitarian social policies reduce the pay gap between men and women (for example, Portugal and Spain have smaller pay gaps than Britain and Germany). Case studies of desegregated occupations (employing roughly equal numbers of men and women) where there is no sex (or race) discrimination due to continuing labor shortages, demonstrate that sex discrimination is no longer the main cause of the pay gap, which is due instead to gender differences in employment patterns and job choices ([Hakim, 2007](#)). The gender pay gap is thus a myth ([Dunn, 2018](#); [Ketter, 2015](#); [Rosen, 2013](#)), etc.

Countries that are or were heavily socialistic (Russia, China, East Germany, etc.) have often required women to work, have placed hard limits on earnings, and dictated the jobs that people would perform. In those countries there was little or no gender pay gap. However, in virtually all cases extreme socialism has collapsed and has been replaced by more capitalistic systems, with interesting impacts on the gender pay gap. Beblo, et al, studied the economic impact of the reunification of Germany following the fall of the Berlin Wall in 1989. They reported that, as expected, the gender pay gap was minimal under communist rule, even though the overall standard of living was far below that of West Germany. But after reunification, female employment fell because women exercised their new-found freedom to work less and spend more time with children and family. The gender pay gap in East Germany is also widening and

approaching that of West Germany ([Beblo & Görge, 2018](#)). In other words, when given the choice, large numbers of East German women returned to a more traditional gender role paradigm, in spite of long-standing communist propaganda and practice that had attempted to re-educate them. An even more significant study was done in China. Using statistics taken from demographic surveys, the attributes contributing to the “subjective well-being” (SWB) of Chinese women were studied, and in particular, the impact of the growing economic freedom and prosperity following the death of Mao Tse-Tung and the relaxation of socialist totalitarian control. Other studies had previously found that there is a growing traditionalization, even though most urban Chinese women have jobs. Some women earn more than men, but married women in general have tended to return more to home life. The biggest complaint of those women is not the fact that they earn less, or that they spend more time in homemaking activities; rather it is the husband is not fulfilling his breadwinning role. This study concluded that for Chinese women: 1) SWB increased by employment; 2) SWB increased as her husband’s income and status grew; 3) SWB decreased as the percentage of her earnings rose in relation to total family earnings; 4) marriage was generally more important than job or income, and was a large component of SWB for women. Gender norms are deeply rooted for both men and women and according to the study are “profoundly internalized” ([Chen, 2018](#)).

Other studies have reached similar conclusions – most women prefer economic dependence on men, and increasing educational attainment among women has had remarkably little effect on the preference of women for hypergamy – the practice of women “marrying up” if they can – to a higher-earning male spouse ([Hakim, 2007](#)). Ironically, the sex segregation of occupations is lower in China, and is greater in the Scandinavian countries than in America or

western Europe. In Sweden, for example, three-quarters of employed men work in the private sector, while two-thirds of employed women work in the public sector ([Hakim, 2007](#)).

The American Association of University Women (AAUW), a feminist organization which had previously published the 23% differential quoted by President Obama, later recalculated their numbers controlling for the differences mentioned above, and then stated that the gap was 6.6%. However, even those computations have been challenged by analysts who point out that this figure was generated by the overly broad job classification scheme used, which – for example – would allow the pay of a male lawyer to be compared to a female librarian. Therefore, the gender pay gap is minimal if it exists at all ([Sommers, 2012](#)). But informal surveys of young college women reveal that they continue to believe the claimed 23% gender pay gap ([Lips, 2016](#)), despite it being shown as a feminist lie.

Assuming that a gender pay gap exists, there are a number of possible solutions of varying severity and impact, as follows:

1. The Paycheck Fairness Act. This puts the onus on companies to identify discrimination by requiring them to report employee pay to a government commission, which would then investigate any instances where male pay exceeded that of females. It requires that employers prove that a pay differential favoring males is due to a factor other than gender, and that it must be consistent with business necessity. The legislation has been repeatedly introduced since 2009, but it has been consistently rejected and criticized as overly vague, opening the way for endless lawsuits and a huge increase in bureaucracy ([Lipman, 2015](#); [Lips, 2016](#)).
2. Companies could be mandated to provide much longer parental leaves for both mothers and fathers. This is already a policy of many companies for females, but less so for males. To be sure, it could provide a benefit to parents as well as possibly getting fathers more involved with their children, but it's unclear that it would have any impact on the gender pay gap ([Sommers, 2012](#)).
3. Government could provide subsidized childcare or require companies to do so. This could potentially have an impact on reducing female time off but would be very expensive on a national level ([Sommers, 2012](#)). However, there are several studies which have independently concluded that family-friendly employment policies in countries such as Sweden do not reduce the pay gap or solve work-family conflicts, and family-friendly

policies appear to be a cause of the pay gap and of segregation in the workforce, as indicated above ([Hakim, 2007](#)). Maternity leave rights have made little or no difference to mothers' decisions to return to work after childbirth, both in countries where these policies are used, such as Britain, and in countries where they are rarely used, such as Spain ([Hakim, 2007](#)).

4. Female-oriented jobs could arbitrarily be compensated at a higher rate, and/or the US government could move toward a more socialized, controlled, and "equalized" economy. That would require much more government taxation and control. Furthermore, it would be perceived by many as inherently unfair because companies would be arbitrarily required pay individuals on the basis of their sex. It would also lead to efforts to eliminate female jobs.
5. Women should avoid marriage. If married, women should avoid having children and/or get divorced ([Aragão, 2023](#)).

Queer Theory

Second wave feminism prepared the ground first for the acceptance of homosexuality, then for natural sexual aberrations, and most recently for transgenderism. The third wave of feminism seeks to move beyond the binary character of Beauvoir toward her hopes for an "indefinitely open future" of sexual identities. Feminist predecessors were therefore insufficiently radical because they did not reject the binary character of gender and instead just encouraged supposedly "immanent" women to perform more like "transcendent" men. The goal is to move "beyond gender" and to "undo gender." This is characterized by scholars such as Judith Butler, who extended feminism to include advocacy for transgender rights. In their focus on sisterhood that bound the feminist movement together, feminists formerly opposed the inclusion of those who dressed in drag, queer people (homosexuals), the butch (masculine lesbians), the femme (feminine lesbians), and transgender individuals. But now all of these must be included; feminism must be widened to include all forms of queerness and be transformed into the LBGTQ+ movement. Butler therefore advocated a more developed form of feminism that includes queer theory, which shows us how the norms of reality should be questioned and

how new modes of reality can become institutionalized, which was a core desire of feminism all along. Butler's new "legitimizing lexicon for gender complexity [must be developed in] law, psychiatry, and society" is a form of Newspeak, like the re-definition of misogyny. The next step is to move beyond second-wave feminists because the ground assaulted by them has been won, and new fields of conquest can be opened. In Butler's words, transgender activists are "carrying on the legacy of Simone de Beauvoir: if one is not born a woman, but rather becomes one, then becoming is the vehicle for gender itself" ([Butler, 2004](#)).

John Money and others who sought to perform gender reassignment surgeries considered themselves as breaking new ground, but to Butler, they were merely reinforcing society's tendency to view people as either women or men. Butler thinks that these surgeries call for "a serious and increasingly popular critique of idealized gender dimorphism within the transsexual movement itself," one that will lead to a world in which "mixed genital attributes might be accepted and loved without having to transform them into a more socially coherent or normative notion of gender" ([Butler, 2004](#)).

Transgender activism needs the help of a science – or more accurately, the deconstruction of science – to understand that gender dysphoria, like guilt, is a psychological myth. There is thus no need for a gender incongruent individual to suffer from dysphoria because he/she is perfectly normal. People may submit to a diagnosis of gender dysphoria "ironically or facetiously" to obtain the necessary health care, but at the same time reject any implication that dysphoria is a pathology to be corrected. Kids who are experiencing gender confusion should not be "cured" – instead their inner feelings should be affirmed and celebrated. Such children should demand that their schools and communities recognize and affirm their queerness. According to Butler, gender is an imposition, an act of "pseudo-violence" which has been integrated into our

language and expectations. Since there supposedly is no real and natural gender, there also is no natural or proper expression for sexuality. Facilities such as public restrooms and showering are based on a binary conception of gender, and therefore serve as instruments of oppression for those who do not conform to society's norms.

Violence emerges from a profound desire to keep the order of binary gender to appear natural or necessary, to make of it a structure, either natural or cultural or both, which no human being can oppose, and still remain human. ([Butler, 2004](#))

Dichotomies in the sexual world such as gay/straight and masculine/feminine are thus arbitrary products of our bourgeois sexual regime. Butler especially relied on the ideas of the French philosopher Michel Foucault who sought to expose political power as a manifestation of our ideas of truth, reality, and language, and to reinforce the dominant group's vision of life as normal. Society is said to exert this power subtly by the construction of "truth" and "reality," thereby controlling what it means to be human. According to Foucault, many elements of society, from religious teaching to popular culture, encourage people to engage in traditional male-female relationships, so these elements must be exposed as artificial to allow for an open and queer future to arise that is free of all constraints ([Foucault, 1976](#)).

The supposed female identity crisis is thus extended beyond women, and the emphasis is now on queer theory, homosexual advocacy, and transgender rights. Susan Stryker, another transgender advocate, sees the current transgender scholarship as "part of a broader queer intellectual movement." Queer theory holds that all gender and sexuality is socially constructed and hence mutable, and that celebrating queer lifestyles will undermine fixed notions of personal identity and rigid distinctions of sexuality. Especially prominent is criticism of society for pigeonholing individuals into binary male and female categories; liberation consists of moving beyond the binary and beyond normal and celebrating those whose self-conception transcends supposedly normal conceptions of gender, whether or not they seek to modify their bodies to

accommodate this self-conception. Leslie Feinberg states that the discrimination suffered by the transgendered is an oppression without a name because it is so engrained in culture as to appear natural ([Feinberg, 1992](#)). Another advocate is Joan Hedrick:

Queer is...whatever is at odds with the normal, the legitimate, the dominant. There is nothing in particular to which it necessarily refers. It is an identity without an essence. ([Halpern, 2011](#))

A new politics must “create a world in which those who understand their gender and their desire to be non-normative can live and thrive not only without the threat of violence from the outside but without the pervasive sense of their own unreality, which can lead to suicide or a suicidal life” ([Butler, 2004, pp. 64-65](#)). This process is now well underway in public schools. For example, a parent enrolled his five-year-old in Minnesota’s Nova Classical Academy. The child, according to the parent, thought of himself as a boy who likes “girl things.” The parent demanded that the school support the non-gender-conforming student with changes in curriculum and policies (among many other things), and the school complied under legal and public pressure ([Kersten, 2016](#)). These types of battles are now continually being fought across America.

There is no better way of extending the sexual revolution imagined by second-wave feminists than by shaking confidence in the very idea of man and woman. Transgender theories are thus the latest iteration of the feminist goal of a sexual revolution that includes abolition of male supremacy toward the cultivation of androgyny, elimination of family, and celebration of every form of sexual experience ([Yenor, 2017](#)). The great project of the transgender movement is to eradicate the distinctions of the male and female, transcend the limitations established by God and nature, and connect the personal struggles of trans individuals, and by extension the entire social justice movement, to radicalize society.

Freedom from society’s impositions or constructions is not enough. The future of transgender liberation is that “a thousand genders will bloom because the public will supposedly

recognize the legitimacy, even the beauty, of all gender variations” ([Stryker, 2006, pp. 3-7](#)). In the words of the last sentence from George Orwell’s classic *1984*, “He loved Big Brother,” society must be brought to the place where they love the new androgynist god/goddess of LGBTQ+.

Summary of Third-Wave Feminism

The third wave of feminism seems to be milder in some ways than the second, in that direct criticism of mothers, motherhood, and the family has become more subtle. But it is no less damaging and destructive, because gender feminism has become absorbed into the American soul and has developed in demands for supporting queer ideology. A recent study reveals the impact of feminism ideologies on young women; they report pressure to conform to male behavior and male norms ([Jackson & Bussey, 2020](#)).

Understanding the above background of feminism’s third wave, it becomes easy to see why we are experiencing the increased levels of gender despair and confusion that have been termed “Rapid Onset Gender Dysphoria” as discussed above. Third-wave feminism is not only an academic mental illness, but a deep-seated societal pollution that is pathologizing the Western world. Given the fact that it has penetrated academia and politics, it has huge amounts of taxpayer money and other resources to advertise, implement, and enforce its ideas and policies.

The Fourth Wave – Critical Theory and Intersectionality

The fourth wave of feminism is simply a continuation of the third wave #MeToo movement with the emphasis on empowering women through the increased visibility and societal awareness of Critical Theory (CT) and Intersectionality. CT is a philosophy that sees societal and political reality through the lens of conflict between social classes where one side

wins and the other loses. Based on the writings of Karl Marx, it essentially divides people into two categories, the oppressors and the oppressed ([Marx & Engels, 1848](#)). The Marxist disciple Antonio Gramsci further developed this concept and termed it “cultural hegemony.” He wrote that “a complex interlocking of political, social, and cultural forces” is employed by oppressors, and they maintain control not only through coercion but also through the voluntary consent of the oppressed to maintain peace and the status quo. ([Felluga, 2015, pp. 127-128](#)). Marx himself was primarily concerned with economics, and with establishing socialism to replace capitalism, but as socialistic societies imploded and that effort repeatedly failed, others sought to modify Marx’s ideas and apply them to social issues. Perhaps the most well-known was the Frankfurt School (the Institute for Social Research in Frankfurt, Germany), a group who were concerned with issues causing inequality. They believed that the current social reality was broken and applied the oppressor/oppressed paradigm as the only valid way of viewing social issues. ([Baucham, 2022, pp. xiii-xiv](#)).

CT is also based on postmodern philosophy in which truth is relative and can be recast as individual desires – I have “my truth” and you have “your truth.” A quote from CT literature explains this: “An approach based on critical theory calls into question that objectivity is desirable or even possible” ([Sensoy & DiAngelo, 2017, p. 29](#)). CT is thus a worldview and a religious belief system that rejects any other perspective and insulates its adherents from guilt about the negative consequences of their ideas ([Baucham, 2022](#)). Regardless of a person’s philosophical position they typically think that other views are wrong, but CT takes this one step further, in that other views should not even exist. American society is thus becoming increasingly polarized; the sides are unwilling to even hear each other.

CT as applied to racial issues became known as Critical Race Theory (CRT) which holds that systemic racism is inherent in the law and legal institutions of the United States, and that American culture is based on and seeks to maintain social, economic, and political inequalities. True to its roots in Marxism, CRT divides people into two categories based only on their gender and skin color: the oppressors (white males) and the oppressed (everyone else). CRT views American society as a hierarchical structure of power and privilege created by white males and designed to oppress blacks and females. Racism has thus come to be defined as “systemic white privilege” rather than as an attitude held by some individuals. CRT demonizes white people, and especially white males as inherently and incorrigibly racist, as well as asserting that no one else is racist and there is no such thing as anti-white racism. CRT also asserts “white supremacy” and “white privilege” – that having white skin automatically means that one has privileges denied to non-whites, and that white people should be continually held guilty for their skin color, and white males for their gender. ([McIntosh, 1989](#)). This inverts visions of a just society where, in the words of Martin Luther King, “people will not be judged by the color of their skin, but by the content of their character.” ([King, 1963](#)). CT is therefore incompatible with the Declaration of Independence and the U.S. Constitution.

CT as applied to gender and LGBTQ+ issues is known as Critical Social Theory (CST) and has the same characteristics with the addition of the idea of “intersectionality.” This seeks to promote victimology and measure the level of discrimination against a person by the patriarchal system as the intersection of race, sex, and sexual orientation. So, if an individual is black, female, and lesbian she suffers from three intersecting layers of oppression. CST holds that only victims of oppression are allowed to tell their stories, and the more levels of oppression an individual is experiencing, the more valid and believable their stories are. White supremacy in

action has supposedly led to “white fragility” where whites are said to experience anxiety and discomfort from their innate superiority and entitlement. CT closes the loop for its adherents to shut off any debate by explaining that when a white male denies that he is racist, he is just exposing his white fragility ([DiAngelo, 2011](#)). Gender feminism uses the same concepts and applies them to the male-female dynamic.

Feminism is thus identified and associated with anti-racism, and social justice advocates speak of a unification with all elements of social justice – race, gender, and transgender. As before, there is a ceaseless striving for equity, the eventual superiority of women, and the associated elimination of gender norms, sexism, and the objectification of women. LGBTQ+ also seeks equity and superiority through the gay pride movement.

I feel that “man-hating” is an honorable and viable political act, that the oppressed have a right to class-hatred against the class that is oppressing them. (Robin Morgan, Ms. Magazine Editor)

Probably the only place where a man can feel really secure is in a maximum-security prison, except for the imminent threat of release. (Germaine Greer)

The proportion of men must be reduced to and maintained at approximately 10% of the human race. (Sally Miller Gearhart, *The Future – If There Is One – Is Female*)

If life is to survive on this planet, there must be a decontamination of the Earth. I think this will be accompanied by an evolutionary process that will result in a drastic reduction of the population of males. (Mary Daly)

I believe that women have a capacity for understanding and compassion which man structurally does not have, does not have it because he cannot have it. He’s just incapable of it. (Barbara Jordan, former Congresswoman)

We are taught, encouraged, molded by, and lulled into accepting a range of false notions about the family. As a source of some of our most profound experiences, it continues to be such an integral part of our emotional lives that it appears beyond criticism. Yet hiding from the truth of family life leaves women and children vulnerable. (Canadian Panel on Violence Against Women)

White Privilege, anti-whiteness, and anti-masculinity are constantly being pushed by the left. For example, “White people need to be eradicated” ([Silverstein, 2021](#)), and “I don't think

about men. I really don't care about them. I'm concerned with women's capacities" ([Daly, 1990](#)).

When white men characterize this as simply leftist and feminist extreme bias and mendacity, they are typically accused of being "white supremacists." Therefore, it seems to require non-whites to clarify the situation and expose the fallacies of the social justice movement, e.g., ([Arora, 2020](#); [Baucham, 2022](#); [Williams, 2020](#)). Arora, a Sikh Indian, makes the following points:

- Whatever "systemic racism" exists in America appears to be incredibly ineffectual, or even nonexistent, given the multitude of groups who consistently eclipse whites.
- Rising from poverty to economic prosperity is common for immigrants from all backgrounds in America. For example, after the communist takeover of Cuba in 1959, many refugees fled to America, leaving most of their wealth behind and having to start from the bottom. But by 1990, second-generation Cuban Americans were twice as likely to earn a high salary of than non-Hispanic whites in the United States.
- Whites are the majority in Canada and America, and more white people live in poverty or are incarcerated than any other racial group. Twice as many American whites live in poverty than blacks.
- Several minority groups substantially out-earn whites, including Pakistani Americans, Lebanese Americans, South African Americans, Filipino Americans, Sri Lankan Americans and Iranian Americans (the group the author belongs to is the highest-earning ethnic group with almost double the household median income of whites). Several black immigrant groups such as Nigerians, Barbadians, Ghanaians and Trinidadians and Tobagonians have a median household income well above the American average. Ghanaian Americans earn more than several white groups such as Dutch Americans, French Americans, Polish Americans, British Americans and Russian Americans. Do Ghanaians have some kind of sub-Saharan African privilege?
- Nigerian Americans are one of the most educated groups in America. Though they make up less than 1% of the black population in America, nearly 25% of the black student body at Harvard Business School in 2013 consisted of Nigerians. In post-bachelor education, 61% of Nigerian Americans over the age of 25 hold a graduate degree compared to only 32% for the US-born population.
- The economic problem in America is not whiteness – it is the results of feministic influences (divorce, fatherlessness, and female-headed households). Forty-one percent of children born to single mothers grow up in poverty whereas only 8% of children living in married-couple families are impoverished. The poverty rate among two-parent black families is only 7.5%, compared to 11% among whites as a whole and 22% among whites

in single-parent homes. Since 1994 the poverty rate among married black Americans has been consistently lower than the white poverty rate.

- Suicide rates are disproportionately high among whites – in 2018 they had the highest suicide rate of 16.03 per 100,000. Whites are dying faster than they are being born in a majority of US states – in large part due to high rates of substance abuse and suicide. In comparison, black Americans had a suicide rate less than half of whites (6.96) and Asian Americans/Pacific Islanders had the lowest rate of 6.88 per 100,000. In this context, do blacks and Asians have some kind of unmerited “privilege” they must atone for?

The bottom line is that we need more patriarchy – more responsible males, both white and non-white, rather than less of it.

The Fifth Wave – Empowerment

Fifth wave feminism is also a continuation of what came before with more of a breakdown in focus and consistency, reflecting the many crosscurrents in Western society and the individualism of America. It is defined in a variety of ways depending on the spokesperson. As discussed above, the face of current feminism is typified by femvertising, and by feminist advocates in media, government, and education. As the women’s movement expanded and deepened, the emphasis has periodically softened and then re-hardened with the #MeToo movement. The initial anti-male bra-burners are long out of vogue and feminists may say publicly that “we don’t reject men or marriage.” Like politicians who routinely change their image to convince voters, some feminists are seeking a more centrist appeal in public dialog, such as Betty Friedan, who later reversed her position and declared herself in favor of the nuclear family. However, other feminists such as Hillary Rodham Clinton in her presidential bid re-emphasized gender feminism. Her major policy initiative was “breaking the glass ceiling” and closing the gender pay gap. Her desire was to “remold society by redefining what it means to be a human being in the new millennium;” which was newspeak for her long-held agenda of a

socialist utopia free of traditional sex roles: “family, marriage, slavery, and the Indian reservation system are examples of arrangements which deprive people of rights” ([Clinton, 1973](#)).

Here are some feminist quotes indicating that the hatred of both men and traditional women among gender feminists is alive and well:

Since marriage constitutes slavery for women, it is clear that the women’s movement must concentrate on attacking this institution. Freedom for women cannot be won without the abolition of marriage. (Sheila Cronin, leader of NOW)

The nuclear family must be destroyed... Whatever its ultimate meaning, the break-up of families now is an objectively revolutionary process. (Linda Gordon)

The institution of sexual intercourse is anti-feminist. (Ti-Grace Atkinson)

When a woman reaches orgasm with a man she is only collaborating with the patriarchal system, eroticizing her own oppression. (Sheila Jeffrys)

Men who are unjustly accused of rape [and sent to prison] can sometimes gain from the experience. (Catherine Comins)

All heterosexual intercourse is rape because women, as a group, are not strong enough to give meaningful consent. (Catherine MacKinnon)

And if the professional rapist is to be separated from the average dominant heterosexual male, it may be mainly a quantitative difference. (Susan Griffin, *Rape: The All-American Crime*)

As long as some men use physical force to subjugate females, all men need not. The knowledge that some men do suffices to threaten all women. He can beat or kill the woman he claims to love; he can rape women...he can sexually molest his daughters... THE VAST MAJORITY OF MEN IN THE WORLD DO ONE OR MORE OF THE ABOVE. (Marilyn French)

I do want to be able to explain to a 9-year-old boy in terms he will understand why I think it’s OK for girls to wear shirts that revel in their superiority over boys. (Treena Shapiro)

Rape exists any time sexual intercourse occurs when it is not initiated by the woman. (Robin Morgan, Ms. Magazine Editor)

It is clear that feministic attempts to destroy marriage have had extensive effects in the western world, with a growing consensus among family scholars that the institution of marriage is being “deinstitutionalized” across social groups. The norm to marry is now weak and conditional, and marriage is declining as a relationship choice ([Robbins et al., 2022](#)).

Feminism and Social Pathologies

As discussed above, there is a fundamental disagreement in Western culture as to whether or not a sacred order exists, so it is fruitless to argue that “feminism is wrong” or “feminism is right.” We have long since passed the point of any morality-based arguments so it will be evaluated on the basis of results and outcomes. Understanding the philosophical background and history of gender feminism may well lead one into revulsion with its concepts, but the real question in evaluating its goodness or badness is the effects it has had on society.

The legacy of workplace feminism is that it created new roles and opportunities for women, but the legacy of gender feminism is the creation of social pathologies. These pathologies were not accidental, but rather caused by deliberate societal and governmental policies.

Relational Dissatisfaction and Divorce

In their drive for total equality and female supremacy feminists have sought to empower women and disempower men, so under their influence Western society is generating more aggression in females ([Leschied & Anne, 2004](#)). But given the fact that male-female differences are immutable, the typical male reaction to feminism is not to become gentler, more feminine, or more caring; it has instead generated more coarseness and wariness in men, as well as creating more insecure and passive-aggressive males who lash out at women. The result is that the sexes are increasingly dissatisfied with each other. There are now many defiant females who reason, “Maybe Mom submitted to Dad, but I’ll be damned if I will submit to any man,” as well as many irritated males who reason, “If a woman doesn’t act like a real woman, I’ll be damned if I’m

going to treat her like one.” Therefore, women say, “Where are the real men?” and men say, “Where are the real women?”

Steven Goldberg remarked that masculinity is currently treated like sex in Victorian England. As the Victorian suppression of sex led to “lurid flowers in secret gardens” so the denial of masculinity in modern life perverts natural male aggression into pathologic directions – toward violence, pornography, fighting at sports events, the exploitation of women, and a quest for potency through drugs and alcohol. Like women watching romantic soap operas, men feed on the masculinity of contemporary heroes – football players, boxers, rock stars, entrepreneurs, and macho actors. The result is an America where male aggression is denied and disparaged, but at the same time society is completely preoccupied with it – with muscles, guns, and macho images such as Rambo, Conan the Barbarian, Rocky, the Terminator, MMA octagon fighters, and many others. Public life now revolves around male violence – terrorists, hijackers, serial rapists, killers, and school shootings.

The single man. An image of freedom and power. A man on horseback, riding into the sunset with his gun. The town and its women would never be the same, but the man just moves on... The hero of the film and television drama: cool, violent, sensuous, free. The American dream, the superstar. ([Gilder, 1986, p. 61](#))

While selfishness is nothing new, it has metastasized and become the gospel preached by the social justice and women’s movements. By generating antipathy toward men, feminism provides intellectual support and a rationale for selfishness which is often seen as a virtue and is viewed as a form of self-protection. Some would say, “What’s wrong with selfishness – why shouldn’t we just do what we want?” People will always, in general, do just what they want, but the point is that when selfishness is upheld as a goal, the result is that we get more of it; society becomes filled with immature, narcissistic individuals who never reach the benefits of maturity. Therefore, things such as community, love, romance, loyalty, long-term relationships,

responsible parenting, and – most significantly – male-female intimacy, will suffer, because all of them require self-sacrifice and maturity. Couples grow unhappy with each other, become distant and uninvolved, start having affairs, get divorced, spend their money on lawyers, the man leaves, the woman stays with the kids, and finally they hook up with or marry someone else and the whole process begins again.

Men may seem to be macho and tough but are often fragile on the inside. Not understanding this fragility, women with their better verbal skills can easily tear a man down by criticism and disrespect. As the disrespect continues, he begins to abandon the relationship, first by un-involvement and pornography and eventually by leaving. In either case he is typically the one who is blamed, so women may not realize or admit their own culpability and remain in denial.

How men feel about feminist women:

- Most men have mixed feelings about dominant women. Initially and from a distance they are viewed as a challenge and as an adventure. Men tend to see them in competitive terms – like they would another man – rather than in relational terms as they would view a more submissive woman. Up close and in a long-term relationship however, men often tire of and resent assertive women and seek to distance themselves. This may take the form of aggression and power struggles, followed by passivity, detachment, non-involvement, and eventual abandonment. Working with such a woman at arms-length in a job setting may be fine, but it can be corrosive in a marriage relationship, where the relationship's success depends on long-term care and love.
- Most men feel empowered and sexually stimulated by submissive women and are inclined to want to protect and provide for them, as well as have them sexually. It is important to note that a submissive woman may also be very intelligent, vivacious, and self-reliant. The key difference between her and the dominant woman is in her giving spirit, and willingness to yield to the man's leadership.

How women feel about passive-aggressive men:

- Most women feel romantically repelled in varying degrees by passive or less competent men, who are not “man enough” to warrant their interest. This is expressed in the quote: “Women are not satisfied – they want men, but all they find are little boys” which is what gender feminism is producing. A woman will also lose respect for an unfeeling, uncaring

man even if he is dominant. She may stay with the relationship, but only from fear or from a sense of duty.

- Most women feel attracted to a man who is both strong and loving. What sustains their attraction over the long-term is a man who is sensitive to her needs and makes her feel special, as well as being masculine. Women in general are hypergamous – attracted to men who are superior in strength, intellectual ability, and earning power.

Given the fact that females in general are still interested in traditional female pursuits, many women have balked at, or only partially absorbed the feminist message.

Far from being a movement for the greater self-realization of women, as it professed to be, feminism was the very negation of femaleness. Although hostile to men and hostile to children, it was at the bottom most hostile to women. It bade women commit suicide as women and attempt to live as men... its objective is the achievement of maleness by the female... In so far as it was attained, it spelled only vast individual suffering for women as well as men.”

Women, in the feminist view, are insufficiently feminine to find satisfaction in rearing their own children, but too feminine to compete on an equal basis with men. Thus, having taken women out of their homes and settled them in the workplace, feminists sought to reconstruct workplaces to create “feminist playpens” that are conducive to female qualities of sensitivity, care, and empathy... The qualities that are the most likely to make women good mothers are thus redeployed away from their own children and into workplaces that must be restructured to accommodate them. The irony is twofold. Children – the ones who could benefit most from the attentions of their own mothers – are deprived of those attentions... Moreover, the occupations... either do not require [feminine qualities] for optimal job performance (often such qualities are not conducive to professional success) or were long ago recognized as women’s occupations. ([Graglia, 1998, p. 91](#))

Groping and date sex have become problems in high schools and on college campuses (and now even at some grammar and middle schools) because of the increase in sexual activity, the lowering of standards, the scorn heaped on virginity, and the confusion over roles and the appropriateness of casual sex. Females were once much more confident in saying “no” and cooling the passions of ardent males, because they understood that casual sex was not in their best interest. In essence, they understood that girls are fundamentally different from boys, and that each sex has a different agenda. As Carolyn Graglia puts it,

Today's well-educated professional women, who are embarrassed to defend the unsophisticated concepts of virginity and chastity, are less competent to control men's sexual advances than high school girls were in the 1940s. ([Graglia, 1998, p. 170](#))

This situation, largely brought on by feministic influences, has resulted in the passage of extensive sexual harassment legislation as a desperate attempt to reassert some degree of female control over male desires in casual relationships. In effect, a whole new body of law has been created to criminalize seduction. Laws can penalize and criminalize behavior after the fact, but in the heat of the moment, they often have little influence. Kids have been taught in sex ed classes that they are going to do it anyway, and premarital sex is fine as long as you are "ready" for it.

No-fault divorce laws have made it much easier to leave a partner and move on. This was first enacted in California by then-Governor Ronald Reagan in 1969 – he later referred to it as one of the biggest mistakes of his political life ([Wilcox, 2009](#)). Nevertheless, in the next 15 years almost every state in the U.S. followed suit, and from 1960 to 1980, the divorce rate more than doubled – from 9.2 divorces per 1,000 married women to 22.6 divorces per 1,000 married women. The result was that the freedom desired by feminists backfires on women when their husbands exercise the same freedom and trade them in for younger, sexier models. Feminists fought very hard for this legislation that eliminated traditional protections for married women. In a classic case of creating a problem in order to mandate a solution, after the no-fault laws were in place, feminists informed women, "Now you had better get a real career, because there's nothing to stop your husband from dumping you for some other female." Many girls still have a princess fantasy of a lifetime love relationship and living "happily ever after" with her prince, but in today's world that is increasingly rare – feminism kills chivalry.

A survey of women that had left the work force to raise children disclosed that only a few respondents saw the lack of extra income as a major disadvantage. The most frequently mentioned issue mentioned was the lack of respect from society in general. "I get tired of people ranking motherhood so low," stated one woman. "We need credibility for making our families a priority and caring for our own children." ([Iscoe & Welch, 1992](#))

Research on the effects of divorce confirms common sense thinking. In the short-term, men may be more vulnerable to mental problems; men have greater health gains from marriage and divorce puts men at a higher risk of health declines, substance abuse, and mortality. Life satisfaction is lower for divorced men. Women tend to be more aware of marital problems and may make more efforts to hold a marriage together but are also more likely to initiate divorce when they feel that the situation is hopeless. However, in the medium and long-term, women are more affected by losses in income and associated increases in their risk of poverty. The likelihood of divorced women remarrying is also lower than men, and children are usually assigned to the woman, so long-term single parenting is more likely. Thus, the strain of divorce on men is transient, whereas on women it is chronic ([Leopold, 2018](#)). Divorce also has negative effects on children. Here is one man's testimony of how divorce affected him as a child:

I was deeply influenced by my parents' divorce which took place when I was eight. I became a terrible student who wouldn't grow up, spending most of my time angering teachers and leading petty class revolts. A little voice whispered in my ear, "Why grow up when this is what is in store for you?" I became a young cynic who believed that nothing in life worked. The world seemed to be made of incongruous pieces of a broken puzzle that never really fit... One of the consequences of being a child of divorce is no longer feeling special. ([Boteach, 1999, p. 2](#))

Every human society has socially enforced rules of what constitutes appropriate masculine and feminine behavior, and these rules or gender role norms have a profound impact on people's lives. Sweden is one of the most gender-equal societies worldwide due to its history of socialism under Olaf Palme and others, so studies have investigated the perceptions of Swedish women and their conformity to feminine norms. Overall, Swedish women displayed more feminist conformity than other nations with the largest difference in sexual fidelity (Sweden has the highest levels of out-of-wedlock births in the world along with the associated problems). The study found that Swedish women are torn between the perceived need for beauty

and investing in their appearance, and the risk of being viewed as non-equal when doing so. In other words, despite the fact that traditional gender roles are less pronounced in Sweden, gender role conformity is still a significant issue ([Kling et al., 2017](#)).

Some believe that the Scandinavian countries of Finland, Denmark, Sweden, and Norway are the happiest in the world, and past surveys have indicated that ([Nikel, 2022](#)). The productivity of the population, the past lack of minorities, and the capitalistic underpinnings of Scandinavian socialism have kept the numbers up. Those countries still have a degree national honor which has been trashed in America by the social justice movement. But under the hood is a different picture. This author has Danish ancestry, still has family there, and has traveled to Denmark frequently; the effects of divorce and depression are evident and widespread, and have also been noted by others, e.g., ([Erlangsen et al., 2023](#)). In Sweden the marriage rate fell to the lowest level ever recorded in world demographic data, the illegitimacy rate skyrocketed, and the abortion rate to similar levels in America. The birthrate fell to 40% below the replacement rate necessary to maintain the population, and the Swedish economy foundered. Along with the industrial world's highest tax rates came government deficits three times higher than the US as a percentage of GNP ([Gilder, 1986, p. 152](#)).

The central lesson of the Swedish experience is the profound and irretrievable damage inflicted by a policy of driving mothers of small children out of the home and into the work force. Women in the home are not performing some optional role that can be more efficiently filled by the welfare state. Women in the home are not wasting their human resources. The role of mother is the paramount support of civilized human society... Moreover, the link of men through marriage to the support of particular children is crucial to male motivation in productivity. ([Gilder, 1986, p. 153](#))

Denmark and Norway have similar policies as Sweden, but not as severe. Nevertheless, *The Lørenskog Disappearance*, a 2022 Norwegian drama, contained this comment about Norway which reveals the postmodernism of the society and a similar feminist-created contempt for men:

Know what I read the other day – that truth with a capital “T” is dead, and that public life is now just a form of theatre where anything can be true. In contrast, Tom Hagen [the central character in the drama] is the old Norway – a part of our traditions that are all crumbling.

Tom Hagen – what’s he like? He’s quiet, careful with money, modest. He’s not one of those flashy nouveau riche narcissistic guys. He drives a run-down old Citroen Picasso. He lives in that old house in Sloraveien. The whole family, they remind me of old Norway, you know? The frugal lifestyle – the happy housewife. A hard-working father who sits in his armchair and reads the paper. He probably doesn’t know what an app is. He sits and works out electricity prices with his pencil, and he’s not paying a penny more than he has to.

You know, isn’t that everything we admire? Isn’t that the Norway we came from? I mean, we all wanted to be like Tom. His wife is the one who kept the family together - the good old-fashioned mother figure. She’s the one that we all miss – the one that we all wanted – happy, kind, warm, friendly. Home-made blueberry jam, waffles, family gatherings and baby-sitting.

The reason that people blame Tom is that the rich are hated in this country, and that’s fucking weird, because we’re some of the richest people on earth. Why are we so hard on the rich? We’ve forgotten that people like Tom Hagen are role models. I mean, he built this country, so we should admire him, and uplift the Tom Hagen’s of this country. But instead, we hold him in contempt because we hate ourselves and can’t accept who we are. We’re all metrosexual, cortado-sipping, bourgeois, social climbers who have become incapable of respecting a real man.

In sexual terms, the most powerful people in society are young, beautiful women, who can be highly selective about their relationships and may have affairs with many powerful men. But like Marilyn Monroe, they may give the marriageable years of their life to men who toy with them, and afterward become cynical as they realize that like sports stars, they have become victims to the next generation of young women. In financial terms, the wealthiest people in society are married men, because they have focused their energy and efforts on providing for their families, but like Jeffrey Epstein their enlarged ego may make them think that they are invincible – pride comes before a fall. The answer for both male and female is marriage and commitment.

Earl Nightingale grew up in poverty during the depression and wanted to determine the reasons why some people achieved wealth whereas others remained poor. In 1956 he recorded a

message and eventually wrote a book entitled *The Strangest Secret* ([Nightingale, 1956](#)) that became wildly popular. The secret of which he spoke is the power of the self-fulfilling prophecy – what a person truly seeks in life they will generally find. This concept is typically used in motivational speaking for businesspeople, e.g., *The Psychology of Winning* ([Waitley, 1979](#)), but applies equally well in intimate relationships. If a man and a woman enter a relationship with a rights mentality and with their guard up, expecting or fearing to be damaged by the other person, the relationship is likely to fail. Feminism makes divorce a self-fulfilling prophecy.

The forces of feminism and secularism have encouraged and increased divorce and cohabitation split-ups, but the effects on society go far beyond the individuals involved. Family breakdown has many pathological effects considered in the sections below.

Fatherlessness and Family Breakdown

The Welfare Society

As George Gilder writes in his book *Men and Marriage*, all societies face a continual invasion of barbarians, and unless they are brought to heel, they pillage and despoil the settlements of society. These barbarians are, of course, boys and young men, and societies must figure out ways to channel their virility into productive directions that will build up society rather than tear it down. The anthropologist Margaret Mead who studied diverse cultures stated, “The worry that boys will not grow up to be men is much more widespread than the worry that girls will not grow up to be women” ([Mead, 1949, p. 123](#)). Other than military service, the only historically secure method of civilizing young men is by young women – in return for sex, a young man gives up a lifestyle of rebellion, excitement, and danger and instead comes to direct his energies into providing for his woman and their children. In this way the male desire for

respect, leadership, and sexual conquest are refocused into positive ways that benefit not only his family, but the entire society. Wealth in society requires peace and is created through entrepreneurship and productivity, which are generated primarily through the efforts of men.

Potential problems with the government usurping the male provider role were identified as early as the 1930s when Edwin Bakke described the impact of welfare on white families: “Consider that the check normally goes to the woman and is often accompanied by female social workers. The man, already suffering from his failure as provider... is reduced to an errand boy to and from the welfare office.” ([Gilder, 1986, p. 88](#))

But the serious breakdown of self-responsibility started in the 1960s through the Great Society initiatives of President Lyndon Johnson and others. This is well-documented by Charles Murray in his 1984 book *Losing Ground*. The government began giving welfare money to single women, with the only requirement being that she have one or more out-of-wedlock children (benefits were not available for married women). The government therefore usurped the male provider role and incentivized illegitimacy. An iron law in economics is that whatever you incentivize you will get more of so, no surprise, illegitimacy increased dramatically. Once established as being “normal,” the problems repeated and became a permanent fixture in subsequent generations. Much of the income of ghetto households came from welfare, so the man was only sometimes present and was only sometimes the real father of some of the children. Men typically don’t way to pay for another man’s children, so tensions were rife, the man and women were fighting, the teenage boys were out of control, flaunting knives and guns, so the girls may very well have wanted to escape. On her sixteenth birthday, the welfare system offered the girl a chance for independence – free housing, medical and legal assistance, and financial benefits on one condition: have an illegitimate child. The predictable result was a proliferation of

out-of-wedlock kids being raised by single mothers while the men who impregnated the women and were no longer economically necessary left, with many of them forming gangs to affirm their masculinity.

Welfare affected all racial groups but was targeted largely at blacks. Through the 1970s the average income of intact black families rose to 90 percent of comparable white households, but then the welfare policies of the government increasingly began to destroy black families, trashed cities, and created urban ghettos by effectively cuckolding men. Ironically this problem was identified as early as 1965 by Daniel Patrick Moynihan who was then Assistant Secretary of Labor in the Johnson administration. He wrote that the black family was breaking down because female jobs and welfare payments usurped the man's role as provider, leaving fatherless families that tended to repeat themselves from generation to generation and created a "tangle of pathology" ([Rainwater, 1967](#)), but his report was ignored because according to feminist sociologists, "welfare and the associated programs are virtually irrelevant to the ghetto" ([Gilder, 1986, p. 90](#)). Unfortunately, the opposite was true and Moynihan was correct. As the above pattern was accepted, it became multi-generational; government dependency in place of husband dependency has become a way of life. The product of this was the growth of inner-city ghettos characterized by female-headed households, poverty, and violence.

Fatherless Boys

The problems of black boys raised without a father are typical of all fatherless children of any race. They are less responsible, less able to defer gratification, less interested in achievement, more prone to crime, and lower in IQ than boys from intact families. Boys born out of wedlock are twice as likely to become chronic criminal offenders. Studies of prisoners and veterans have indicated that patterns of sexual insecurity persist into adulthood with fatherless

men scoring higher on indices of femininity and passive-aggressiveness, while at the same time behaving in overly aggressive ways as they become “foot soldiers” in gangs and feel an urge to continually prove themselves. Like all boys, they resist discipline but also crave it; they push against boundaries but also need them, and they crave a father or a male figure who provides boundaries and who will demand their respect ([Gilder, 1986](#)).

When fatherless boys enter school, they find that the better pupils tend to be girls, and most of the teachers are women struggling to maintain order. So, they learn that the world of responsibility, regularity, and academic achievement is a world of women; unless they excel in sports there are no avenues of specifically male achievement. But if a boy is academically inclined and able to succeed in the classroom, he faces peer pressure from other boys who deride him because school is “sissy.” The discipline needed by these boys is restricted by law in public schools, so there are no ways of restraining them short of probation or giving them drugs such as Ritalin. Therefore, they despise the world of responsibility and work; seeing the fast cars and flashy lifestyle of drug lords, they get involved with alcohol and drugs – the movie *Boys N’ The Hood* is a tragic example of the ghetto male mentality. A typical social justice response to ghetto issues is to demand the creation of more jobs, but there are two problems with that approach:

1. The ghetto male youth culture tends to reject the attractions of civilized society because drugs, petty crime, and easy women are more attractive, so jobs alone will not overcome the male bias for street life.
2. Most firms who would hire these males want to avoid the areas where their stores are more likely to be robbed and their employees assaulted. Companies are currently leaving cities like San Francisco and Portland because of the brazenness of the crime there and the “defund police” attitudes of city leaders. This dynamic is one of the main reasons why cities like Detroit have become drug and crime-ridden ghettos, and why some other large cities are going downhill.

The issue underlying all of this pathology is fatherlessness, which is the most critical social problem in American society. That factor more than any other has led to the poverty and decline of black families and the decay of inner cities. A few statistics to detail this problem:

- Around 80% of single-parent homes are led by single mothers.
- Children from single-parent families are twice as likely to suffer from mental health and behavioral problems as those living with married parents.
- Children born out of wedlock have lower test scores and are twice as likely to drop out of school.
- In one study, 70% of youth in state operated facilities were from single-parent homes.
- In a study of 56 school shootings, 82% grew up in either an unstable family environment or grew up without both biological parents together.
- Around half of violent crimes (murder, rape, robberies, and other felonies) are perpetrated by and against ghetto residents.
- In proportion to their numbers, young ghetto males commit 7 times more homicides and are 30% more likely to commit suicide.
- Around half of the addict and prison population comes from the ghetto.
- One out of every four households in America has no father in the home.
([Brewer, 2023](#); [Gilder, 1986, p. 79](#))

Fatherless boys also have problems developing romantic relationships with girls. Because of their sexual insecurity and less marketable skills, they have difficulty attracting, courting, and eventually loving and marrying a girl, so their sexual compulsions lead to short-term flings as well as stalking and rape. According to one survey of sexually active teenage girls (some of whom were already mothers) the information they sought most was how to say “no” without hurting a boy’s feelings ([Whitehead, 1994, p. 68](#)). Fatherless boys typically become the “beta males” who lash out against women and the society that has put them in this box. Feminists correctly label this as “toxic masculinity” but without any acknowledgement that feminism and the welfare culture have been the primary factors in creating it.

The crucial process of civilization is the subordination of male sexual impulses and biology to the long-term horizons of female sexuality... Society has a much larger stake in employing young men than in employing young women. The unemployed man contributes little to the community and will often disrupt it, but the woman may do even more good without a job than with one. Her joblessness may spur new efforts to induce the man to work, supporting her crucial role as mother... Male outcome is thus set by

work and women. If he finds work that affirms his manhood and a girl who provides sexuality but also requires that he care for her, he is likely to become a valuable and constructive citizen. If, on the other hand, he sees long-term employment and marriage as a woman's world, he will tend to exploit both jobs and women as short-term ways to money and pleasure. . . . The contribution made by a responsible man rarely exceeds the damage he can do if his masculinity is not socialized or subjected to female patterns. ([Gilder, 1986, pp. 5, 39-40](#))

Fatherless Girls

Teen pregnancy is largely caused by broken and/or fatherless homes and the removal of traditional cautions and protection of young women. Girls who have no father figure at home reach out more readily to boys for love ([Gilder, 1986](#)). Feminism sees girls and boys as equivalent, so theoretically there should be no need for protection, however, she is a potential target for a male set on sexual conquest. The girl has the most to lose, and if she gets pregnant and doesn't have an abortion or give the baby up for adoption, she is typically the one who to whom the child is assigned. They are usually raised without a father, with all of the attendant consequences of single-parent families mentioned above, except the teen mother has them in spades due to her lack of maturity, experience, and job skills. It is also unlikely that a teen mom will find a marriage partner, thus locking her into poverty and the welfare system, and putting a strain on her parents to continue supporting her and her child. This problem also tends to perpetuate itself from generation to generation, because the children don't know any other way of living. In 1998, thirty-two percent of U.S. children were born to never-married mothers, up from eighteen percent in 1980, and it has increased since then (US Census Bureau, and the American Journal of Public Health).

Studies confirm that fathers play an important role in shaping their daughters' outcomes. Father absence due to divorce or separation has been shown to predict their daughters' accelerated pubertal development, early initiation of sexual activity, higher rates of teenage

pregnancy, increased engagement in risky sexual behaviors, such as having sex with a greater number of partners and having unprotected sex, and heightened risk of sexually transmitted diseases. These negative effects on the outcome of daughters seem to be more pronounced when the separation occurs early in life and are independent of the effects of mothers. Older sisters who live with their fathers for longer periods of time experience greater protective effects than their younger sisters who live with their fathers for shorter periods of time ([DelPriore et al., 2018](#)).

This problem is not related to race or ethnicity. As previously mentioned, Sweden has the highest rate of out-of-wedlock births of any western country, and in an overwhelmingly white Scandinavian population. Not surprisingly, it is also the most feministic of any western country. White teenage girls, even in middle class homes, are five times more likely to become teen mothers if they are living with only their mother, rather than with both parents (US Census Bureau, and the American Journal of Public Health). There are signs that this problem may be on the decline, but historically and compared to other countries, the rate is still high – over four times the rate in France, Germany, and Japan (Allan Guttmacher Institute. “U.S. and Russian Federation Lead the Developed World in Teen Pregnancy Rates”).

Feminist Response

One meta-analysis of research on fatherlessness reviewed 47 various studies on the topic, with the conclusion: “We find strong evidence that father absence negatively affects children’s social-emotional development” and these effects stretch into later adolescence and beyond. “The evidence is strongest and most consistent for outcomes such as high school graduation, children’s social-emotional adjustment, and adult mental health” ([McLanahan et al., 2013](#)). Despite this

overwhelming evidence, many feminist academics are in denial. For example, a study from the University of Pennsylvania concluded that fathers were essentially dispensable:

We find weak evidence that fathers influence their children's transition to adulthood. The effects are admittedly small. My own theory is that once you have one good parent in place, having another parent doesn't have a huge impact on children. ([Furstenburg, 1998](#))

From the author of the book *The Two-Parent Family Is Not the Best*: "Mothers and fathers are interchangeable, and single mothers can really do a good job with their kids" ([Stephenson, 1998](#)). From a professor of gender studies at the University of Southern California:

To me, the question is whether we will accept the changes that have occurred in society and work to strengthen all kinds of families without insisting on a single model of family life for everyone. ([Stacey, 1998](#))

It is certainly true that all families should be strengthened, and that in many cases single mothers as well as fathers are doing a good job raising their kids. But to encourage the formation of single-parent households by saying they are just as good or preferable to one with both parents is patently ridiculous. In light of the statistics on poverty and the poor outcomes of children from female-headed households, combined with the common-sense demonstrable understanding of the value of fathers, these statements completely strain credulity, and descend to the level of propaganda. This is dangerously close to social science malpractice. Ironically, the group that has been the most successful in socializing young black males is the Black Muslims. They do this by a combination of several key factors: 1) reasserting the dominance of males and the submission of females, 2) reinforcing strict moral codes with discipline from older men (long-term relationships and care for woman and children is mandatory), and 3) developing businesses to employ young males and help them to become productive and responsible via accountability mentoring ([Gilder, 1986](#)).

Welfare legislation has changed since the early days. The original version known as AFDC (Aid to Families with Dependent Children) has largely been repealed and replaced with TANF (Temporary Assistance to Needy Families). By placing limits on the aid received and making it harder to qualify for government assistance, this program has produced some positive results in making welfare families less dependent ([UrbanInstitute, 1999](#)). But there are still many other entitlement programs, and the victimology and dependency mentalities are still very much with us, as well as the ongoing proliferation of female-headed households. Furthermore, critical race theory and intersectionality doctrines of the social justice movement perpetuate these problems by hardening attitudes.

Rather than encourage marriage, forces in American government, education, psychology, and the media have taken the opposite tack. Feminists formed political pressure groups, such as NOW (National Organization for Women), and eventually infiltrated and enlisted the aid of government and the media to censor contrary views and coerce women into their way of thinking, using a constant drumbeat of negativity and scorn heaped on femininity and homemaking combined with calls for female empowerment. Claiming to speak for all women, the women's movement generated confusion, fear, uncertainty, anxiety, and depression in the lives of many women who in their heart wanted to devote their lives to their husbands and children but have been told that such a desire is debased and worthless. To the extent possible, the women's movement has become totalitarian, with government mandates, daycare funding, Title X subsidies for Planned Parenthood in the hundreds of millions, protections for abortion clinics (e.g., the use of RICO statutes against abortion protesters), abortion for teens girls without parental knowledge or consent, Title IX legislation requiring equal funding for male and female sports programs, politically-correct requirements on the research earning federal support,

elimination of the military restrictions on women in combat; and intense pressure on every significant all-male institution to admit women. Some western countries, such as Sweden, have gone so far as to financially penalize families where the wife stays home to raise her children.

Women tend to take their cues from other women – “Men can be coaxed to do what women want, and women are little disturbed by men’s complaints. But women care very much what other women think... Other women’s opinions can profoundly affect a woman’s confidence” ([Graglia, 1998, p. 91](#)). Girls have generally accepted and implicitly believe the propaganda taught by feminists while at the same time their innate female nature leads them in the opposite direction. When a girl gets pregnant and has a baby, she suddenly discovers the difficulty of reconciling the intensity of maternal love with a simultaneous devotion to career achievement.

Feminism and the associated government initiatives have thus created a vicious cycle – encouraging women to abandon men, and then transmogrifying men so that they are less attractive to women. Being Caballero’s quote is applicable here: “If we stopped treating manhood as something shameful, we might end up with fewer men we are ashamed of.” Just as home-economics courses have long been abandoned for girls, boys are no longer taught to lead, cherish, and take care of a girl, so chivalry is a dying anachronism. Even though girls still want to be cherished (“City girls just seem to find out early – how to open doors with just a smile.” The Eagles), the old customs such as opening doors for girls are passe and chauvinistic – females can now take care of themselves. With women being taught that they don’t need men (“a woman needs a man like a fish needs a bicycle” – Irina Dunn) and becoming more independent, bitchy, and disinclined to take care of him, men have reacted by developing even more of a “F*** her and forget her” mentality. The male response to #MeToo is #MGTOW (men going their own

way). Feminism has created a male backlash which will continue due to the biological nature of sex differences.

Gangs, Drugs, and Violent Crime

Several factors contribute to these problems, but they are largely caused by the lack of responsible fathers in the home to discipline the sons, as was discussed above. Violent criminals are overwhelmingly male, and boys born out of wedlock are twice as likely to become chronic criminal offenders. The problem perpetuates itself because when one generation of males fails to exercise discipline over their sons, the sons have no role model to understand how a real man runs his family and becomes a productive member of society. Therefore, they become predators, trying to tear down the society – bitter men who don't fully understand the reason for their bitterness, but who lash out nevertheless. Each generation of such males unleashes a new group of barbarians to terrorize the society. They impregnate girls for kicks and have no intention of becoming responsible, because no one has taught them and forced them to do so. Violence is cool and drugs are much easier money than working at a regular job. Male defection from family responsibility leaves women helpless to handle rebellious teenage boys.

Dysfunctional Families

The Significance of Marriage

Marriage matters – since the dawn of time it has been a universal human institution. An extensive report including family scholars from U.C. Berkeley; Rutgers University; and the Universities of Texas, Virginia, Minnesota, Chicago, Maryland and Washington; found that children who lived with their own married parents, in general, lived longer, healthier lives both physically and psychologically. “Marriage is an important social good, associated with an

impressively broad array of positive outcomes for children and adults alike” ([Doherty & al, 2002](#)).

The benefits for children include the following:

- They do better in school.
- They are more likely to graduate from high school and attend college.
- They are more likely to have well-paying and high-status jobs.
- They are more likely to have a successful marriage when they are older.
- They have better relationships with their fathers.
- They have better physical and mental health.
- They are less likely to live in poverty.
- They are less likely to drink or do drugs.
- They are less likely to be delinquent, engage in criminal behavior, or be in trouble with the law.
- They are less likely to experience child abuse.
- They are less likely to be victims of sexual or physical violence.
- They are less likely to be violent or sexually active at a young age.
- They are less likely to be an unwed parent.

The same report also highlights many benefits for married couples:

- They are wealthier - married couples build more wealth on average than singles or cohabiting couples.
- They have better health and lower rates of injury, illness, and disability.
- They have lower rates of depression, mental illness, and suicide.
- They have lower rates of alcohol and substance abuse.
- They have lower rates of infant mortality.
- They are less likely to be either the perpetrators or victims of crime.
- Married men have longer life expectancies than single men.
- Married men earn more money than do single men with similar education and job histories.
- Married women have a lower risk of experiencing domestic violence than do cohabiting or dating women.
- Married women and mothers have lower rates of depression than do single or cohabiting mothers.

The above benefits apply to married couples and not necessarily to those that are merely cohabiting ([Doherty & al, 2002](#)). Marriage tends to lock couples into each other – men have always resisted this, and feminism has pushed women in the same direction. Why not “play the

field,” and “sow your wild oats,” and “what if he or she isn’t what I want”? But the “locking in” aspect of marriage is the reason that it produces better results for a number of reasons:

1. After the initial excitement of sex wears off and problems occur, it spurs couples to work out their problems and renew their love and commitment rather than just giving up and going their own ways.
2. It creates a more stable environment for both parents and children, with less fears of abandonment and less worries about the future.
3. It allows the man to focus on providing (married men become the wealthiest members of society), and it allows the woman to focus on children and family issues.
4. The increased feelings of security make for better romance and sex, as well as decreasing depression and suicidal impulses. Therefore, both physical and mental health is improved and there is less need for drugs, stimulants, and medical interventions.

Other studies echo these findings. A meta-analysis which reviewed a number of studies showed that marital status is one of the most important factors determining whether women and children will spend any of their lives in poverty. Adjusting for family size, family income is 73% higher for married women compared to that of their unmarried women. Married white men have an average annual “marriage premium” of around \$16K per year compared to single men, and for black men the premium is around \$13K. This advantage also extends to couples who are less educated – married men with a high-school degree or less enjoy a premium of at least \$17K, and the premium is even more substantial for the most disadvantaged ([Doherty & al, 2002](#)). James Wilson, a professor at Harvard and UCLA, wrote about the importance of marriage and explains the academic consensus:

Almost everyone—a few retrograde scholars excepted—agrees that children in mother-only homes suffer harmful consequences: the best studies show that these youngsters are more likely than those in two-parent families to be suspended from school, have emotional problems, become delinquent, suffer from abuse and take drugs.

The best studies, such as those by Sara McLanahan and Gary Sandefur, show that low income can explain, at most, about half of the differences between single-parent and two-parent families. The rest of the difference is explained by a mother living without a husband. ([Francis et al., 2016](#))

Responsible Parenting

Even in homes where both parents are present there have been an increase in problems. The fact that mothers have gone off to jobs, either because they must or believe that they should, has led to a decline in mothering and in the value placed on motherhood in general. Mothering and caring for kids may seem trivial and insignificant, but it is vitally important to children.

“What did you do today?” my husband asked me one evening when I was sitting at the dinner table, stuck and silent like a pillar of salt.

“Nothing,” I said. It had been one of those days that dissolve into a whirl of unsuccessful errands, unreturned phone calls, malfunctioning machinery, and piles of junk mail. But our daughter, Ariel, six at the time, looked at me across the table as if she’d caught me in a big lie.

“That’s not true!” she said. “You did a lot today!”

“Like what?” I asked, surprised.

“You mixed that color of blue paint that I wanted for my clay necklace. You crawled under my bed and found that shoe I was looking for. And you went to the store and bought four tapioca puddings.”

In this world “you mixed the color blue” can be a fitting epitaph – not just for a day, but for a life ([Oxenhandler, 1999, pp. 121-123](#))

The above is an example of the small gestures that mothers do to create a nurturing home environment that has a balance of love and discipline. Over the course of childhood small things add up to a large impact on the lives and behavior of children and prepare them to be successful adults. To cite a personal example – when having lunch at a restaurant and observing the rude and out-of-control behavior of a kid while his mom ignored him and chatted with her girlfriends, one of my children commented, “We would never even think of behaving like that!” When mothers (and fathers) minimize or abandon their role of teacher and moral guide, they are potentially damaging their children as well as forsaking their birthright – what to many women has historically been the most satisfying thing in life.

I am speaking here not of the unhappy broken homes that are such a prominent part of American life, but the relatively happy ones, where husband and wife like each other and care about their children, very often devoting the best parts of their life to them. But they have nothing to give their children in the way of a vision of the world, of high models of action or profound sense of connection with others. The family requires the most delicate mixture of nature and convention, of human and divine, to perform its function... The family requires a certain authority and wisdom about the ways about the ways of the heavens and of men. The parents must have knowledge of what happened in the past, and prescriptions for what ought to be, in order to resist the philistinism or the wickedness of the present.

People eat together, play together, travel together, but they do not think together. Hardly any homes have any intellectual life whatsoever, let alone one that informs the vital interests of life. Educational TV marks the high tide... Fathers and mothers have lost the idea that the highest aspiration they might have had for their children is for them to be wise... Specialized competence and “making it” are all that they can imagine.

Moral education is supposed to be the family’s special responsibility in a democracy. The moral teaching was religious teaching... which the family has failed to maintain. The dreariness of the family’s spiritual landscape passes belief. The delicate fabric of civilization into which the successive generations are woven has unraveled, and children are raised, not educated.

Parents do not have the legal or moral authority they had in the Old World. They lack self-confidence as educators of their children... they no longer control the atmosphere of the home and have even lost the will to do so. Nietzsche said that newspapers had replaced prayer in the life of the common man, meaning that the busy, the cheap, and the ephemeral had usurped all that remained of the eternal in his daily life. Now television, [the Internet and video games] have replaced the newspaper. ([Bloom, 1987, pp. 57-59](#))

Unpacking Bloom’s critique of American society reveals pathologies which feed on each other creating a downward spiral. Parents now may have more college education than their forebears and inspired by psychology and feminism, they may feel like the newer “hands off” ways of child rearing where children are allowed to decide everything for themselves is more enlightened. But children left to their own devices are a disaster waiting to happen, like the boys in the novel *Lord of the Flies*. Morality is more caught than taught, and if standards of behavior are not inculcated when children are young, they may never be. Following are some of the consequences of missing moms and dads:

- Children left with television or the internet as a babysitter learn passivity, as well as having their attention span shortened due to the continual rapid-fire pace of what they see. They also absorb the poor, immoral, and rebellious behavior of the people in the

shows they watch, and the constant commercials create more materialist pressures to buy and have ([Shaw, 2003, p. xi](#)). A related consequence is childhood obesity and associated lifestyle diseases such as diabetes because children are sitting and playing video games on iPads and computers rather than doing outdoor sports and games. ([Eberstadt, 2004](#))

- The problems of child labor in former times have unbalanced us in the opposite direction – today’s children are less responsible than those of prior generations. People tend to resist responsibility and discipline, so teaching it to kids requires firmness, effort, and patience, all of which are more difficult if parents are less present and involved. Young adults are now remaining with parents for longer periods, and one of the reasons is that self-responsibility (paying for themselves, buying and preparing their own food, doing their own laundry, etc.) has not been inculcated. During the years of school everything is about the kid, but then at age 18 or perhaps 21, kids suddenly have a rude awakening and discover that the world is not about them – they must serve others in order to make a living. Pregnancy is a serious wake-up call – becoming a parent means that you are now responsible for your child.
- Children are increasingly sullen, unfriendly, distant, and unpleasant – whining, nagging, and throwing tantrums. Feeling guilty and anxious, parents try to soothe kids with snacks and toys, and fathers try to make up for a lack of personal involvement by buying things and spending money. Children often treat parents rudely and with contempt – if not corrected in the early years this metastasizes into alcoholism, drug addiction, sexual experimentation, and serious acts of rebellion.

“Large numbers of children, even including those who could be considered privileged, are no longer developing the empathy, moral commitment, and ability to love necessary to maintain our society... The behavior of these discontented, joyless children is so common these days that many people no longer consider it abnormal. For some strange reason, our way of dealing with this is has been not to look, not to notice, not to care.” ([Shaw, 2003, pp. 1-2](#))

- Undisciplined kids lacking parental supervision are more inherently brittle and insecure, and more easily led and entrapped by advertising, peer pressure, cult leaders, sexual predators, and other negative influences, which may be a reason that sex trafficking is on the rise. The consequences in turn may become long term patterns and physical and/or psychological addictions that can be very hard to break.
- New clinical diagnoses have been invented to explain why children are more spoiled and disobedient, and large number of children, especially boys, are diagnosed with ADHD and given psychotropic drugs, because schools have no legal means of disciplining kids other than kicking them out. ([Shaw, 2003, p. xi](#))
- Bullying in schools is on the increase and has almost doubled over recent years, following the trend of increasing social media hostility. In one study over half of students in schools said they had been bullied ([Patchin, 2019](#)). Girl fights which were once rare

are increasingly common and violent, e.g., ([Best, 2022](#)).

- School shootings and violent acts are on the rise. The 1998 Columbine shooting which traumatized America has been followed by many more. “When the news reports began to break about the catastrophe at Columbine High School where two teenage boys had mercilessly slaughtered a teacher, 12 fellow students, and injured 23 others, people were wondering “What makes a young person capable of planning such an atrocity for months and then carry it out?” “As sad as these events were, they were not surprising. The shooters were not an aberration. They were the natural outcome of the way we have been raising children... There is an epidemic in the way that American children are raised” ([Shaw, 2003, pp. ix-x](#)).

The Columbine shooting is now a quarter century ago, and the situation has gotten worse. Death and injury in such atrocities is always blamed by progressives on the availability of guns, so if we could just get rid of assault weapons that would supposedly solve the problem. Reducing guns may help, but the real underlying cause is marriage and parental breakdown primarily due to feminist influences, which is rarely if ever mentioned.

- Public school teachers are leaving the profession due to out-of-control kids who challenge them, refuse to be taught, and know that the teacher cannot touch them. Teachers need to spend much more time in “police work” maintaining discipline and schools have become more like prisons with metal detectors and security guards. Teachers need to monitor bathrooms to prevent sex and drug use, in some cases even at the grammar school level. This was the problem in the 2021 incident where a transgender male student wearing a skirt tried to rape a girl in a bathroom at a high school in Virginia, and then tried to assault another girl after being transferred to a different school ([Arnold, 2022](#)).

Feminism proposes to solve these problems by more government subsidized daycare, but that also leaves children to be supervised by someone other than a parent. Psychologists speak in abstract terms of daycare providing “educational readiness,” “developing cognitive abilities,” and others, but ignore the psychological toll of early daycare on kids:

- Daycare exposes kids to more sickness as they crawl on the floor and put things in their mouth that may have been touched by other sick children. ([Eberstadt, 2004, pp. 5-6](#))
- Having very young kids focus on academic or quasi-academic material too early is counterproductive because they have not yet developed the necessary mental capacities. More important in the early stages is the development of responsibility and obedience in an environment of security and love along the lines of education in Montessori schools which are patterned on home life. ([Standing, 1962](#))

- Long periods in daycare creates stress and insecurity in young kids who miss their parents, like stories of children sitting on the daycare floor and crying, “Mommy, Mommy, Mommy!” ([Eberstadt, 2004, p. 1](#)). One study which measured the levels of cortisol, a stress-producing hormone, in daycare children showed that cortisol levels in such children rose throughout the day as the kids became more stressed ([Eberstadt, 2004, pp. 4-10](#)).
- The worse-behaving kids have an overly large negative impact, and daycare can make kids more aggressive, belligerent, biting, cruel, disobedient, demanding, and noncompliant ([Eberstadt, 2004, pp. 4-10](#)).

The evidence suggests that absentee parents and daycare are significant contributors to the problems stated above. But psychologists and feminists angrily counter with studies showing the seeming success of daycare with statements such as: “My son eventually graduated from Harvard,” and especially, “Kids are resilient.” This is true, but should psychology encourage parental non-involvement and the associated trauma in their children in order to test their resilience, and produce more negative behavior patterns? This is similar to the argument that kids can survive without fathers.

The ugly truth often hidden by the media is that teenage school shooters are typically the product of divorce and daycare. For example, the 2001 San Diego teen killer was a “latch-key” kid who often ate dinner and slept at friends’ homes, called their mothers “Mom,” and was left to his own devices as a home-alone child. Serial killers such as Jeffrey Dahmer, Charles Manson, and Ted Bundy were adult examples of parental abandonment – they became like the lost boys in *Lord of the Flies*. Violent activity is now seen even in pre-school children: biting, kicking, profanity, hitting teachers, and other disruptive activity by 5-year-olds from all socio-economic backgrounds ([Eberstadt, 2004, pp. 23-24](#)). But feminism continues its desire to squelch motherhood and ignore these inconvenient realities:

The signs of pushing the [feminist] envelope are out there, including round-the-clock daycare or night care, a trend already established in Scandinavia and now beginning to appear in the United States. ([Eberstadt, 2004, pp. 17-18](#))

Another feminist desire is getting men to take on the role of the wife and mother.

However, studies have shown that fathers of working wives typically do not compensate for the reduction of mothering time, as the husbands of working mothers spend less time with their children than husbands who are married to homemakers ([Vigilante, 1992](#)). Another sensitive and polarizing issue is housework and the fact that it is performed primarily by women. This prompts the question: are men who live with working wives more actively engaged in doing housework? A study of households in an American and a Russian city showed that the time spent by husbands on household work was the same in both cities – an average of eleven hours per week, despite the fact that the percentage of working wives was much higher in Russia than in America and had been so for a long time.

A recently long-term study of married couples has concluded the following: 1) husbands who do more household tasks are less satisfied with the way the tasks are distributed, and this division of tasks is associated with declines in their love for their wives; 2) the more fathers in dual-earner marriages are involved with child care, the more negativity in the marriage; and 3) the more single-earner fathers are in love with their wives, the more (rather than less) involved they are in child care and leisure activities alone with the children. ([Lasch, 1977, p. 220](#))

Men do not “mother” the same way that women do, and getting males more heavily involved in child-care to the point where they have the main responsibility may cause additional problems:

Abuse and neglect in the home is the leading cause of death for young children in this country (the vast majority of those children being under four years old). Most physical abuse fatalities are caused by enraged or extremely stressed fathers and other male caretakers. ([Rivera, 1995](#))

Robert Shaw in his book *The Epidemic: The Rot of American Culture, Absentee and Permissive Parenting, and the Resultant Plague of Joyless, Selfish Children* provides a list of ways that our culture teaches us to ruin a child’s life as well as one’s own:

1. Don’t plan ahead, and especially don’t pick a husband or wife with the character traits that make him or her a true partner and supporter in raising children.

2. Leave your child to be raised by an unconnected caretaker for many hours.
3. Keep yourself stressed and busy, be exhausted when you come home, and feel guilty about being away for so long.
4. Give in to your child's whims on everything in order to make up for your neglect.
5. Facilitate your child's plunge into consumerism by accommodating all urges to buy.
6. Let your child think that he/she is the boss of the universe in order to avoid frustrating and regulating him/her.
7. Live without thoughts of the larger meaning of life.
8. Don't subscribe to any code of ethics that will override impulses.
9. Don't supervise your child's friendships.
10. Let your child enjoy all the television, internet, and video games that he/she wants.
11. Act as though your child is already an adult and on their own.
12. Don't take your child out for one-on-one unscheduled times – have all of the time pre-scheduled.
13. Don't interfere with your child's involvement in sex, drugs, tobacco, or alcohol.
14. Never give your child household chores ([Shaw, 2003](#)).

A call to reverse the effects of gender feminism is also a call for parents to reassume their place of authority, and to re-involve themselves in their children's lives in ways that create family solidarity and long-term horizons. Many parents of today are missing the “magic years” when their children are young and parents can shape and mold young lives into people of grace and beauty that will outlive them and become their legacy, but it also means valuing children more than money in decisions related to income-producing activities. The challenge for parents is to provide love, discipline, and instruction in the appropriate measures, and raise their children to be proud of their parents, proud of their own name, and in time, to be prepared to pass the torch to their children. In the words of the grown-up former student in the movie *Mr. Holland's Opus*, “We are the notes in your symphony.” Children are the potential gems in our crown.

Poverty

The major issue in social justice is poverty, and the movement seeks to simplify it to one issue – rich white men are taking advantage of everyone else. This has become a mantra for progressives and is repeated endlessly. One of the latest social justice books is *Poverty*, by

America which states: “Millions of families are denied safety and security in one of the richest nations in the world,” and “We [i.e., the white male patriarchy] prioritize the subsidization of affluence over the alleviation of poverty” ([Desmond, 2023](#)). Examples of the accolades for the book include “Poverty, by America is a searing moral indictment of how and why the United States tolerates such high levels of poverty and of inequality.”

The problem with this social justice analysis is that it is mostly a lie – poverty is a complex problem with multiple causes. People at the bottom who cannot help themselves need the assistance of both government and the community; programs such as minimum wage, SSI for disability, and food stamps exist for those who cannot get jobs or cannot adequately care for themselves. However, poverty is not caused by racism or by patriarchy, white or otherwise; rather a major cause of poverty is the lack of patriarchy – the lack of men staying with and providing for their women and children. The overwhelming reasons for poverty and societal dysfunctionality in America are family breakdown, low marriage rates (i.e., cohabiting instead of marriage), and female-headed households caused by divorce and unmarried childbearing.

Certainly, feminism is not alone responsible for our family’s sufferings. As Charles Murray details in *Losing Ground*, President Lyndon Johnson’s Great Society programs, for example, have often hurt families, particularly black families, and these programs were supported by a large constituency beyond the women’s movement. What distinguishes the women’s movement, however, is the fact that, despite the pro-family motives it sometimes ascribes to itself, it has actively sought the traditional family’s destruction. In its avowed aims and the programs it promotes, the movement has adopted Kate Millett’s goal, set forth in *Sexual Politics*, in which she endorses Friedrich Engel’s conclusion that “the family as that term is presently understood, must go”; which “is a kind fate,” she remarks, in “view of the institution’s history.” This goal has never changed; feminists view traditional nuclear families as inconsistent with feminism’s commitment to women’s independence and sexual freedom. ([Graglia, 1998, pp. 2-3](#))

In one of most pernicious forms of hypocrisy in history it is necessary for the social justice movement and gender feminism to blame something else because it is they who have been

instrumental in creating and sustaining many of the conditions that produce poverty and dysfunctionality. Consider the following story from Desmond's book:

Crystal's mother found a way to leave her father, and soon after, he began a lengthy prison stint. Crystal and her mother moved in with another man and his parents. That man's father began molesting Crystal. She told her mother, and her mother called her a liar. Not long after Crystal began kindergarten, Child Protective Services, the branch of government tasked with safeguarding children from maltreatment, stepped in. At five, Crystal was placed in foster care.

Crystal bounced around between dozens of group homes and sets of foster parents. She lived with her aunt for five years. Then her aunt returned her. After that, the longest Crystal lived anywhere was eight months. When she reached adolescence, Crystal fought with the other girls in the group homes. She picked up assault charges and a scar across her right cheekbone. People and their houses, pets, furniture, dishes—these came and went. Food was more stable, and Crystal began taking refuge in it. She put on weight. Because of her weight, she developed sleep apnea.

When Crystal was sixteen, she stopped going to high school. At seventeen, she was examined by a clinical psychologist, who diagnosed her with, among other things, bipolar disorder, post-traumatic stress disorder, reactive attachment disorder, and borderline intellectual functioning. When she turned eighteen, she aged out of foster care. By that time Crystal had passed through more than twenty-five foster placements. Because of her mental illness, she had been approved for Supplemental Security Income (SSI), a government income subsidy for low-income people who are old, blind, or who have a disability. She would receive \$754 a month, or a little over \$9,000 a year.

Crystal was barred from low-income housing for two years because of an assault charge she received for fighting in the group home. Even if she had not been barred, she would still have found herself at the bottom of a waiting list that was six years long. Crystal secured her first apartment in the private market: a run-down two-bedroom unit. The apartment was located in a majority-Black neighborhood that ranked among the city's poorest, but Crystal herself was Black and had been turned down for apartments in the Hispanic and white areas of town. Crystal's rent took 73 percent of her income, and it wasn't long before she fell behind. A few months after moving in, she experienced her first official eviction, which went on her record, making it likely that her application for housing assistance would be denied. After her eviction, Crystal met a woman at a homeless shelter and secured another apartment with her new friend. Then Crystal put that new friend's friend through a window, and the landlord told Crystal to leave.

Crystal spent nights in shelters, with friends, and with members of her church. She learned how to live on the streets, walking them at night and sleeping on the bus or in hospital waiting rooms during the day. She learned to survive by relying on strangers. She met a woman at a bus stop and ended up living with her for a month. People were attracted to Crystal. She was gregarious and funny, with an endearing habit of slapping her hands together and laughing at herself. She sang in public, gospel mostly.

Crystal had always believed that her SSI was secure. You couldn't get fired from SSI, and your hours couldn't get cut. "SSI always come," she said. Until one day it didn't. Crystal

had been approved for SSI as a minor, but her adult reevaluation found her ineligible. Now her only source of income was food stamps. She tried donating plasma, but her veins were too small. She burned through the remaining ties she had from church and her foster families. When her SSI was not reinstated after several months, she descended into street homelessness and prostitution. Crystal had never been an early riser, but she learned that mornings were the best time to turn tricks, catching men on their way to work. ([Desmond, 2023](#))

Crystal's and her mother's problem stem not from patriarchy or systems of oppression – people from churches and from the government tried to help her, but by that point she was already severely damaged. Her problems instead come from the failure of her mother's marriage and the fact that she didn't have a father to protect her or parents who encouraged her to succeed. Furthermore, her mother's choice in a second marriage partnership led to her getting molested, and the family-related failures in her life led to subsequent problems in which she became an increasingly dysfunctional teen and adult. Once she was broken it became impossible for others to fix her. These problems were caused by failure of marriage – people taking vows to each other and then reneging on their vows.

Her condition and the thousands like her require expensive welfare programs, social workers, foster care providers, courts, police, and layers of government so that these broken people can survive and be cared for. But the fact that feminism and government initiatives have in large part created the dysfunctionality of which Crystal is a sad example and continue to preach gender feminism and the supposed evils of the nuclear family, guarantees that we will continue to generate more societal dysfunctionality and the resulting poverty. This seems to be a form of intellectual insanity. Desmond states, "Poverty isn't simply the condition of not having enough money. It's the condition of not having enough choice." The central problem fueling poverty in America is the exact opposite – feminism has provided too many choices of the wrong kind – in particular, the now seemingly inevitable choice for men and women to split up and the consequences of that choice on them and on their children. Divorce or cohabitation followed by

separation is a major cause for female and child poverty. Furthermore, it creates dysfunctional environments in which boys may well grow up to be abusers, and girls may become the abused which perpetuates problems and transforms them into a vicious cycle.

Thomas Sowell, the celebrated black scholar and economist, explains the negative effects of social justice versus the positive effects of marriage: “The poverty rate among blacks as a whole is 22%, among whites as a whole it is 11%, while [surprise, surprise] among black married couples it is 7.5%.” Instead of focusing on improving and encouraging marriage, the social justice movement has taken the opposite tack and accused society. Sowell is extremely critical of what he terms the “race industry” – black and white leaders who have a Marxist approach:

Affirmative action harms everyone, but in different ways. We are suffering due to having generations being steeped in the welfare state vision of grievances, victimology, and resentments, and who believe there are enemies out there trying to keep you down. That is the message that has been pumped into the head of the white lower class in Britain and is the same message that has been pumped into black people in America. And the result is the same in both cases.

Black leaders blame all the problems on the larger society so they can play the role of the defender of the black community against enemies, which in turn creates the situation in which many blacks feel that nothing they can do will help themselves unless it's done politically as a group. Why would you knock yourself out in school for a career knowing that “the Man” is not going to let you get anywhere? Black boys think that the white man will not let them succeed. Hopelessness is one of the major products of the race industry. ([Sowell, 2011](#))

Sowell frequently has written on the counter-productivity of many government anti-poverty programs:

Behind much of government activities to redirect people and resources is the implicit assumption that social problems in general and crime in particular will be reduced by removing people from bad physical surroundings to the kind of surroundings that third parties consider to be better. This assumption need not be tested by planners, politicians, bureaucrats, or judges, because seldom will any of these have to pay any price for being wrong. Nor are they likely to have the kind of intimate knowledge of the lives, values, and behavior patterns of the very different people whom they are moving about like pieces on a chess board to carry out some grand design.

Given the incentives and the constraints at work, it can hardly be surprising that attempts to reduce crime by destroying slums have so often proved not only futile but

counterproductive. Time and time again, moving slum dwellers into brand new public housing projects has only created new centers of crime in those projects, with the new buildings rapidly deteriorating into new slums. Widely praised designs for projects, like Pruitt-Igoe in St. Louis, have ended up as such abject failures that they had to be dynamited. By 2002, Philadelphia had blown up 20 high-rise public housing projects. Chicago blew up 28 sixteen-story buildings, containing more than 4,000 apartments.

But while such projects have been demolished, the assumptions behind those projects have not. They continue on in still more schemes based on similar assumptions, such as housing vouchers to enable slum dwellers to move to middle-class communities – in utter disregard of the years of sacrifice that people in the middle-class communities have made, precisely in order to be able to live away from the hoodlums and criminals now placed in their midst by government programs. The Chicago area has been typical – in south suburban Chicago, with one of the highest concentrations of voucher holders in the country, middle-class African American residents complain that they thought they left the ghetto behind, only to find that the federal government is subsidizing it to follow them.

These assumptions continue to dominate social thought and government policy, both shaped by people who seldom live in the places to which the ghetto residents had been moved, and who pay no price for being wrong. On the contrary, what would cost them dearly in both personal and career terms, would be admitting that they were wrong, that they had disrupted thousands of lives and had wasted billions of taxpayer dollars.

([Sowell, 2011, pp. 48-49](#))

Sowell's comments illustrate the difference between business and government.

Companies need to please and care for individual customers with products and services that meet their needs and at a price that customers can afford, because companies must be profitable in order to survive. In contrast, government has no need to be profitable. It spends money and generates ever increasing debt mostly in response to the pressures of various pressure groups with different agendas. Perhaps the most searing indictment of the how government policies pushed by Democrats and conceded to by Republicans have deliberately pathologized the black community in America and by extension, America in general, is the movie *Uncle Tom II* by Black film director Justin Malone. The movie is a journey through recent history showing the gradual demoralization of America through Marxist infiltration and unveils the Marxist strategy of creating false racial and gender tensions among Americans, with the ultimate goal of obtaining power, destroying capitalism, and replacing God with government. It explores how this ideology

has torn apart the fabric of American society using Black America as its number one tool and it details the hidden history of honorable Black men, Black entrepreneurship, Black prosperity, Black faith, and Black patriotism, which has been transmogrified and corrupted into anger, discontent, victimology, and hopelessness by the social justice movement ([Malone & Elder, 2020](#)). This movie should be watched by everyone. The following statement by the Black female journalist Star Parker is a synopsis:

Blacks are not given enough credit for being trendsetters in America. Blacks started playing the blues, jazz, and R&B, then the rest of America started playing them. Blacks discovered the politics of victimhood, then the rest of America started catching on. Black women got into having babies without marriage. Then white women started getting into it and the incidence of white out-of-wedlock births today - almost 30 percent - is higher than the black rate in the 1960s. Blacks bought into dependency and the welfare state. Now the rest of America has bought in. Blacks for years elected politicians championing public policy that destroyed their own communities. Now the rest of America has installed a new political leadership with the perfect formula - run roughshod over private ownership, disdain traditional values, substitute political power for personal responsibility - for destroying our country.

We can expect the rest of America to reap the same benefits that Blacks have enjoyed from this lunacy. In the late 1960s, when President Lyndon B. Johnson announced his war on poverty and seeded welfare-state culture in our inner cities, the majority of black families had married parents living at home. By 1995 only one in three black homes had married parents. As the black family collapsed, predictable social pathologies escalated: crime, drugs, promiscuity, sexually transmitted diseases, fatherless children, abortion, and disdain for education. Not surprisingly, the black poverty rate, almost a quarter of the black population, has remained frozen at twice the national average since the late 1960s.

Racism? I don't think so. Black poverty is overwhelmingly a phenomenon of single-mother homes. The incidence of poverty in black homes with married parents is around ten percent, well below the national average. It's what happens when lives get politicized and people are instructed to be helpless. In the case of Blacks, it's being taught that America is inherently racist and that their only hope is political protection from white exploitation.

Our politicians tell us now that we need to turn the whole country over to them because capitalism has supposedly failed and we need protection from exploitation by the wealthy. University of Michigan economist Mark Perry recently listed on his blog 16 typical household items - furniture, kitchen appliances, electronics - showing how many hours of work, at the average wage, it would take to purchase these items today, compared to 1950. The whole basket of goods takes one-fifth the amount of hours of work today to purchase compared to 59 years ago. This is the innovation of our politicians at work.

Anyone who is curious where the current left-wing takeover of our economy will lead,

with government soon taking 40 cents out of every dollar we produce, should tour through any of America's inner cities. ([Parker, 2009](#))

Government is growing increasingly perverse. While people are leaving California because of its high taxes, crime, and woke mentality, the California state government responds by issuing fines to toy stores that don't have a "gender neutral" toy section ([Farthing, 2023](#)).

Another serious wake-up call for progressives is the fact that homeschooling is producing better educated and more productive kids.

In 1997, a study of 5,402 homeschool students from 1,657 families was released. The study demonstrated that homeschoolers, on the average, out-performed their counterparts in the public schools by 30 to 37 percentile points in all subjects. A significant finding when analyzing the data for 8th graders was the evidence that homeschoolers who are homeschooled two or more years score substantially higher than students who have been homeschooled one year or less. The new homeschoolers were scoring on the average in the 59th percentile compared to students homeschooled the last two or more years who scored between 86th and 92nd percentile. ([Ray, 1997](#))

That study was from over 25 years ago and in the meantime the situation has grown better for homeschooling and worse for public schools, which now cost more per student in taxpayer dollars than most private schools but provide worse education. The 2021 national average cost per public school student in taxpayer dollars was \$15,205, whereas the average private school tuition was \$11,645 ([Doyle, 2021](#)). The public school history and social studies curriculum is increasingly Marxist and anti-American, and the sex education celebrates feminism and transsexualism due to control by the National Education Association and the National Federation of Teachers. See, for example, *The Worm in the Apple: How the Teacher Unions Are Destroying American Education* by Peter Brimelow:

It is no coincidence that the thirty-year decline in U.S. K–12 education and the simultaneous surge in education spending began at the same time the modern teacher unions were created. Today, the National Education Association has nearly three million members. Its agenda is not to provide better teaching in schools; it is to provide more money and benefits for teachers - and, above all, for itself. ([Brimelow, 2004](#))

Children raised in rural America are outproducing and doing better than their urban counterparts. A recent study revealed that children raised in rural poverty have higher average incomes as adults than children raised in urban poverty. Authors attributed this “rural advantage” to the greater number of two-parent households in rural America ([Frank, 2023](#)).

There’s something of a big-city bias in academia and journalism... [The success of rural boys] goes back to that strong sense of community that they grew up in. Rural communities tend to adhere to a group morality. While it’s not necessarily Christian, it’s rooted in a Judeo-Christian ethic which leads to a work ethic in rural areas. ([Connor et al., 2023](#))

But it was also determined that this income advantage only works for boys – girls raised in rural poverty attained lower levels of income as adults than their urban peers. This was attributed “partly to the persistence of traditional gender norms.” Feminists would fulminate at such outcomes, but rural women may well be happier and more satisfied than urban women, as they are focused more on children and home life.

If we somehow could reverse gender feminism the impact would certainly not be immediate – we still need welfare programs as well as charitable individuals and churches that seek to care for the Crystals of the world. But it would dramatically improve the long-term outlook of American society.

Abortion

Abortion is the major right that feminism has fought for. More than any other issue, this is the cause célébré of the feminist movement, so it could be said that it is the sacrament of feminism. It is especially necessary for the sexual revolution in which women are encouraged to become more like men and have multiple sex partners.

It is understandable why this is so, because prior to the 1973 Roe v. Wade Supreme Court decision abortion was generally prohibited in the U.S., and women who were pregnant with an

unwanted baby often faced censure and humiliation. If the woman had financial support she could travel to locations where an abortion could be performed, but if she was poor, her options were limited to back-alley abortionists or attempted self-abortion. The overwhelming powerlessness that women felt in such a situation is an issue that resonated with people, so the right to abortion became a cornerstone of feminism.

However, while abortion solves the unwanted pregnancy problem encountered by women, it has many other negative effects which are typically unstated, including health risks. The most common method of abortion is done by stretching the cervix with dilators and inserting a tube attached to a syringe to suction the fetus out. Complications of the surgical vacuum method can include post-abortion abdominal swelling and pain, excessive bleeding, uterine perforation, incomplete or partial birth abortion, and cervical tears. Increasingly the abortion drug mifepristone (RU-486) is being used instead. It is non-surgical and claimed to be safe and effective, but studies of the drug indicate that complications are four times more common than with surgical abortions including the possibility of death ([Anderson & al, 2023](#); [Brown, 2023](#)). Using the drug as an abortifacient after the first trimester would thus be increasingly dangerous.

However, the more serious problems with abortion may be psychological and communal. It often produces deep distress and guilt in women – a condition known as post-abortion syndrome which is a form of PTSD. This is hotly denied by abortion providers such as Planned Parenthood but acknowledged by doctors and researchers. In a study of 500 post-abortive women, researchers found that 50% expressed negative feelings, and up to 10% had developed “serious psychiatric complications.” Another study found that 33% of post-abortive women develop intense longings to become pregnant again to “make up” for the lost pregnancy; 18% of these women succeed within one year of the abortion. However, abortion increases the chance

that woman's reproductive systems are damaged ([StudentsForLife, 2023](#)). Adoption is therefore an attractive alternative to abortion as it provides for couples where the woman wants to get pregnant but can't ([AmericanAdoptions, 2023](#)).

Abortion is now far and away the leading cause of death world-wide – 45 million per year or around 40% of total world-wide deaths. The number of abortions exceeds the combined total of all other non-natural forms (communicable diseases, cancer, smoking, alcohol use, HIV/AIDS, traffic accident fatalities, suicide, etc.) ([Foley, 2024](#)).

At the core of the debate over abortion as well as euthanasia is the issue of human exceptionalism. In other words, are humans simply advanced animals and a different species of ape, or are we a divine creation and therefore distinct from and above all other forms of life? We kill cows, chickens, and pigs for their meat, but are we fundamentally better and distinct, and should moral law exist for us? Those who believe that humans are nonexceptional have taken that perspective from Darwin, and they have no intrinsic basis for any morality except that imposed by majority rule and government. Therefore, there is ultimately no compromise between Darwinists and those who hold to divine creation. Furthermore, in contemporary society where psychology and self-identity are all important, babies don't yet have a self-identity and are thus dispensable.

From a moral perspective, abortion cheapens sex and cheapens the value of human life; it dulls the conscience of society so that the removal of "undesirable" elements of the population seems more reasonable, like Hitler's program of eugenics to eliminate the Jews, Blacks, and other non-Aryans. Children are no longer seen as precious, and therefore by extension, people in general are no longer precious, thus giving human life harsher Darwinian overtones. Rather than viewing children as a legacy and one of the most important things in life as in the past, feminism

treats kids as either an inconvenience or an expensive luxury. As this philosophy seeps deeper into the subconscious, it provides moral justification to those in power to treat people as “assets,” and to act without regard to human consequences. Motherhood is an increasingly dangerous proposition, but women still want children, and society still needs women to bear and nurture the next generation, if for no other reason that our social security system depends on it. Here is an excerpt from a speech given by Mother Teresa at a White House prayer breakfast in 1994:

But I feel that the greatest destroyer of peace today is abortion, because it is a war against the child, a direct killing of the innocent child, murder by the mother herself. And if we accept that a mother can kill even her own child, how can we tell other people not to kill one another?

By abortion, the mother does not learn to love, but kills even her own child to solve her problems. And, by abortion, that father is told that he does not have to take any responsibility at all for the child he has brought into the world. The father is likely to put other women into the same trouble. So abortion just leads to more abortions. Any country that accepts abortion is not teaching its people to love, but to use any violence to get what they want. This is why the greatest destroyer of love and peace is abortion.

Many people are very, very concerned with the children of India, with the children of Africa where quite a few die of hunger, and so on. Many people are also concerned about all the violence in this great country of the United States. These concerns are very good. But often these same people are not concerned with the millions who are being killed by the deliberate decision of their own mothers. And this is what is the greatest destroyer of peace today – abortion which brings people to such blindness. ([Mother Teresa, 1994](#))

Ironical attendees of this breakfast were abortion advocates Bill and Hillary Clinton.

Mother Teresa was prophetic – along with abortion, the removal of prayer, the Bible, and traditional morality from public schools¹² have culminated in the school shootings that began soon afterward. Columbine happened four years later, and since then there have been 394 incidents of gun violence in schools that have impacted around 360,000 kids (not to speak of the

¹² On June 25, 1962, the U. S. Supreme Court decided in *Engel v. Vitale* that prayer in schools violated the First Amendment by constituting an establishment of religion. The following year, in *Abington School District v. Schempp*, the Court disallowed Bible readings in public schools for the same reason Waggoner, M. D. (2012). *When the Court Took on Prayer and the Bible in Public Schools*. <https://religionandpolitics.org/2012/06/25/when-the-court-took-on-prayer-the-bible-and-public-schools/>. The year 2022 marked the 60th anniversary of those decisions.

violence in general society). The numbers are increasing with 46 incidents in 2022 and the most recent one happening a few weeks ago in December, 2023 ([Cox & al, 2024](#)).

Anti-abortion protesters have received great hostility from the media, the government, and especially the courts. Unlike demonstrators concerned with civil rights, the environment, war, or animal rights, the anti-abortion movement has been singled out for special punitive treatment because it is not politically correct. Abortion clinics may sue them under the RICO statutes that were originally intended for dealing with organized crime, and which include treble damage penalties. There have been bills in Congress to deny bankruptcy protection to any anti-abortion activist who has lost a lawsuit.

Abortion is also one more consequence of the damage that has been inflicted on male-female relationships – a (necessary?) consequence of feminist attitudes and the family breakdown caused by feminism. As the traditional bonds holding men and women together have been broken, the evil of abortion and the associated decline in morality is one more societal consequence.

Materialism

Since the 1960s American society has become much more materialistic. In contrast to other societies and former generations of Americans who placed a high value on children, family, and community, we have placed our highest value on careers and financial success. American children nowadays are often seen as an expensive inconvenience, taking time away from careers and interfering with recreational and leisure-time pursuits. This is in contrast to former generations who viewed children as their treasure and poured their lives into them. Social commentators of all stripes have acknowledged this problem. For example, Erica Jong, feminist author of *The Fear of Flying* said, “We live in a culture that loves babies in theory, not in

practice” ([Jong, 1993](#)). Feminism taught women that homemaking and the care of children was worthless, that the male focus on careers and making money led to self-fulfillment, and that being a homemaker was a disgrace to one’s gender. Everyone needs to see themselves as valuable, and it’s hard to feel affirmed if the culture tells you that you are inherently less competent, and that your natural characteristics render you less suitable than others for the society in which you live. These ideas reduced the worth and value ascribed to feminine things and increasingly caused women to seek status in traditionally male pursuits.

Cartoons and animated movies for kids have transitioned from *Cinderella* and *Snow White* with their traditional romantic themes of a woman being kissed by her prince and riding off with him on a white horse, to *Frozen* where everything is about her, and she rejects all the rules and morals of society:

Don’t let them in, don’t let them see. Be the good girl you always have to be. Conceal, don’t feel, don’t let them know. Well, now they know.

Let it go, let it go, that perfect girl is gone. Here I stand in the light of day, let the storm rage on, the cold never bothered me anyway.

It’s time to see what I can do, to test the limits and break through. No right, no wrong, no rules for me. I’m free.

Another factor stimulating materialism is the increasing selfishness of American culture. Advertisers encourages and even theologizes selfishness (“I deserve this!”) with commercials such as that of McDonalds (“You deserve a break today!”). Thus there is an increased focus not only on money, but on how spending money can satisfy personal desires. But money doesn’t provide lasting satisfaction – it can easily become an addictive psychological drug that produces cravings to spend even more.

So, under feministic influences of both guilt and selfishness, women became increasingly money- and career-motivated leading to the growth of so-called “DINK” couples (double

income, no kids) as well as “SINK” – single income, no kids. Children are expensive, require attention, and consume a lot of resources. So, DINKs have abandoned children in order to focus on wealth and material comfort. They go out to eat every night, attend many events, and engage in expensive sports and other activities. They often live in “bedroom communities,” so-called because that is the only time people are at home. In 2020, America hit a 40-year-low in births, with only 3.6 million babies born, and as of 2022, 43% of households were childless which is a 7% increase from 2012 ([Sahakian, 2023](#)). Developed European countries also have low birth rates so that the native population is declining (the death rate exceeds the birth rate), and this fact is raising concerns about the funding of social security systems. France has gone so far as to provide payments for couples who have children. Elon Musk commented, “There is an awful morality to those who deliberately have no kids: they are effectively demanding that other people’s kids take care of them in their old age – that’s messed up” ([Sahakian, 2023](#)). The DINK lifestyle is also criticized as being a vapid existence that ignores the need that people have for family connections. As indicated above, one of the main factors resulting in suicide is loneliness, so as DINKs grow older, they may become increasingly isolated, lonely, and unhappy.

Nevertheless, because women often want children, the desire for both career and motherhood has led to a female need to become “super moms” who have both career and kids, along with the associated stress of trying to juggle both roles. In the course of doing so, the complex process of child rearing has been trivialized and the responsibility for raising children has increasingly been fobbed off to daycare centers, schools, and other government-sponsored organizations. These have in general done a poor job of surrogate parenting, contributing in large part to the growing dysfunctional of youth in America which is largely due to the lack of real parenting, as has been explored above.

When the wife goes to work her income should presumably allow a couple to reach a higher standard of living, but the reality is that dual-income couples are only able to keep less than 20% of what the wife earns until her income rises over \$60,000 ([Jaffe, 1994, pp. E1-2](#)) (more is required in current dollars), because their spending typically rises. The wife needs another car, better clothes, daycare for the children, etc., and the additional stress caused by having to juggle home, kids, and job, raises desires to spend even more money to compensate her for the pressure she is under. The “we owe it to ourselves” philosophy begins to strike a more resonant chord. As one married woman whose salary was \$500 per week put it, “at the end of the day I have gone absolutely nuts and am exhausted, and all I have is \$20 to show for it” ([Jaffe, 1994](#)). Often couples with higher incomes are in worse financial shape because of increased cravings to spend, and the fact that their larger credit lines enable them to go much more deeply in debt. As a couple becomes used to a given income level and the associated lifestyle, it becomes difficult to contemplate living on less, and the wife becoming pregnant can be a financial disaster. Life is hurried, and schedules are packed – problems like a sick child or a car that won’t start cause trauma. There is less time for community, for romance, for walks in the park, for playing with and having long talks with your kids, and so on. Life becomes simply a long relentless struggle to pay off the mortgage and the credit card bills.

One woman’s depiction of secularism and materialism in action was the video *Generation Wealth* by Lauren Greenfield. She details the debasement of American culture into drugs, parties, keeping up with the neighbors, shows and magazine such as “Lifestyles of the Rich and Famous,” and unsatisfying sex with multiple partners (“We have a culture that prizes celebrity, bling and narcissism”). She profiles a *Wolf of Wall Street*-type hedge fund manager who escaped to Columbia when his company failed and there bought prostitutes for his 15-year-

old son, and a single millionaire female executive who is now raising a child in luxury like a trophy. Echoing JonBenet Ramsey was a 6-year-old beauty pageant princess and star of the reality TV show *Toddlers & Tiaras*, who tells Greenfield, “My favorite princess is me... Beauty means that I get money, and I’ll be a superstar.” Also included is the former porn actress Kacey Jordan, who received \$30K for attending a sex party at Charlie Sheen’s house and sought greater wealth through extreme sex, which may have provided temporarily cash but didn’t make her happy. She made numerous suicide attempts and wound up in the same dead-end job she had before starting her porn career ([Neate, 2018](#)). Being a feminist progressive, Greenfield attributes all of this to the presidencies of Ronald Reagan and Donald Trump, but the real underlying cause of materialism in everyone she profiles is secularized feminism, and the impact it has had on American culture. Similar in some ways to the movie *Uncle Tom II*, this documentary depicts how we have descended into conspicuous consumption, cheap sex, in-your-face raunchiness, and Jerry Springer-type family dysfunctionality. In an ultimate irony, absorbing the feminist message from her mother led Greenfield to abandon her own kids for a career in making the video. She turns the camera on her own family and her 16-year-old son tells her: “I got used to growing up without you around. [But it’s too late to do anything about it now] – the damage has been done.” Unfortunately, Greenfield never acknowledged the hypocrisy of blaming other factors when the materialism she depicts was largely due to feminism of which she was a part.

A related factor in materialism is the determination of what constitutes “success” and the reporting of it in psychology-related studies and articles. Science desires “hard data” meaning the quantification of what is being studied. Income is easy to measure and can be done from generalized statistics, but it is harder to measure the degree of “life satisfaction” provided by various lifestyles and to effectively compare them. An example of this is the article on rural

families mentioned above where there was handwringing over the lower eventual income level of girls raised in rural communities as opposed to boys. However, those women may well have been happier and more satisfied with life than those with higher incomes.

Mental Illness, Guilt, Anxiety, Depression, and Suicide

Serious forms of mental illness such as schizophrenia, bipolar, and obsessive-compulsive disorder are typically biological in nature and can occur regardless of the environment in which an individual is raised. They are thus more truly the result of a “disease” rather than a breakdown in personal responsibility ([Mueser & Gingerich, 2006](#)). However, the term “mental illness” covers a wide swath of pathologies, and due to our psychosomatic nature, guilt, anxiety, and depression may cause what appears to be mental illness or at least generate some of the symptoms associated with it ([Adams, 1970, pp. 26-40](#)). Even in cases where guilt, anxiety, and depression are not the primary cause of mental illness they may well exacerbate its negative effects.

Alcoholism and other addictions are an example of this psychosomatic conundrum. An individual may be genetically predisposed to alcoholism, but drinking is a chosen behavior pattern. The resulting addiction has the characteristics of a disease in that it can be very hard for the alcoholic to break free, but nevertheless the individual is not helpless – he or she can be cured only if they chose to take the necessary steps which require personal responsibility. The same thing is true for guilt, anxiety, and depression.

Stress is a significant component of depression. Everyone experiences stress to some degree, so the significant difference is the level of stress, and even more so, the way that stress is handled. A study found that personal confidence and a sense of well-being protect oneself from the negative effects of stress (consider the potential stress level of a business leader or politician

vs. the average person). But stress coping mechanisms differ by gender with men using self-control and women using emotional control. Emotionality was not found to be helpful for gay men in dealing with stress ([O'Connor & Brown, 2016](#)).

Depression

Men are three times more likely to commit suicide, but women exceed men in everyday misery, as women are more inclined to mood swings due to hormones and the menstrual cycle. Therefore, there is a natural tendency to depression in women, but contemporary women are more depressed than former generations. Psychologists who study the happiness of women believe female happiness is declining and depression is rising. Prior to the 1970s (i.e., prior to the feminist movement) women were generally happier than men ([Petherick, 2016](#)), but as the women's movement has taken hold, female satisfaction has decreased.

This is a great time for women. Women all over the world are running countries, companies, and universities. The most recent U.S. Secretary of State and Speaker of the House were women. Women make up about half of the workforce and can now fight side-by-side with their male counterparts in the military. But, given all of these advancements, are women happier? The answer is a resounding no. ([Davis, 2013](#))

Something strange is going on in women's happiness research. Because despite having more freedom and employment opportunities than ever before, women have higher levels of anxiety and more mental health challenges, such as depression, anger, loneliness and more restless sleep. And these results are seen across many countries and different age groups. ([Dowthwaite-Walsh, 2023](#))

Sometimes blame is placed on the way that questions are asked, but it's clear that rates of mental problems among women actually have been increasing. Feminist articles attribute the decline in female happiness to causes such as the continuing gender pay gap, continued sexism and objectification of women, and the continuing female roles of housework and childcare for women who also have careers. Ironically, this is exactly what feminists have been fighting for – the primary causes for the decrease in female happiness is the result of feminism in action – the

pressures of family breakdown and fatherlessness, the poverty and pathologies created by divorce, and female guilt from leaving children to pursue careers.

In survey after survey, people who espouse a secular worldview, people who identify as liberals, and people who never attend religious services report the highest levels of support for feminist ideals and also report the lowest levels of personal satisfaction ([Riley, 2020](#)). The feminist Betty Friedan noted in her day that some housewives were being prescribed “happy pills” to get them through the day presumably because they didn’t have a career. But according to recent statistics, psychotropic drug use is increasing as feminism has taken hold. One in five women between the ages of 40 and 59 are taking antidepressants, and women are more than twice as likely to be on such drugs than men ([Prager, 2018](#)). As feminism’s influence has grown over the past half century, women have become less happy. Gender feminism produces anger and victimology, which in turn creates feelings of hopelessness leading to depression and guilt, especially as women abandon family concerns.

Evidence from Switzerland supports this. Women were not allowed to vote in Switzerland until 1971, and ten years later a referendum was conducted similar to the 1963 Equal Pay act in America as to whether the Swiss constitution should be amended to state that women deserve equal pay for equal work.

Different parts of Switzerland voted very differently... Strangely, working women in areas with strong traditional values – where most people had voted against equal pay – were happier than working women in liberal cantons. Even though their salaries were further below those of the men around them, the women in more traditional communities were less likely to report discrimination than their countrywomen in more liberal areas. ([Petherick, 2016](#))

The research on the subjective well-being (SWB) of Chinese women considered in the [Gender Pay Gap](#) section above is also relevant here; women in traditional relationships were happier, more satisfied, and therefore less depressed. Marriage for Chinese women is generally

more important than job or income, and despite socialized efforts over many years to make the sexes equivalent, traditional gender roles are embraced by Chinese women and provide the most SWB for them ([Chen, 2018](#)). Chinese married women in general are happier than single women, and stay-at-home wives in general are almost as happy as those with jobs. The disparagement of marriage coupled with an increase in divorce and the related pathologies are thus major factors in the increase of female depression. The following counsel from a psychologist and physician needs to be considered:

Because she can trust no man, the frigid woman's approach to the tasks of life has a difficult, painful, frenetic quality. She feels responsible for everything – guiltily responsible. Details and trivia overwhelm her. She constantly has to fight herself, and her resentment... But as she explodes her groundless fears one by one and explores a new attitude toward men, toward love, toward motherhood – as all of these things happen her lifelong restlessness begins to depart. For the first time she realizes how restless she had been and how unsatisfied. She feels how precariously balanced her life has always felt. Now something deep within her relaxes and lets down. When this happens she is beginning to experience the essence of all that is truly feminine, spiritual tranquility.

The arrival of this tranquility results from the fact that she is really allowing herself to trust her husband in a very deep sense. It means that she finally realizes that she no longer has to oppose his strength, and that she can now rely on it to protect her, to give her the secure climate for the full flowering of her femininity.

Feminine tranquility of spirit is a grace and a beauty of the first order. It is the psychological cornerstone of the happy family. It emanates from a woman who has found herself and pervades those around her as well. The children of such a mother are strong... and the husband of a wife who has achieved such tranquility returns from his work to his home as to an oasis and redoubles his loving efforts to make her more secure.

And now she has tapped into the greatest psychological joy of woman; her capacity to give. Untrusting women instinctively fear this characteristic, feeling as they do that men will exploit and abuse her desire to give. But women who are secure within themselves have an inexhaustible store of giving, and they also tend to have an innate sense about picking a man who will make them secure and not exploit them. Related to her sense of security, and springing from it is a profound delight in giving to those she loves.

[\(Robinson, 1959, pp. 211-212\)](#)

Suicide

As with depression, suicide rates are also increasing, and the reasons are the same factors: mental illness, anxiety, physical and emotional abuse, PTSD, financial problems, and alcohol and drug addiction – all of which are increasing in Western society. Men commit suicide more than women – one of the author’s uncles ended his life by shooting himself in the head as a way of handling physical pain as well as relational disconnection. Suicide is the result of feeling trapped and unable to cope – the pain and suffering experienced becomes overwhelming. However, pain is an inevitable part of life, and everyone must deal with pain to a certain extent, so escaping all pain and suffering is impossible. Either a way must be found to reduce the level of pain and/or coping resources must be increased ([Gloom, 2014](#)).

Psychologists explain the increase in suicide based on three factors: higher rates of depression, limited availability of mental health services, and the growing availability of guns ([Prager, 2023](#)). Considering each of these in turn:

1. *Higher rates of depression.* Since it is assumed that happy people don’t kill themselves, we can also assume that as the number of depressed people increases, so will the number of suicides. Therefore, “higher rates of depression” explains nothing. It simply raises the more important question: “Why are so many more Americans depressed?”
2. *Limited availability of mental health services.* This may be true, but like the previous statement, this answer avoids the question it raises: “Why are so many more Americans in need of mental health services?”
3. *The growing availability of guns.* Easy access to a gun makes suicide more probable and shooting oneself may be the quickest and least painful way of committing suicide. But this is also not an explanation. Guns have been ubiquitous in American life for many years, but the suicide rate in the past was always lower.

Instead, there two major factors for the increase in suicides, both of which are related to feminism and postmodernism:

- *Loneliness.* More Americans are living alone than at any time in history; 25% of all Americans aged 40 have never been married, by far the highest percentage of never-

married people at age 40 in American history. As previously discussed, materialism has infected American culture. After the 1960s, the baby-boomer generation rejected almost everything that made life meaningful. Many came to hold their parents in contempt because as college graduates they believed they understood life better than their less formally educated parents. Inspired by gender feminism, women no longer believed they needed a man, and marriage and family became less important. Therefore, the downward spiral of women's happiness began, and more young women are depressed than at any time since such data began to be measured.

- *Loss of Meaning.* Life can provide distractions, but ultimately meaning is all-important. The institutions that gave most Americans meaning – marriage, the nuclear family, religion, and patriotism – all of these are being disposed of. The term “God and Country” which provided generations of Americans with deep meaning has come to be regarded as foolish and even quasi-fascist. God is for simpletons, and the social justice movement teaches people to hate America. How can anyone be patriotic if the country is actually racist, unequal, chauvinist, imperialist, capitalist and patriarchal? ([Prager, 2023](#)).

These two factors are primary drivers for the increase in both depression and suicide.

Sexually Transmitted Diseases

STDs such as herpes, chlamydia, gonorrhea, syphilis, infectious hepatitis, HPV, and AIDS have increased largely because of the loosening of sexual standards, which results in sexual promiscuity and the failure of people to sexually keep to one partner. The prevalence of venereal disease in the American population has increased dramatically from an average of 3% in the 1950s to approximately 25% in the 1990s and has continued to increase ([GuttmacherInstitute, 1993](#)). The study stated that if “current trends continue, one-half of all women of age 15 in 1970 will have had [pelvic inflammatory disease] by the year 2000.” In other words, if a person has unprotected sex with four different untested partners, the likelihood of getting an STD essentially goes to 100%. New forms of STDs periodically appear, and viral versions, such as AIDS/HIV, HPV, hepatitis B, and genital herpes are incurable.

Another serious problem is that the symptoms of many venereal diseases don't show up for years, allowing a person carrying it to go untreated, and to unknowingly infect others

([GuttmacherInstitute, 1993](#)). These problems have resulted in a call for free condom distribution in high schools so that kids can have “safe sex.” Sex, of course, can get messy, so the notion of “safe sex” with a casual partner is essentially an oxymoron. Condoms reduce the likelihood of infection, but the risks are still significant. Condoms can break or come off, and studies have shown high rates of breakage – up to 50% when used in anal sex.

The failure rate of condoms during anal sex was so high that the National Institute of Health cancelled a controlled study of condom use in preventing HIV infection among homosexuals in Los Angeles because “it would be immoral to put people at such risk.” The results of a large multivariate study by the European Study Group indicated that when the practice of anal intercourse and a history of sexually transmitted disease in patients are considered, condom use no longer significantly reduced HIV transmission. ([Panzer, 1997, pp. 31-32](#))

Even when condoms are properly applied, some STDs, such as HPV, can still be spread by contact with the genital region of a carrier ([Panzer, 1997, pp. 31-32](#)). Putting them on is also a drag because it stops the action, and in the heat of the moment – “well, forget the condom, let’s just go for it.” Also depressing is the failure of people to use condoms and other means of protection against sexual disease, even after they have been educated. A study by Dr. Margaret Fischl at the University of Miami followed 35 couples in which one partner was HIV-infected, and the other was not. The study reported that 17 out of the 35 couples did not use condoms at all, and the other partner became infected in fourteen cases (82%); whereas the remaining 18 couples did use condoms, and three (17%) reported that the HIV infection had spread to the other partner. The study noted, however, that very few of the 18 couples used condoms all of the time and in an effective manner.

Since all of the individuals were under the care of the University of Miami and clearly informed about the urgency of correct, consistent condom use, their failure can’t be attributed to a lack of information. Seventeen out of the thirty-five did not even try to use condoms, and the others tried, but didn’t follow through. A 1994 study found that two in every five HIV-infected individuals did not use a condom with casual partners or even let them know that they were HIV-positive. ([Panzer, 1997, pp. 22-23](#))

The principal message of contemporary sex education is that kids have “sexual rights,” should feel free to sexually express themselves on a casual basis with multiple partners, and should avoid talking with their parents, who are probably too repressed, and no doubt would freak out if they were told what was really going on. The curriculum teaches kids how to engage in “outercourse,” how to have orgasms, and, of course, how to put a condom on. And this will supposedly reduce AIDS and teen pregnancy.

Unsurprisingly, there is not a shred of evidence that non-coital sex, with or without communication, will reduce the likelihood of coitus... Outercourse is a precursor to intercourse. But do we need studies to tell us this? Is it not graven in our memory that getting to third base vastly increases the chances of scoring a run? In fact, it could be argued that teaching non-coital sex techniques as a way of reducing the risks of coitus comes close to educational malpractice. ([Whitehead, 1994](#))

Therefore, the social policy of tacitly encouraging early sexual experimentation by phases such as “decide for yourself when you’re ready,” and “they can’t help it – they’re going to do it anyway,” is dangerous. Smoking cigarettes would probably be safer. Thus, the joke about safe sex: “Grandson to grampa: ‘What did you wear when you were young to avoid STDs?’ Grampa to grandson: ‘A wedding ring.’”

Pornography and Sex

As previously discussed, feminism promoted the sexual revolution, free love, and no-fault divorce, all of which have damaged marriage and sexuality. So the push for free sex has provided less sexual satisfaction rather than more.

Pornography has been present throughout history but in the past it was viewed in a more surreptitious manner – boys sneaking looks at girlie magazines – because it was seen as morally questionable. It shapes the sexual expectations of its consumers to engage in and expect more extreme sex and is often connected to sex trafficking ([Trueman, 2020, pp. 285-286](#)), but under

contemporary media figures, advertisers, and the internet, pornography has been mainstreamed, which in Freudian terms represents a victory of the “id” (our unconscious base desires) over the “super ego” (our conscience). Some of this is due to the fact that sex sells, but the transformation of pornography from morally bad to good is also due to the fundamental shift away from religion and toward the postmodern self, where both truth and morality are self-defined. Larry Flynt’s *Hustler* magazine and Hugh Hefner’s *Playboy* were large contributors to this normalization.

Hefner’s genius lay in the way he was able to remove the social stigma typically attached to pornography and the selling of sex as a commercial interest. This was exemplified in the way *Playboy* was constructed, with its combination of titillating photographs and serious interviews with individuals of cultural significance. ([Trueman, 2020, p. 281](#))

The U.S. Supreme Court wrote the principle of the postmodern self into law in one of its rulings on abortion in support of *Roe v. Wade*:

At the heart of liberty is the right to define one’s own concept of existence, of meaning, of the universe, and of the mysteries of human life. Beliefs about these matters could not define the attributes of personhood were they formed under the compulsion of the State. ([Kennedy, 1992](#))

With the establishment of this as legal precedent, it was no longer possible to view anything as “pornographic” in the sense that pornography is wrong. Therefore, the moral status of pornography is now irrelevant – the only question is whether this or that variety appeals to people. Chastity and virginity are mocked, and in the same way, there are no longer any moral standards of modesty, nor is there any longer a true legal basis for denying bestiality, polygamy, or pedophilia, except though current societal taste, majority rule, and pressure politics. Court decisions approving gay marriage followed because American law had abdicated legal control over personal identity. Pornography has thus become more extreme and has descended into the darkness of Marquis de Sade from whom we got the term “sadistic.”

Following the male-female dichotomy discussed above where the primary male orientation is visual whereas female is verbal, pornographic pictures are almost exclusively

sought by men. But women have “female porn” which is the genre of romantic novels read by many women. In both cases, porn causes sex to be viewed and experienced only by the individual, rather than with a partner. Sex is thus perceived as self-pleasure and self-gratification rather than intimacy with another person, so the relational aspects of sex are eviscerated. Some have considered the *Kama Sutra* and even some sections of the Bible to be pornographic because they address sexual topics. But these are focused on sex in the context of a relationship and how sexuality relates to the sacred order, rather than self-pleasure.

Pornography is seedy and sordid, but on a deeper level, it cheapens sex and removes the ecstasy that is only possible through connection with a partner. Just as nudity removes the sense of mystery from the female body, so pornography removes the potential highness from sex, making it crude and vulgar.

Now we arrive at a strange paradox. Ours is simultaneously the most oversexed and yet also the loneliest generation of all time... *The real underlying reason we seek sex is not primarily physical pleasure, but emotional intimacy. Because our sex lives today are not yielding emotional intimacy, we are fast becoming bored with sex. It is becoming an empty experience that leaves few pleasant memories.*

An ancient Jewish aphorism declares that the difference between the wise and the clever man is that the clever man can extricate himself from situations that the wise man would never have gotten himself into in the first place. Ours is a clever generation, not a wise one. [italics in original] ([Boteach, 1999, pp. 7-8](#))

Many if not most things in society are a consequence of what happens in the lives of individual pairings of men and women. What is needed is an increased level of commitment to our existing spouses, more marital sex, and an enlightened return to more traditional male-female roles, where Mom is a mother to the children at least when they are young, Dad is there to provide love and discipline, and Mom and Dad learn to understand and love each other. In reforming society, that is the real problem and the real challenge. We must create incentives for

couples to stick together and educate them as to how marriage and sex in marriage can become the most fulfilling of all relationships.

Higher Taxes and Costs

Many factors increase taxes and costs, but a significant amount of taxes goes to police, courts, prisons, security experts, psychologists, therapists, lawyers, child advocates, daycare providers, social workers, foster parents, medical providers, drug companies, and government bureaucrats at all levels, who are necessary in such large numbers to handle the problems associated with family breakdown, domestic violence, crime, disease, substance abuse, poverty, welfare, etc. We never get something from nothing, so more government spending must be paid for, either with higher taxes or with inflation, which reduces the buying power of our money. Crises create opportunities, and the pathologies created by gender feminism have necessitated a larger and more expansive government role in the affairs of American life; that is good for bureaucrats but bad for the average American.

Summary of Feminist Pathologies

As detailed above, gender feminism and its associated beliefs have pathologized Western society. Following is a summary of its circular effects:

1. The promulgation of humanistic and postmodern philosophy and the separation of church and state movement removed absolutes, biblical teaching about morality, and appreciation for traditional gender roles from the public square.
2. The desires of women for family and relationships were trashed by the guilt and shame heaped on traditional women. The devaluing of motherhood produced declines in the self-worth of women who would otherwise devote more of their time and energy to their children. Responding to this criticism, women sought jobs outside the home while at the same time trying to mother and care for their children, creating super mom pressures on women.

3. Feminist sex education encouraged early sexual activity, and welfare system payments incentivized out-of-wedlock births, creating many single mothers and absent fathers, as well as increasing rates of STDs. Teaching the social construction of gender has promoted homosexuality and androgynism, and devalued marriage.
4. Along with the devaluing of mothers, fatherhood and parental influence in general has also been devalued, and there is less acknowledgement of how much children need parents, especially their mothers. The number of children left to television and the Internet as babysitters increased along with an increase in problems caused by unattended kids.
5. Women going off to work or receiving welfare payments from the government reduced or removed the male role of being the provider and leader of his family. Sexual intimacy between couples was reduced as female submissiveness and surrender was condemned. Power struggles increased and the prevalence and likelihood of divorce and split-ups created more relational instability and a corresponding decrease in female security and feelings of well-being. Depression and other forms of mental illness increased.
6. The debasement of patriarchy discouraged men from being chivalrous and caring for women, resulting in more insecure masculinity with a tendency to lash out via stalking and rape. As females became bitchier, males responded by more of a “F*** ‘em and forget ‘em” mentality. The increasing feminization of girls and the dissatisfaction of the sexes toward each other resulted in more divorce and short-term relationships, producing more female-headed households, more potential poverty, and more confused, bitter, and dysfunctional children. The associated increase in fatherlessness created many pathologies in youth, such as teen rebellion, juvenile delinquency, and early pregnancy.
7. As the importance of parenting declined, success was increasingly viewed in monetary terms, so money became more important. Mothers sought careers either because they were forced to be a breadwinner, or because feminism has taught them that a career is necessary, or both. Materialist desires created pressure for two incomes, but often failed to deliver as the second income was consumed by desires for additional spending. The reduced value of children also made abortion a more acceptable solution for disposing of an unwanted child. Parents have increasingly given over authority of their children to government and schools and have increasingly abdicated their role as teacher and moral guide.
8. Femvertising and the emphasis on power for women and weakness for men created more gender confusion and dysphoria in teens, especially girls, in what has been termed rapid onset gender dysphoria.
9. Responding to the problems of poverty and the pathologies in black families, the social justice movement taught critical theory, systemic racism, and the condemnation of patriarchy, where all of the above problems are blamed on patriarchy and on white males. The result has been increased hatred, victimology, and a hardening of attitudes with

dialog becoming increasingly impossible.

Starting with the removal of biblical morality, followed by the separation of sex from gender and the corresponding push toward androgyny, the above factors are circular and have created a downward spiral of dissatisfaction, gender confusion, divorce, broken families, poverty, depression, suicide, and societal breakdown. The Venus fly trap of feminism has gradually been poisoning America, but its influence has been ignored, excused, and blamed on other factors; we have grown used to the current philistinism and low level of society. “Practically all the indicators of youth health and behavior have declined year by year for over a generation. None has improved. The litany is now so well known that it is losing its power to shock.” ([Damon, 1995](#)).

Feminism and Psychology

In reviewing psychology articles related to gender issues, the underlying world view is almost entirely feministic; the themes of female inequality and the evils of patriarchy and male dominance are repeated over and over. Here are a few examples:

Ballroom dancing, nowadays a multibillion-dollar industry, has emerged and developed within western, post-industrial, post-modern societies. As such, its representations rely heavily on heteronormative gender performances, most of which reiterate rape culture codes. ([Meneau, 2020](#))

The authors argue that complementary hostile and benevolent components of sexism exist across cultures. Male dominance creates hostile sexism, but men's dependence on women fosters benevolent sexism. ([Glick & al, 2000](#))

Women's submission fantasies in psychological studies are typically depicted as being pathological. ([Hawley & Hensley, 2009](#))

Gender differences exist between the sexes concerning sexual dominance fantasies, which are coercive and therefore criminal. ([Renaud & Byers, 2005](#))

Despite evidence that men and women's sexual roles are becoming more egalitarian over time, empirical evidence suggests that the traditional sexual roles continue to dominate heterosexual relations. This article concludes that traditional sexual scripts are harmful for both women's and men's ability to engage in authentic, rewarding sexual expression, and the female submissive role may be particularly debilitating... For instance, feminist scholars have argued that men's dating violence perpetration is a byproduct of systemic gender inequities which promote a culture that tolerates violence against women. ([Sanchez et al., 2012](#))

Sexual arousal by dominance and submissiveness was long considered as a pathology. The Diagnostic manual International Classification of Diseases (ICD) 10 of the World Health Organization places even consensual BDSM in the Mental and Behavioral Disorders subchapter of Disorders of Sexual Preference. ([Jozifkova, 2018](#))

Psychology has thus been deeply influenced by feminism, which is now the dominant and perhaps even the universal position, e.g., ([Rutherford & Pettit, 2015](#)). As indicated in Rutherford's article, "Feminism is psychology, and psychology is feminism." As George Gilder stated, "Masculinity is always a gaffe in the world of social science" He further writes,

What is interesting about these kinds of [social science] books and articles is the strange spectacle they afford, of high-ranking professors at prestigious state universities palling around with pimps and prostitutes, pouring over pornography, sampling sessions of

sexual therapy, investigating behavior at homosexual bars, attending orgies, all at the expense of the American taxpayer... Although sociologists tend to scorn the proposition that sexual promiscuity is evil and destructive, they hasten to condemn discrimination at every turn. Discrimination, even by sex, is regarded to be an unquestionable crime... The three things detested by social science are capitalism, male-female differences, and religion. ([Gilder, 1986, pp. 156, 158-159](#))

The original plan for this dissertation was to include a quantitative research section – an analysis of survey results from peer-reviewers at psychology journals to determine their level of support for gender feminism. These individuals could be considered the “gatekeepers” of psychology as they review and either recommend or refuse articles for publication. An electronic survey using a commercial survey tool (Jotform) was developed consisting of 30 Likert-style questions with the answers specified as “agree strongly, agree, neutral, disagree, disagree strongly, or not applicable.” The goal was to determine the cultural attitudes of the reviewers on a variety of topics including their assessment of feminism. Fifty psychology journals were selected, and emails sent to all of them containing a request for involvement from their peer-reviewers and a link to the survey. Following are the survey questions:

Assuming that an article presented to you for peer review had a sufficient level of scientific rigor, would you and/or your journal approve it for publication if was on the following topic:

1. Support for early gender transition in school policies.
2. Support for allowing gender transition counseling and drug administration without parental approval.
3. Allowing abortions to be performed in the 2nd trimester.
4. Allowing abortions to be performed up to and possibly after birth.
5. Further restricting or disallowing abortion.
6. Support for rape laws that disallow female retraction.
7. Benefits of patriarchy and male leadership.
8. Problems of fatherless families and appeals for more intact marriages.
9. Negative impact of female careers on child supervision and behavior.
10. Appeal for the denial of gender transition for minors.
11. Support for LGBTQ+ literature in schools and school libraries despite parental complaints.
12. Support for stay-at-home mothers.
13. Support for the gender pay gap.
14. Support for abortion as a family planning tool.

15. Universality of male leadership in human societies.
16. Positive aspects of divorce and blended families.
17. Connections between fatherless families and depression and mental illness.
18. Appeal for more stay-at-home fathers, and support for more working wives.
19. Criticism of the lack parental involvement as an explanation for the problems in schools.
20. Considering males and females to be equivalent and therefore recommending policies of total equality and equity.
21. Analysis of feminist advertising and its impact on behavior, especially in regard to the “rapid onset” gender dysphoria in girls.
22. Concern for the increase in “beta males” due to criticism of male leadership.
23. Criticism of feminism, questioning of Marxist analysis, and rejection of critical theory and white male supremacy doctrines.
24. Rejection of religious and traditional principles for marriage and male-female relationships.
25. Appeal for responsible male leadership and increased leadership training for boys.
26. Reinstitution of home economics training for girls.
27. Analysis of the gender pay gap as a myth.
28. Validity of the Marxian “oppressor/oppressed” analysis of history and its applicability to male-female relationships.
29. Analysis of male/female differences and their implications for distinct role differences.
30. Criticism of Title IX legislation as related to men vs. women’s collegiate sports programs.

One would think that such individuals would be willing to respond to a request for a psychology PhD research project, but the request was rejected by all of them – only one response was received to which the answers for all of the questions were marked “not applicable.”

Therefore, this aspect of the dissertation required a different approach – considering the peer-review process and bias in research, reviewing the policies and curriculum at various collegiate psychology and Women’s Studies programs, and a consideration of cancel culture.

Women’s Studies Programs

Secular universities used to teach students about the past and its cultural values, but they are now committed to the opposite – to tearing down all past beliefs, destroying cultural traditions, and rejecting a transcendent morality with the self as the only measure. The goal is not a new culture but rather anti-culture – the deconstruction of all grand narratives and historical

traditions, especially those associated with men. They are following the dictates of Herbert Marcuse and other leftists in their desire to turn education into indoctrination.

Ways should not be blocked on which a subversive minority could develop, and if they are blocked, by organized repression and indoctrination, their reopening may require apparently undemocratic means. This would include the withdrawal of toleration of speech and assembly from movements which promote aggressive policies, armament, chauvinism, discrimination on the grounds of race and religion, or which oppose the extension of public services, social security, medical care, etc. Moreover, the restoration of freedom of thought may necessitate new and rigid restrictions on teaching and practices in the educational institutions which, by their very methods and concepts, seek to enclose the mind within the established universe of discourse and behavior...

([Marcuse, 1965](#))

Marcuse's essay is thus a revealing thesis on how societal tolerance should be deployed and turned into intolerance as a means of political attack. How can the "restoration of freedom and thought" be brought about by the withdrawal of free speech? It only makes sense if "freedom of thought" is defined as total conformity to Marxist principles. Leftists have thus arrogated to themselves a monopoly on truth where contrary ideas are suppressed and, when possible, criminalized.

Nowhere is this seen more clearly than in the development of Women's Studies Programs. The 1960s launched a period of feminist activism in which many newly minted PhDs established Women's Studies as a new field of inquiry at universities across the Western world. Here are examples of how these programs at schools across America describe themselves:

- *Arizona State University* – is part of the nation's first school of social transformation. The diverse community of scholars takes an innovative approach to the study of social justice by uniting multiple academic disciplines to strategically create social change that is democratic, inclusive, and just.
- *Indiana University* – builds upon decades of path breaking research by feminist, anti-racist, queer scholars working in multiple disciplinary traditions and interdisciplinary fields.
- *Ohio State University* – relies on multi-disciplinary approaches to the study of gender and sexuality, particularly as they intersect with race, ethnicity, class, culture, religion, nation, and ability. Our program emphasizes academic excellence, the use of feminist and anti-

racist pedagogies, and scholarship that contributes to social change and justice.

- *Rutgers* – to explore the intricate connections between feminist theory and practice, to illuminate the centrality of the intersection of gender identities with other socially and culturally produced identities.
- *University of California, Los Angeles* – teaching in areas that emphasize women of color feminism, racial justice, and gender non-conformity.
- *University of Kentucky* – we explore how gender relations occur simultaneously with other hierarchical social relations and inequalities of power, including those based on ability, age, class, ethnicity, family composition, race, region, religion, sex, sexuality, citizenship status, and nationality. We examine the inequitable distribution of resources in and among countries and groups transnationally and envision paths toward equity and freedom.
- *University of Minnesota* – along with feminist studies, the contribution of queer and transgender studies – in regard to gender, sexuality, and biological bodies – is also a central component of our graduate program.
- *University of Washington* – has a strong interdisciplinary orientation: intersectional, decolonial, indigenous, queer and transnational feminisms foreground our studies of gender, sex, and sexuality.
- *Yale University* – critically interrogates gender and sexuality as categories of inequality, difference, and identification. Gender (the social and historical meanings of distinctions across sexes) and sexuality (the domain of sexual practices, identities, discourses, and institutions) are studied as they intersect with class, race, nationality, religion, ability, and other zones of human and nonhuman experience. The introduction of these perspectives into all fields of knowledge necessitates new research paradigms, organizing concepts and analytics, and critique.

(All of the above descriptions were taken from The National Women's Studies Association PhD Program List: <https://www.nwsa.org/page/phdprogramlist>).

Note that none of these programs are at all concerned with the desires of traditional women for home and family, but rather with their elimination. All are based on Marxian concepts of social justice, critical theory, and gender feminism so that the women (and the miniscule number of men) attending these programs are indoctrinated into this mindset.

The study of history is another victim. For example, the Harvard University catalog does not have any courses on the Reformation but does have Native American History and British

Colonial Violence classes. The entire history of modern Europe (1450 to 1789) is crammed into a single course whereas Feminism and Pornography (1975 to 1995) runs an entire semester. Large sums are thus being paid by students to receive a poor and completely biased education, in what has been termed “cultural and historical amnesia” ([Trueman, 2020, p. 332](#)).

As the affirmative action policies favor females, women have had more scholarship opportunities than men, especially those applying for study in STEM fields, and the number of women earning master and doctoral level has exceeded men for the last fifteen years. In some fields, as many as three-quarters of the PhDs awarded went to women, including public administration and services (75.6%), health sciences (70.3%) and education (68.8%). Women were also ahead of men in arts and humanities, as well as social and behavioral sciences, so why does affirmative action for women still exist? American institutions also awarded the majority of graduate certificates (64%) and master’s degrees (57.3%) to women in 2016-17 ([Whiting, 2018](#)). Women have not only earned more doctoral degrees than men, in 2020 women outnumbered men in grad school by 32% especially in the field of psychology and social sciences in which women make up the majority of the degrees awarded by a 2 to 1 margin ([Perry, 2021](#)). Given the fact that this has been the case for many years, it is easy to understand how “psychology has become feminism.”

The facts that: a) men are underrepresented in graduate school enrollment overall (only 100 men were enrolled in 2020 for every 148 women), b) men received fewer master’s (less than a 40% share of the total) and doctoral degrees (47% of the total) than women in 2020 and c) men were underrepresented in 7 out of 11 graduate fields of study at both the master’s and doctoral levels last year for both degrees and enrollment will get almost no attention at all from feminists, gender activists, women’s centers, the media, universities, or anybody else in the higher education industry.

Additionally, there will be no calls for taxpayer-funded studies or increased taxpayer funding to address the significant gender disparities favoring women in graduate schools, and nobody will refer to the gender graduate school enrollment and degree gaps favoring women as a problem or a national “crisis.” Further, despite their stated commitment to “gender equity,” the hundreds of university women’s centers around the country are unlikely to show any concern about the significant gender inequities in graduate school

enrollment and degrees, and universities will not be allocating funding to set up men's centers or men's commissions on college campuses or providing funding for graduate scholarships for men to address the significant male under-representation.

If America's diversity worshipers see any female under-representation as a problem and possibly even as proof of gender discrimination, what do they propose should be done about female over-representation in higher education at every level and in 7 out of 11 graduate fields at the master's and doctoral degrees? ([Perry, 2021](#))

Criticism of Peer-Review and Research Bias

There have been a number of criticisms of the peer-review process, e.g., ([Baglioi, 2010](#); [Lee & al, 2015](#); [Street & Ward, 2019](#)). Baglioi discusses the significance attributed to peer review, combined with the lack of investigation and research into its impartiality and empiricism. He writes:

[What interests me here] is the fact that such a substantial body of usually polarized private or quasi-private comments seem to exist in the absence of a public analytical discourse about peer review. ([Baglioi, 2010](#)).

Street writes:

Our research proposes that one way the peer review process could appear flawed is if those involved had different beliefs about what was important in evaluating research. We found evidence for a cognitive bias where respondents to a survey asking about the importance of particular validity and reliability method practices gave different answers depending on whether they were asked to answer the survey as a researcher or as a reviewer. ([Street & Ward, 2019](#))

Lee writes:

In the context of peer review, confirmation bias is understood as reviewer bias against manuscripts describing results inconsistent with the theoretical perspective of the reviewer (Jelicic & Merckelbach, 2002) ... Confirmation bias challenges the impartiality of peer review by questioning whether reviewers evaluate submissions on the basis of their content and relationship... Empirical study suggests reviewers are vulnerable to confirmation bias. ([Lee & al, 2015](#))

Beyond issues with peer-review are questions related to the honesty of research reporting and the tendency to spin the results in favor of the researcher's biases. Marc Tessier-Lavigne, the former president of Stanford University, resigned after it was discovered that his team had

manipulated data in some of his research articles ([Archie, 2023](#)). Studies on groupthink and bias made this disturbing statement about whether academia can be trusted to do unbiased research on topics where their careers are in jeopardy if they don't toe the politically correct line, such as feminism:

Can scientists be trusted to conduct unbiased science? There is a growing body of papers arguing that psychological research is guided by “ideological epistemology.” ([Van Bavel & al, 2020](#))

Political bias manifests as theories the field has advanced that flatter liberals and disparage conservatives, as ideologically motivated skepticism against theories and data that challenge liberal positions, and an overrepresentation of liberals in social psychology. Conservative students reported greater experiences of hostility from instructors than did their non-liberal peers; furthermore, even liberal students agreed that conservative and religious students are the disproportionate recipients of hostility from university faculty... In scientific abstracts for social psychology research, for example, conservatives and conservative ideas are described more negatively than liberals and liberal ideas. The lack of conservatives in the social sciences, combined with explicit endorsement of discrimination against conservatives, gives lay conservatives ample reasons to doubt the validity of conclusions seeming to support liberal, equalitarian, social justice narratives. ([Honeycutt & Jussim, 2020](#))

Recent scholarship has challenged the long-held assumption in the social sciences that Conservatives were more biased than Liberals, contending that the predominance of Liberals in the social sciences might have caused social scientists to ignore liberal bias. Here, we argue that victims' groups are one potent source of liberal bias. We contend that many Liberals are cosmic egalitarians, that is, they believe that demographic groups do not differ (genetically) on socially valued traits (e.g., math ability, IQ). This, coupled with a sacred narrative about protecting victims' groups (e.g., Blacks, Muslims, women) leads to bias against any challenge to cosmic egalitarianism. ([Winegard, 2019](#))

Along with issues of liberal bias, there is also a “reproducibility crisis” in which more than two-thirds of researchers have tried and failed to reproduce other scientists' results, which is especially concerning in view of progressive intolerance and mendacity.

Concern over the reliability of the results published in scientific literature has been growing for some time. According to a survey published in the journal *Nature* last summer, more than 70% of researchers have tried and failed to reproduce another scientist's experiments.

Marcus Munafo is one of them. Now professor of biological psychology at Bristol University, he almost gave up on a career in science when, as a PhD student, he failed to reproduce a textbook study on anxiety. “I had a crisis of confidence. I thought maybe it's me, maybe I didn't run my study well, maybe I'm not cut out to be a scientist.” The

problem, it turned out, was not with Marcus Munafo's science, but with the way the scientific literature had been “tidied up” to present a much clearer, more robust outcome. “What we see in the published literature is a highly curated version of what's actually happened,” he says. “The trouble is that gives you a rose-tinted view of the evidence because the results that get published tend to be the most interesting, the most exciting, novel, eye-catching, unexpected results.” It's about the funding bodies that want to secure the biggest bang for their bucks, the peer review journals that vie to publish the most exciting breakthroughs, the institutes and universities that measure success in grants won and papers published and the ambition of the researchers themselves. ([Feilden, 2017](#))

Cancel Culture

Cancel culture is usually considered as a social media phenomenon of “group shaming.” But it has come to be a form of mob rule dominating virtually every sector of American life: politics, journalism, music, entertainment, sports, business, and especially higher education. To be fair cancel culture is practiced by all sides and anyone who expresses his or her opinion on public web sites typically experiences flaming and harsh feedback. Cancel culture has been defined as “collective strategies by activists using social pressures to achieve cultural ostracism of targets accused of offensive words or deeds.” The prevalence of the internet and the sophistication of social media apps has expanded the opportunities for online mobilization of both progressive and conservative activists and the ability to harass those with whom they disagree ([Bagus et al., 2023](#)). But progressive academics, bureaucrats, and media figures have shifted the goal posts steadily leftward, so that anyone who espouses ideas considered uncontroversial even a few years ago are now anathematized. Progressive orthodoxy has thus become severely offended by the perpetuation of the many “isms” or “phobias” viewed as major sins by the modern left, such as sexism, misogyny, racism, nationalism, climate change denial, homophobia, transphobia, and islamophobia. There is an expectation that academics must do more than simply teach their subjects; they must also devote themselves to the work of being against all of the above whether they agree or not ([Acevedo, 2023](#); [Norris, 2020](#)). The word

“progressive” is evidence of the hypocrisy of the left – believing that their views are the best or the only way forward, when they may in fact be the worst.

Progressives are seriously castigated in books such as Carl Trueman’s *The Rise of the Modern Self: Cultural Amnesia, Expressive Individualism, and the Road to Sexual Revolution*, as well as the classic by Allan Bloom, *The Closing of the American Mind: How Higher Education Has Failed Democracy and Impoverished the Souls of Today’s Students*, which was declared by the Chicago Tribune as “Possibly the most important work of its kind by an American since WW2.” Both are serious studies on state of the American soul, and the latter is an indictment of higher education and postmodernism. In his introduction Bloom writes:

There is one thing that a professor can be absolutely certain of: almost every student believes, or says he believes, that truth is relative. If this belief is put to the test, one can count on the student’s reaction: they will be uncomprehending. That anyone should regard the proposition as not self-evident astonishes them... They are unified only in their relativism and allegiance to equality, with the two being morally related. The relativity of truth is not a theoretical insight but a moral postulate, the condition of a free society, or so they see it, and they have been equipped with this framework early on.

The danger they have been taught to fear from absolutism is not error, but intolerance [perhaps the worst sin of all according to progressives is openness (i.e., tolerance)]. Relativism is necessary to openness, and this is the virtue, the only virtue, which all primary education for more than fifty years has dedicated itself to inculcating... The true believer is the real danger... so the point is not to correct the mistakes of the past and really be right; rather it is not to think you are right at all.

Openness pays no attention to natural rights or the historical origins of our regime, which are now thought to have been essentially flawed and regressive. There is no enemy other than the man who is not open to everything.

The students, of course, cannot defend their opinion as it is something with which they have been indoctrinated. Young Americans have less and less knowledge about and interest in foreign places. In the past there were many students who actually knew something about and loved England, France, Germany and other countries, but that love has been replaced by an interest in the political problems of the Third World with a corresponding ignorance of their cultures as well, which is a disguised form of imperialism. The upshot of all this is that young Americans now know little about other nations and much less about American history; the purpose of education is not to make them scholars but to make them morally open... Openness as it is currently conceived, is a way of making surrender to whatever is most powerful look principled. So, openness is actually a great closing.

Students now are narrower and flatter... and there is less soil in which university teaching can take root. Students have been taught to doubt belief before they believe in anything. ([Bloom, 1987, pp. 25-26, 33-34, 42](#))

This closing of American minds leads to progressive reactions against any attempts to re-open them. In his article on feminist censorship Kåre Fog refers to the feminist stranglehold on academia as a “lace curtain” concealing and prohibiting any psychological research critical of feminist positions ([Fog, 2018](#)). Efforts to do this have been ongoing for many years. In 1984 Catherine MacKinnon and Andrea Dworkin wrote a potential ordinance for the City of Minneapolis which would allow women to sue anyone involved in the production, sale, or distribution of pornography on the grounds that they had been harmed by images of female sexuality being portrayed. Forms of the ordinance became law for a short time in cities such as Boston, Indianapolis, and Los Angeles despite the difficulties in a legal definition of “pornography” and the fact that no direct link between pornography and violence against women has been established ([Rodgerson & Semple, 1990](#)). It is not yet possible to control the internet where pornography flourishes and free speech is still practiced, although censorship is being attempted by social media sites such as Facebook, YouTube, Google and others in a troubling attempt to eliminate certain forms of informational content, such as data about and criticisms of vaccines, big pharma, and the subsequent government complicity. Nevertheless, Dworkin spoke for many gender feminists:

Marriage as an institution developed from rape as a practice... I want to see a man beaten to a bloody pulp with a high heel shoved in his mouth, like an apple in the mouth of a pig. ([Dworkin, 1987](#))

As Fog states, academia has proved to be much easier to regulate, and this becomes abundantly clear when one searches academic resources for articles related to feminism. For example, a search for “gender pay gap” via a university resource site returned thousands of hits which were consistently pro-feminist in their outlook. In attempting to locate a peer-reviewed

study exposing the myth of the gender pay gap only one academic article was found ([Hakim, 2007](#)). The same thing is true searching for peer-reviewed articles critical of John Money's attempt to turn a boy into a girl. Efforts to find articles on the policies of academic journals by returned articles such as the following:

- The Future Is Female: A Behavioral Account of Sexism.
- Bringing Feminist Sociological Analyses of Patriarchy Back to the Forefront of the Study of Woman Abuse.
- The Contestation of Patriarchy.
- Integrating Multiculturalism and Intersectionality into the Psychology Curriculum: Strategies for Instructors.
- Re-Visioning Family Therapy, Third Edition: Addressing Diversity in Clinical Practice.
- Victimology: Research, Policy, and Activism.
- Victims of Stalking: Case Studies in Invisible Harms.
- Boys Will Be Boys: Power, Patriarchy and Toxic Masculinity.
- Analyzing Violence Against Women.
- Social work, feminism, and prison abolition: Feminism as Activism and Sisterhood.
- Breaking the binaries in research.
- Embodying health behaviors in everyday life: the social and gendered practices of female senior managers.
- Feminist writing that matters.
- A Woman's Place: Inside the Fight for a Feminist Future.
- Religiosity and male-to-female partner violence: Exploring female submission in context and how to reduce female submission.
- Beaten Into Submissiveness? An Investigation into the Protective Strategies Used by Survivors of Domestic Abuse.
- The relationship between social comparison and submissive behaviors in people with social anxiety: Paranoid social cognition as the mediator.

This is in contrast to the many results returned from a general internet search using similar phrases on both sides of the issue, revealing the chokehold that feminists have on academia and on publishing articles in psychological journals. The same thing is true when searching academic resources for articles on patriarchy – the results returned are uniformly negative, whereas a general internet search will return both positive and negative articles. It should be noted that this is not necessarily due to the fact that there are more females in the field of psychology than males. Studies of scholarly journals in general indicate that there are more

male peer-reviewers than female – evidence that males in psychology have also absorbed or at least conform to the feminist bias ([Squazzoni & al, 2021](#)).

Social justice and leftists in general, and gender feminism in particular, are at the forefront of “cancel culture” and “political correctness” – attempts to suppress and eliminate any ideas, teachings, and research that contradicts their beliefs, e.g., ([Rothschild, 2021](#)). As in the saying, “My mind is made up, don’t confuse me with any facts,” cancel culture generally rejects debate that would challenge its views. Explaining this tendency becomes clear when it is understood that gender feminists choose feeling over thinking when there is a conflict, as truth for them is largely self-defined.

An example of this was Tim Hill, a research scholar at the California Polytechnic State University who performed a study entitled “An evolutionary theory for the variability hypothesis” published on August 18, 2018. It had been accepted by several scientific journals, but it was suddenly yanked by all of them. When Hill questioned the reason for the rejection, he found that it had nothing to do with the quality of his research. Rather it was because Hill’s article explored Darwinian reasons that there are both more highly intelligent and intelligence-deficient men than women, so it exposed the reality that the sexes are fundamentally different. One journal editor explained that the study had been rejected due to worries about “the very real possibility that the right-wing media could pick this up and hype it internationally” ([PatriotPost, 2018](#)).

Jack Matthews from the Foundation for Economic Freedom noted that “the evidence of reverse sexism [i.e. feminism] is everywhere, and impossible to ignore.” A friend of his involved in higher education wrote an essay about false accusations by female students against male professors. A magazine editor wanted to print it, but said some of the staff females objected,

arguing that what he described could not be true, although his report was completely factual. The piece was also rejected by a second magazine because a feminist on the staff voted against publication; in discussions with the editor, the author was told, “Our women readers aren’t smart enough to understand this” ([Matthews, 1992](#)).

Debra Soh, a sex researcher, likewise was worried about being fired and blackballed from psychology if she supported the biological vs. social construction of gender, and she considered waiting until after she had a tenured position as a university professor before stating her position in writing, “so that pushback from those who were enraged at me would be buffered.” However, she was given a wake-up call by one of her mentors who bluntly told her, “Tenure won’t protect you” ([Soh, 2020, pp. 6-7](#)). She went on to seek a PhD in neuroscience, and she maintains her position that sex differences are primarily biological, despite being heavily criticized and “cancelled.”

My own experience echoes this. While enrolled in the doctor of psychology program at Northcentral University I was “cancelled” by a feminist professor and given a failing grade for a paper that she disagreed with. After taking virtually all of the coursework for the PhD I left the school because it would never have supported my work on this dissertation.

According to the National Association of Scholars, there have been 291 academic cancellations in the United States and Canada since 2020 – some of these were liberals but most were conservatives ([Acevedo, 2023](#)). This is happening to some of the brightest professors, such as Charles Murray, the author of *Losing Ground* and a critic of welfare policies; Michael Behe who wrote books critical of Darwinism (especially his book *The Edge of Evolution* which explored the limits of what evolution could possibly achieve); and Jordan Peterson who was forced to resign from his fully tenured professorship at the University of Toronto in 2022 due to

diversity, inclusivity, and equity mandates ([Bagus et al., 2023](#)), and is now being forced to take “sensitivity classes.”

Bias and censorship are now the rule in secular academia rather than the exception, and the bias against conservative viewpoints extends far beyond psychology to all subjects and to secular universities in general – “progressive seminaries.” ([Acevedo, 2023](#)).

Academic cancellation usually goes something like this: 1) a professor, administrator, or student says or writes something considered heretical by progressives; 2) outcry ensues among the faculty and student body, who demand institutional discipline; 3) administrators cave to the mob and punish the “culprit.” In most cases, it’s really that simple.

For untenured professors and administrators, this discipline may take the form of suspension or firing, but always with a large dose of public humiliation. Tenured faculty have more protections, but schools often make their jobs harder through burdensome investigations and never-ending “sensitivity” and “implicit bias” trainings. Canceled students may have their professional careers ruined before they’ve begun.

After punishment, victims of cancel culture rarely have the opportunity to fight back. Many are at-will employees and therefore lack the ability to pursue legal recourse. Even if they could, colleges and universities can almost always out-lawyer any individual with their internal or external legal teams paid out of hefty hedge funds (i.e., endowments). Sadly, the fate of most canceled is banishment from their academic communities. ([Acevedo, 2023](#))

Eric Kaufmann, a Professor of Politics in the UK, has studied cancel culture and determined that academic freedom is in serious trouble in the form of threats to scholars of being fired, shunned, and discriminated against in a variety of ways, especially for those who are younger. Over 60% of those with conservative views (in contrast to 8% of liberals) are concerned that their viewpoint would make it hard or impossible for them to have a career in academia, especially as they hear stories such as what happened to Bret Weinstein, a biology professor at Evergreen State College in Seattle. He was forced to resign after he objected to a proposal that white students should leave campus for a day to highlight how they have supposedly participated in the oppression of minorities. There are serious consequences to being outed as a conservative, or as someone who believes in the biological origin of gender.

The problem is not that leftist academics discriminate more than right-wing academics, or that academics discriminate more than others. The difference lies in the highly ideological skew and transparently political nature of people who work in the SSH (social science and health) academic disciplines. When you are outnumbered 10 to one, your views matter a lot less than bias from the majority when it comes to getting a job or getting ahead.

One consequence of this censorship is that smart conservative students who do not conform ideologically are being dissuaded from pursuing graduate work and an academic career. In a survey of mainly American and British master's and PhD students, those on the right are far more likely to agree that their political views wouldn't fit a career in academia.

Since the late 1980s, book after book has assailed the lack of viewpoint diversity and power of political correctness on campus. But in the ensuing decades, these problems have only worsened. Universities are now in a feedback loop in which a political monoculture creates a hostile climate for conservatives, driving self-censorship and empowering cancel culture, which keeps conservatives out.

Universities cannot reform themselves... To truly open up academic freedom in America, regulators must proactively monitor universities for compliance with their duties. Only this can prevent them from giving in to the well-organized minority of intolerant activists who are increasingly setting the tone on campuses. ([Kaufmann, 2021](#))

On the other hand, leftist professors can spew extreme venom, often with no consequences. For example, Georgetown professor Carol Christine Fair tweeted that “entitled white men should have their corpses castrated and then be fed to pigs.” She remains a professor at the university.

Tuition for higher education has steadily risen at the same time as universities are replacing education with indoctrination. It is time for people of good will to start demanding changes, like the recent firing of Elizabeth McGill from the presidency of the University of Pennsylvania ([Poulter, 2023](#)) after she and the presidents of Harvard and MIT were brought before Congress to account for their failure to reprimand or discipline students calling for genocide of Jews and the destruction of Israel. Intense criticism has ensued, “Elite colleges have turned into the cesspools of bigotry they once claimed to be fighting” ([Schlott, 2024](#)). Phil

McGraw, the “Dr. Phil” of television, blasted their testimony and called for their immediate termination.

McGraw said he recently saw the IDF video of the raw footage from October 7 in which Hamas terrorists murder, rape, and defile the bodies of Israeli civilians. The targets, he said, were men, women, children, and the elderly, who were hunted, tortured, raped, dismembered, and beheaded without mercy. He indicated, “The sexual assaults perpetrated on the women and girls were so sick and twisted as to defy explanation,” said McGraw in the video. “These were not acts of war; they were mass murdering cowards, high on the drugs, while they celebrated and tallied up their kills like they were in a drunken bar game on a Saturday night. I was so sickened by video images I can never unsee what was done to babies in cribs and young girls begging for their lives. I am changed forevermore.” ([Jaffe-Hoffman, 2023](#))

Unfortunately, antisemitism is just the tip of the iceberg of the leftist rot in higher education. For example, Susan Stryker, a MtF transgender professor at the University of Arizona, writes in her/his essay “Performing Transgender Rage” that transgenderism represents a war against Western society. She/he states, “I am a transsexual and therefore I am a monster...” intended to direct its “rage and revenge” against the “naturalized heterosexual order,” against “traditional family values,” and against the “hegemonic oppression” of nature itself ([Rufo, 2023](#)).

The transgender movement is inherently political. Its reconstruction of personal identity is meant to advance a collective political reconstruction or transformation. Some trans activists even view their movement as the future of Marxism. In a collection of essays titled *Transgender Marxism* activist and writer Rosa Lee argues that trans people can serve as the new vanguard of the proletariat, promising to abolish heteronormality in the same way that orthodox Marxism promised to abolish capitalism. ([Rufo, 2023](#))

These quotes reveal the religious nature of transsexualism and gender feminism. They are the modern equivalent of the biblical Pharisees and the Inquisition, desiring to “burn heretics at the stake” in whatever ways that are possible in contemporary society. See the [Victims of Cancel Culture](#) section below for specific examples.

Given the same hostility and divide in American politics it is unlikely that any such federal initiatives to enforce fairness would be forthcoming. Rather we see the opposite, such as

the “1619 Project” from the National Education Association to transform American history into the study of slavery in order to condemn whites.

Woke individuals are sometime derisively characterized as “snowflakes” – overly sensitive and too easily offended. But that term does not do justice to the level of hatred and animus that Marxism and feminism has imbued, which considers all of history to be oppression by white heterosexual males. This involves more than simple historical deception, revisionism, and bias – it is recruitment of students to engage in politics and warfare, as Carl Trueman states, “The self must be psychologized, psychology must be sexualized, and sex must be politicized” ([Trueman, 2020, p. 223](#)). This is the major reason why campuses are erupting; why militant groups such as Antifa are growing increasingly bold; why politics are increasingly hate-filled; and why American culture is becoming an anti-culture, or as Trueman indicates, a “death-work.” Sadly, debate is increasingly fruitless because there is no common ground; the other side is not simply wrong – they are bigoted and evil. Woke thinking is essentially, “*My* views are rooted in reason, whereas *your* views are irrational, so we need to eliminate your views, and you should no longer have any right to state them.” When one side politicizes issues then all sides are forced to do the same – everything is politicized so everything becomes cultural warfare.

Parents need to wake up to the damage being inflicted by public education in America, to fight against it, and/or to abandon public schools in favor of private education or home schooling. Universities are a major source of Marxist-based societal pollution and degradation that is contaminating and destroying America – parents and young people should vote with their feet and start abandoning these colleges and universities, and funding sources need to rescind their grants. Gender feminist bias and censorship are therefore major factors in producing the problems in education above, as well as the social pathologies described below.

Counseling Modalities

The core difficulty of psychology is that it deals with issues of human nature and the human mind, which are the most complex of all scientific subjects – the human brain is the most complicated thing in the cosmos. Therefore, throughout the history of psychology, people drawn to the field have struggled to define what should be studied, how the studies should be conducted, and how the conclusions of the study should be applied. They have also disagreed about whether and to what extent psychology should be scientific and theoretical vs. practical and applied. As these disagreements became solidified into movements, they have often opposed each other, and there have been many struggles over professional prestige and remuneration. Thus, unlike other sciences which have tended to proceed from one theoretical model to the next in a relatively straightforward way, the history of psychology is fraught with movements and counter-movements that have sometimes provided insights but have not resulted in a comprehensive set of universally accepted theories and practices.

At the beginning there were philosophers such as Aristotle, Plato, the Apostle Paul, Kant, Rousseau, and others who had varying ideas on the nature of man, the mind, consciousness, and religion. After Darwin, when the discipline of psychology was invented, the thought was to make it “scientific” so that religion could be eliminated because religion (Christianity in particular) was supposedly unscientific and non-empirical. As Rodney Stark indicates:

Theology has long been in disrepute among most Western intellectuals. The word is taken to mean a passe form of religious thinking that embraces irrationality and dogmatism. Consequently, as Ludwig Feuerbach (1804-74) put it, “The task of the modern era was the transformation of theology into anthropology”... God is now supposedly an unnecessary hypothesis... But perhaps the most remarkable aspect of the rise of science is that the early scientists [who were all theistic] not only searched for natural laws, but that they found them! It thus could be said that the proposition that the universe had an Intelligent Designer is the most fundamental of all scientific theories, and that it has been put to empirical tests again and again. The most incomprehensible thing about the universe is that it is comprehensible. ([Stark, 2016, pp. 136, 153, 162](#))

The founders of psychology wanted to place it on par with the “hard” sciences of chemistry, physics, and others, which meant that the only acceptable experimental evidence had to be physical and repeatable. However, strict repeatability is rarely possible with human subjects, and many potential experiments on people are unethical. Furthermore, we have no way of determining what people are actually thinking, and we still have no idea how consciousness and the retrieval of memories works, so there are severe limits on empiricism in psychology. This limitation is one of the main reasons behind many of the historical disagreements between the movements in psychology.

Psychology as a discipline began with the work of Wilhelm Wundt in 1879 with a focus on measurement and the use of devices to study human characteristics. Wundt’s efforts became known as “structuralism” which was followed by the “functionalist” movement of William James and others who saw structural psychology as too highly focused on the minutia of human characteristics and sought to develop an applied version of psychology. In the 1890s Sigmund Freud developed psychoanalysis as a means of exploring memories, especially as related to sex, in order to cure what he termed as “neuroses.” Meanwhile, the behaviorist school of Pavlov, Watson, and Skinner sought to maintain a scientific approach in studying the mind. The only thing that actually can be observed and studied is behavior, so they ignored everything else and focused on how behavior could be manipulated and controlled, leading to a mechanist and Darwinian view of people. Others, such as the Gestaltists, focused on studying cognition and perception with a more wholistic approach; they were followed by the development of neuroscience and the use of brain imaging techniques such as fMRI (functional magnetic resonance imaging) to analyze brain structure and function. After the world wars there was increased interest in understanding and treating PTSD, depression, and mental illness, so

psychology was pushed in that direction, but others such as Maslow, Seligman, and Rogers felt that psychology was becoming too obsessed with pathology and was ignoring the problems of relatively normal people. So, they developed what was termed “positive psychology” such as Maslow’s hierarchy of needs, and they wrote many self-help books on topics such as sex, parenting, motivation, business, sales, advertising, and personality. But despite the huge growth in interest, students, and funding, there are still critical questions about how effective positive psychology is and can become ([Yen, 2010](#)). Then feminism and the social justice movement focused on what they saw as “systemic” issues of racial and sexual oppression and pushed psychology in that direction. Finally, spiritistic psychology such as mindfulness sought to incorporate new age, eastern mysticism, and meditation into counseling. This also includes Christian-based psychology which has been active throughout the years and uses the Bible as its foundation.

Because different schools of psychology rest on different presuppositions and have different goals, they typically “talk past each other” ([Waterman, 2013](#)). Thus, there are many forms of counseling offered by psychology that are based on one or more of the above movements, as follows:

- *Psychoanalysis and psychotherapy*. This is the oldest of the secular counseling modalities and typically focuses on the past and on understanding the unconscious roots of behavior. It is based on the theories of Sigmund Freud who believed that the mind consisted of three elements: the id, which is our unconscious mind where our base and sexual desires reside; the super ego which is the source of our propriety and moral nature (i.e., our conscience); and the ego, which contains the personality, and in Freud’s estimation, is the mediator between the id and the super ego. Like his other theories, this has been rejected as overly simplistic, but as discussed above, Freud’s underlying concepts still influence contemporary psychology.

Freud believed that the super ego the id are in perpetual conflict with each other, with our moral nature seeking to control our unconscious nature and suppress our base and sexual desires. According to Freud this conflict produces neuroses which to him were the main basis of mental problems (this was before mental illness was studied). His theory was

based on self-analysis of his own childhood memories of jealousy over his mother's attention to his father rather than to him. Freud expanded this to a belief that early sexual situations, either real or imagined, became pathogenic if the memories were repressed; it became Freud's general explanation for neuroses ([Jay, 2018](#)), so his solution to neuroses was to ignore the morality and conscience of the super ego and allow the id, the unconscious mind to take control. Repressed desires would then be released, and moral control of behavior would be relaxed and ignored, but to prevent people from running amok, the ego needed to be trained to restrain the id. To implement all of this, he developed psychoanalysis, also known as the "talking cure" as a means of exploring suppressed memories especially as related to sex, with the goal of eliminating religion, guilt, and conscience as a guide to action. The basic methodology of psychotherapy is to allow the patient to discover and enunciate their own solutions, with the therapist's job being to allow the patient to "discover their own truth" through many sessions spent on the couch in analysis ([Hunter & Hunter, 2010](#)).

Freud was followed by Adler who used the same general approach – that the solution to an individual's current state lay in analyzing their past and then taking a socialistic and Marxian perspective. Other followers of Freud took different tacks, but both the theory and the therapies developed by Freud have been harshly criticized: "Psychotherapy is Useless" ([Coppedge, 2021](#)), "The 3 Reasons Why Psychotherapy Fails" ([Tsaousides, 2016](#)), "Therapy is Useless – Easiest Scam in Mental Health" ([Raiku, 2020](#)), "Is Psychotherapy Worth It?" ([Nemko, 2016](#)), "Useless Psychotherapy?" ([Bee, 2015](#)), "Why Psychotherapy Appears to Work Even When it Doesn't" ([Herbert, 2014](#)). These echo Hans Eysenck's bombshell report of the 1950s criticizing it: "These studies fail to prove that psychotherapy, Freudian or otherwise, facilitates the recovery of neurotic patients. They show that roughly two-thirds of a group of neurotic patients will recover or improve to a marked extent within about two years of the onset of their illness, whether they are treated by means of psychotherapy or not" ([Eysenck, 1952](#)). More recent studies of the effectiveness of psychotherapy continue to question it ([Allen, 2012](#)), and Eysenck continued his criticism years later in *Decline and Fall of the Freudian Empire* stating that Freud set back the study of psychology and psychiatry "by something like fifty years or more" and that Freud was "a genius, not of science, but of propaganda." Eysenck cites other statements, such as: "Freud's method is not capable of yielding objective data about mental processes," "Psychoanalysis has no scientific or therapeutic merit," and "Psychoanalysis is perhaps the most complex and successful pseudoscience in history" ([Eysenck, 1985](#)). Followers of Freud continue to support psychoanalysis, although it is in decline ([Yen, 2010](#)).

- *Person-centered, Humanistic, and Non-Directive (Rogerian)*. Like psychoanalysis, these modalities are based on the Rousseau belief in the basic goodness of humanity ("I'm OK, you're OK") and the "disease" model of treatment which avoids personal responsibility. As with psychotherapy, these therapies are non-directive, and assumes that the patient already knows the answers to his or her problems ([Hunter & Hunter, 2010](#)). The therapist is therefore not allowed to provide perspective and instead seeks to draw the solution out of the patient. This results in much expense and many sessions where the therapist essentially listens to the patient talk, vent, ruminate, and blame others about their

problems but without providing any resolution. Rogerian counseling is parodied in movies such as *Analyze This* where the psychologist listens to a woman complain, and all the while is thinking to himself, “Why don’t you get a life!” But instead, he tells her, “Our session is over for today – come back next week.” Nevertheless, these modalities are a popular in places like public schools because they don’t allow the therapist to impose their own solutions which may have religious overtones.

- *Existential*. This modality is concerned with the meaning of existence and therefore may appear to be excessively esoteric, abstruse, and depressing ([Hunter & Hunter, 2010](#)). The philosophy was pioneered by Jean-Paul Sartre who was Simone de Beauvoir’s controller and fellow pimp; the nature of their relationship as described above provides insight into the content. Existentialism is focused purely on human meaning and ignores the divine – Sartre’s “theatre of the absurd” play *No Exit* is typical of the emptiness of that genre ([Bradford, 2019](#)).
- *Interpersonal, Narrative, or Creative*. These modalities seek to associate a patient’s problems with their relationships and stories, and the possible lack of creativity. They are similar to the Systemic modality below.
- *Systemic and Constructionist*. These modalities focus on the impact of systems and systemic oppression and therefore are associated with feminism and social justice. Patients are thus encouraged to blame the system instead of themselves. Blame-shifting goes along with the natural human tendency of self-justification and becomes a way of perpetually avoiding personal responsibility. This is the general approach of feminist counseling which blames parents, men, society, the patriarchy, etc. and results in self-righteousness and victimology where others are the problem. To the extent that counseling reinforces a victimology perspective, patients will avoid getting to the root of their issues so that their own culpability continues to be hidden, rather than uncovered and dealt with ([Hunter & Hunter, 2010](#)).
- *Mindfulness*. This modality typically involves yoga, transcendental meditation, and Buddhism. In a secular world meditation seems to fill a spiritual vacuum with a vision of hope by becoming a better and happier individual in a more peaceful world. But Buddhist practices were not designed to make people happier, rather they are intended to remove one’s sense of self. Michael Farias and Catherine Wikholm examined mindfulness in their book *The Buddha Pill*, and debunk a number of popular myths: 1) That meditation never has negative or adverse effects (just sitting and thinking may cause more stress and mental issues as people constantly think about their problems); 2) That meditation can benefit everyone (it helps some but does little for others); 3) If everyone meditated the world would be a better place (people meditate on their own vision for betterment which may be entirely selfish and/or wrong); 4) Meditation is more efficient than therapy for personal growth and change (there is little evidence for that); 5) Meditation is a purely scientific technique (it almost always has a religious/spiritual aspect or bent); 6) Science has concluded meditation will help and change us (it may temporality reduce anxiety similar to the effects of a drug, but how permanent are the

changes?) ([Wikholm, 2015](#)).

- *Reality, Rational-Emotive, and Cognitive-Behavioral (CBT)*. These modalities are an outgrowth of positive psychology and are closer to Biblical counseling – William Glasser, the originator of reality therapy developed it in direct contradiction to the principles of psychoanalysis ([Glasser, 1965](#)). The therapist listens to, cares for, and develops trust with patients, but the focus is on reality, on the rational basis of emotions, and on personal responsibility rather than the disease model of treatment. It is assumed that a patient's problems have been generated by wrong thinking and behavior patterns, so these modalities seek to identify how the patient needs to change. The therapist is therefore a friend to the patient, but also confronts the patient when necessary and gives the patient a set of instructions to be followed ([Stefan & al, 2018](#)). Therefore, the overall counseling process tends to be much shorter, especially in CBT because after a patient's problems have been identified and the necessary changes stated, it is then up to the patient to take the necessary actions.
- *Christian*. This modality uses the Bible as its starting point. Like CBT the therapist listens to, cares for, and develops trust with patients, and the focus is on personal responsibility rather than the disease model of treatment. Patient issues may be practical and non-moral but are typically morally related issues and sin patterns that people have engaged in, along with guilt over what has been done to others, and/or trauma from what others have done to the individual. Therefore, treatment is focused on forgiveness and techniques for personal reformation. Also, like CBT, the counseling process is shorter, as it is focused on action – identifying the changes the patient needs to make and providing practical counsel on how best to make them.

The Bible has a lot of practical advice for marriage, parenting, handling depression, and other issues related to psychology, so it has been and could be used as a non-religious resource. But for patients to fully avail themselves of biblical help requires an acknowledgement of the truth of what the Bible says about human nature. So, the criticism of this modality is that it is based on specific theological truths and beliefs about God, and therefore is considered to be intolerant by secularists. For example, the American Counseling Association's policy is that a counselor's personal values should neither interfere with the counseling process nor be imposed on a client ([Bayne et al., 2020](#)), so if a client has a conflict with Biblical values and refuses to accept them, then the counselor may have to refer the client elsewhere. This may be especially problematic with intersex and LGBTQ+ clients. Christian counselors should affirm and accept them as they would everyone else and be especially sensitive to the struggles that such individuals may face. In accordance with the biological origin of intersex and some homosexuals as discussed above, counselors need to understand the inescapable orientation and inclination that such an individual may have. However, they may not affirm the client's behavior and lifestyle choices, and in the case of disagreement between counselor and client the counseling may need to be discontinued. But this is equally true for all counseling modalities – counselor and client may come to loggerheads and can no longer continue with each other.

There has been a long-term hostility between psychology and Christianity because many movements in psychology were antithetical to biblical principles, and often antithetical to each other. However, the study of psychology involves thinking, behavior, and the human mind which are a huge part of biblical content, so Christianity is fundamentally concerned with psychology. It is not so much opposed to psychology, as to the directions that past leaders in psychology have taken. Some Christian counselors have integrated aspects of psychotherapy into their counseling, and the American Psychological Association has accredited PhD programs in clinical psychology that specialize in spirituality and religion such as, Fuller Graduate School of Psychology, Rosemead School of Psychology, George Fox Graduate School of Psychology, Wheaton Graduate School of Psychology, and others, as well as the development of journals such as the *Journal of Psychology and Christianity*, and the *Journal of Psychology and Theology* ([Strawn, 2022](#)).

In regard to mental illness, as discussed above, some Christian counseling has focused entirely on the moral, behavioral, and spiritual issues, and treats mental illness exclusively as a “behavioral” problem requiring patients to change their behavior to effect a cure. It also considers supernatural forces (i.e., demons) to potentially have negative effects and create symptoms of mental illness. In contrast, some secular counseling has focused entirely on the “disease” model and relied heavily on drugs to help patients manage life. Psychotropic drugs are now commonplace but there are dangers of addiction and side-effects as well as reduced effectiveness over time, e.g., ([McGrath, 2019](#)). But when the complexity of human nature is appreciated, we come to understand that both approaches are valid, and that counselors need to disambiguate disease from behavior to the extent possible. In other words, drugs may very well be necessary to help patients cope, but behavioral patterns may also be causing or contributing to

patient pathologies. In extreme cases demonic activity may also be causative, requiring spiritual help, e.g., ([Lloyd & Waller, 2020](#)). Combining approaches is increasingly seen as being the most helpful, e.g., ([Lee et al., 2017](#))

All counseling approaches have “religious” aspects as everyone has axiomatic (i.e., background and unstated) beliefs about human nature and what works and doesn’t work which inform and dictate their approach. Some counseling modalities such as Rogerian are “values free” and therefore it is somewhat ironic to refer to them as “counseling” because the word implies advising and giving one’s opinion on courses of action. Any counseling methodology in which direction is stated and suggested may be rejected or unimplemented by clients, regardless of whether the underlying issues are perceived as religious or not.

Psychology articles related to spirituality and counseling include the following: ([Cornish & Wade, 2015](#); [Elchert & Gaasedelen, 2016](#); [Evans et al., 2022](#); [Gould, 2005](#); [Hoffman, 2020](#); [Johnson, 2013](#); [Kocet & Herlihy, 2014](#); [Peteet, 2017](#)).

The Ultimate Union – Ideal Male-Female Relationships

In the preceding pages, the pathologies generated by gender feminism and its negative consequences on male-female relationships were detailed. We will now turn to the positive and consider how individual men and women can have the best possible bond between them.

When one speaks of an “ideal” relationship there is a tendency toward viewing it in utopian terms as the “ultimate good.” Given the inherent sinfulness of human nature, heaven on earth is not possible, thus a utopian male-female bond is unattainable. However, there are principles that if adhered to lead to the best possible relationship. What follows is not intended to be a marriage manual or a theological textbook, but rather a set of principles and values that when practiced will create satisfaction between a man, a woman, and their family. If the two are satisfied with each other, there will be fewer fights and distractions; more positive feelings and desires to be with the other; more time, energy, and resources available for family concerns; and more unleashing of the possibilities for personal growth and self-actualization. Satisfied couples are generally happier, healthier, wealthier, give more, live longer, and tend to have children that will follow in their footsteps. Consequently, they will spend less on drugs, lawyers, therapists, and other forms of personal and relational repair. Society largely consists of the aggregation of families, so when family health and wealth increases, societal health and wealth also increases.

Most American adults have a credit rating score which is a measure of financial integrity – the level of debt vs. equity and an indication of personal responsibility and the timeliness of bill payments. But China is taking this much further and is seeking to reward and penalize people based on the degree of their “social credit” which includes factors such as how much individuals give to approved charities, how much they spend on “luxury” goods, the degree to which one uses social media to publish and/or promote “fake news”, and much more. China is thus in the

process of building a social credit system to reward positive behavior and penalize negative behavior which would involve a vast increase in the data collected by the Chinese government – essentially all data on everyone, including everything that each individual has done and all information on their medical and psychological history. This information would be collected in federal databases accessible by government officials and possibly others (e.g., social credit scores on people available on smart phones?). People would then potentially be rewarded with various financial incentives and penalized by having access to loans, air travel, education, and perhaps even purchasing in general taken away (credit cards don't work anymore?). This has frightening implications and raises many troubling questions if it were fully implemented, and if the American government seeks to do the same.

Those who lose credibility will find it hard to make a tiny step in society... Those who have committed serious offenses or violations will not be taken off the blacklist ... their untrustworthy record will be kept for a long time according to laws. ([Lee, 2020](#))

China's social credit system has been compared to Black Mirror, Big Brother and every other dystopian future sci-fi writers can think up. The reality is more complicated — and in some ways, worse... Liu Hu is a journalist in China, writing about censorship and government corruption. Because of his work, Liu has been arrested and fined — and blacklisted. Liu found he was named on a List of Dishonest Persons Subject to Enforcement by the Supreme People's Court as “not qualified” to buy a plane ticket, and banned from travelling some train lines, buying property, or taking out a loan. ([Kobie, 2019](#))

Rather than having the government monitor everything and reward/penalize us on our behavior, this is an appeal for individuals and families to establish, improve, and maintain their marriage relationships and families.

The Blue Zones

Research on life in the “blue zones” where people live longer than any other region and centenarians are common has revealed a set of practices that lead to longer and happier lives ([Sullivan, 2023](#)):

1. Healthy diets (e.g., more fruits, vegetables, and nuts, moderating alcohol consumption, less red meat, avoiding processed foods, eliminating smoking, etc.).
2. Daily exercise.
3. Good sleep.
4. Having a life purpose.
5. Having good marriage, family, and community connections.
6. Being religious or spiritual, and having faith in God.

Most of the above practices of people in the blue zones are essentially “common sense,” but common sense seems to be sadly lacking in America where rates of obesity, depression, anxiety, marital and relational dissatisfaction, and suicide are increasing. Blue zone practices are essentially the development of sound nutrition and behavior – what medicine and psychology should be telling people. The details related to 1 – 4 above are often taught, but unfortunately, such teaching is often ignored as Americans continue to consume large amounts of junk and processed food, fail to exercise, don’t get enough sleep, and look to celebrities for their life purpose rather than cultivating their own version. But our focus here is on the relational, mental, and spiritual issues of 5 – 6 which involve moral and religious factors.

Some would assert that any positive aspects of religion and spirituality are anecdotal, but studies have demonstrated the need for these qualities. For example, it was found that marital satisfaction was highest when both spouses reported high levels of positive religious coping and low levels of negative religious coping ([King et al., 2022](#); [Lai et al., 2023](#)).

Principles of Religion

Comparing Religions

The American doctrine of “separation of church and state” has created a wide gulf between the secular and the spiritual in Western culture. The former is typically viewed as “real life” and the latter is seen as rituals which people periodically engage in before returning to real life. Spirituality is thus significant, but for many it has little to do with the secular and the tangible aspects of life such as making and spending money. Given the secular/spiritual divide and the relative unimportance of the latter, all religions are seen as essentially equivalent, particularly in postmodernism where the selection of one religion over another is considered to be intolerance, and therefore a cardinal sin. Science is thus viewed as “truth” and religion as “opinion.” But as Voltaire said, “If God did not exist it would be necessary to invent Him.” Religion is essential because it is the source of morality, human value, and ultimate meaning. Furthermore, the religions of the world are not equivalent and have very different concepts of God. World religion can be simplified into five basic ones: in Buddhism/Hinduism God is an impersonal force of nature; in Islam God is unknowable, distant, and demanding; in Deism God is an absent and impersonal designer; in Humanism/Atheism God is humanity and/or self; and in Judaism/Christianity God is personal and immanent.

Many people simply adopt the religion of their culture and family without questioning it, and like the economic models of socialism and capitalism, religions don’t exist in their pure forms. People often resist thinking and therefore have not thoroughly examined their personal philosophy, so they may have a synthesis or a mishmash of religious concepts. Therefore, it is typical for Americans to believe in some notion of a higher power that will take them to “heaven” after death, but at the same time they want to live their life in whatever way they think best, without regard for traditional restrictions, such as the Ten Commandments.

However, if we are serious about religion, and for the sake of argument, consider it as we would a “theory of science,” we would select the one that makes the most sense, just as theories in science are accepted to the extent that they explain reality. God as an impersonal force of nature, as distant and demanding, or as an impersonal designer does not fit well with human nature which is intensely personal, has deep desires for love and affection, is concerned with justice, and has dreams of immortality. God as humanity (i.e., God is non-existent) requires Darwinism as an explanation for our origin which despite being taught as fact in public schools is a faulty theory which requires an unacceptably high level of faith and suspension of disbelief to accept it, e.g., ([Sorensen, 2020](#)). Therefore, we are left with Judaism/Christianity as the religion most in accord with reality and human nature.

Another powerful characteristic of Christianity is its openness to doubt and questioning. Unlike Islam where people who leave it are disowned by their family and sometimes become the victims of an “honor killing,” the God of the Bible invites us to bring our doubts into the open and question Him (John 20:24-29; Jude 1:22; Psalm 73; Psalm 34:8). This is the approach taken by the physicist and former atheist Frank Tipler who wrote the books *The Physics of Immortality* and *The Physics of Christianity*.

It is quite rare in this day and age to come across a book proclaiming the unification of science and religion. It is unique to find a book asserting, as I shall, that theology is a branch of physics, that physicists can infer by calculation the existence of God and the likelihood of resurrection of the dead to eternal life in exactly the same way as physicists calculate the properties of the electron... When I began my career as a cosmologist some twenty years ago, I was a convinced atheist. I never in my wildest dreams imagined that one day I would be writing a book to show that the central claims of Judeo-Christian theology are in fact true, and that these claims are straightforward of the laws of physics as we now understand them. I have been forced into these conclusions by the inexorable logic of my own special branch of physics... The time has come to absorb theology into physics [or vice-versa] and to make heaven as real as electrons. ([Tipler, 1994, pp. xi-xv](#))

From the perspective of the latest physical theories, Christianity is not a mere religion, but an experimentally testable science. ([Tipler, 2007, p. 4](#))

Criticism of Christianity

Progressives frequently criticize Christians harshly, such as when Democratic strategist James Carville claimed during a recent interview that “Conservative Christians were a bigger threat to America than al-Qaeda,” they “don’t believe in the Constitution” and are a “fundamental threat to the United States.” All of these statements are lies, but when some people hear the word “Christian,” what comes to their mind is a media-generated picture of a bigoted, small-minded person whose views have no connection with the reality that everyone else experiences, but despite this apparent un-connectedness, they nevertheless want to force their perspective on everyone else (this is more a picture of gender feminists). Furthermore, they are supposedly anti-fun, and sexual prudes. Like many stereotypes, this picture is true of some Christians, but as a generalization, it is false.

Christianity has been criticized as sexually repressive, but that is a misrepresentation – the Bible is very pro-sex (see the section of [Sex](#) below) in the context of marriage relationships; its criticisms of sex are related to perversions of sexuality. There have been Christian and quasi-Christian groups who were anti sex (e.g., the Gnostics), but they ignored or misrepresented what the Bible teaches. It has also been criticized for doctrines such as “the total depravity of mankind,” but again, that is a misrepresentation of biblical teaching.

Those who have rejected Christianity because Christians have offended them or from the past failures of the church should understand that the church has always consisted of fallible humans, and that Bible should not be blamed when people misrepresent or corrupt its message. Christians are human and have all of the same problems as everyone else – like everyone they are deceptive and hypocritical at times, have divorced, have engaged in abuse of spouse or child, have had affairs and sexual issues, etc. People whose power is being threatened will often use

any available tactic to preserve their perquisites, such as those who claimed that the Bible supported slavery. Therefore, we need to look to the Bible and to the God who is behind it as a source of stability, rather than people. “Do not put your trust in princes, in human beings, who cannot save. When their spirit departs, they return to the ground; on that very day their plans perish. Blessed are those whose help is the God of Jacob, whose hope is in the Lord their God” (Psalm 146:3-5).

There are many like Ivan in *The Brothers Karamazov*, who cannot reconcile human suffering and evil with a God of love ([Dostoevsky, 1990, pp. 251-281](#)). That may well be due to a lack of being able to see things from God’s eternal viewpoint which is provided to us only on rare occasions, such as in Hans Christian Andersen’s story *The Little Match Girl*:

But in the cold early morning huddled between the two houses, sat the little girl with rosy cheeks and a smile on her face, frozen to death on the last night of the old year... But nobody knew what lovely things she had seen and in what glory she had risen with her old Grannie to the happiness of the New Year. ([Andersen, 1953, p. 385](#))

God is a righteous judge, and we can be assured that everything will be set right in the end (Psalm 9:7-10; Isaiah 11:4-5; Acts 17:30-31; 2 Timothy 4:6-8; Revelation 19:11).

Science and Christianity

Scientists never start with a blank slate – they always have axiomatic and a-priori beliefs that inform the direction and interpretation of their research. If the foundation of a building is defective it will eventually collapse no matter how well it is built. Likewise, if the axioms and a-priori beliefs of scientists are wrong or deficient, their conclusions may well be incorrect despite their credentials. Einstein said, “Science without religion is lame” and by extension, “Psychology without Christianity is lame.” Psychology is largely humanistic, which is fine as far as it goes, but it doesn’t go far enough because a full understanding of human nature means understanding its spiritual aspects. We cannot “see” or handle quarks and other fundamental building blocks of

physical reality, and neuroscience cannot unravel the physical aspects of how consciousness and thought works – how much less can it examine our spiritual nature? Information on the spiritual aspects of human nature is provided in the Bible, the source book of Christianity, but psychology in general rejects the Bible. Psychology is therefore in a similar position to those who would retain a 19th-century Newtonian model of physics, and therefore have difficulty explaining reality because they have not understood and applied quantum mechanics. Psychology is also lame because it can't or won't see beyond this life to life after death, or in the words of Raymond Moody, to life after life ([Moody, 2015](#)). To fully understand the implications of our spiritual nature we need the Bible so that we can understand both this life and beyond it into eternity. Maintaining our own ideas about God and designing our own religion generates the ultimate foolishness of eventually finding out what God is truly like to the possible detriment of our own soul, instead of having the humility to give up our arrogantly held notions and accept what the Bible teaches.

Einstein also said, “Religion without science is blind”; so Christians or anyone else who rejects science is also wrong. For example, some believe that all mental illness is related to behavior, when the reality is that some mental illness is definitely biological and can be helped by drugs and/or therapies. On the other hand, mental illness can sometimes be caused or exacerbated by behavior – like many other human characteristics there may be both genetic and environmental contributions that can be hard to disambiguate, because we are profoundly psychosomatic. It also doesn't mean that science is always right – gender feminism is a case in point. Science – like every occupation – is done by fallible humans who have biases, and who have often been wrong or partially wrong – the history of psychology is a good example. The

most educated individuals are sometimes also the most biased, with Sigmund Freud and John Money being cases in point.

Giving and Christianity

Pro-life Christians have often been criticized by pro-choicers as caring for the unborn, but not caring for mothers and babies after birth, pointing to the poverty and difficulty that single mothers often experience. Politicians such as gubernatorial candidate Stacy Abrams are now echoing some of the euthanasia themes of Margaret Sanger, suggesting that “having an abortion could be a solution to high inflation, and having children is why people are worried about the price of gas and groceries” ([Panreck, 2022](#)). This, of course, is blatant hypocrisy from a feminist whose ideology has been a major factor in creating female-headed households. But the criticism is equally hypocritical when considering the giving patterns of Christians vs. others. Christians are far more likely to give to charity than non-Christians; 91% of respondents living in a church household gave to charity in 2022, while only 52% of the unchurched made charitable donations (a “churched” person is someone who has attended at least one church service other than a funeral or a wedding in the past six months) ([Foley, 2023](#)). Scripturally engaged Americans are “far more likely than others to donate to charity.” Bible-engaged Americans gave a total of \$145 billion to charities in 2021, amounting to about \$2,907 per household. The same figure for the Bible disengaged was just \$924 per household. Underscoring the large differences, scripturally engaged Americans account for just 19% of adults yet give 44% of every dollar donated ([Hallowell, 2022](#)). America’s tradition of voluntary charitable giving is one of the clearest markers of U.S. exceptionalism. As a fraction of income, Americans donate over 2.5 times as much as Britons do, more than 8 times as much as Germans, and at 12 times the rate of the Japanese. American religiosity plays a central role in that distinctive pattern. Comparing

religious giving to large secular donors, members of U.S. churches and synagogues send 4.5 times as much money overseas to needy people every year as the Gates Foundation does, with many of funds being applied in the hardest places, with high efficiency and low overhead, by Christians who “go the last mile” into rural, extremely poor, and/or dangerous areas where governments and international bureaucracies have no effective reach. Unlike foreign aid where the U.S. State Department, the International Monetary Fund, and the World Bank give taxpayer monies to foreign governments, much of which goes into the pockets of insiders ([Hancock, 1989](#)), international Christian organizations such as Samaritan’s Purse provide aid directly to the people who need it. Charitable giving by the wealthy tends to be focused on donations to arts and colleges, whereas those of lower to middle income are more focused on societal needs ([Zinsmeister, 2019](#)).

From its founding, the United States has been the most religious modern nation on earth. And that devotion has fueled many successes in character development, mutual aid, social reform, and national productivity. Yet right from the beginning, American religious activity has been cyclical—flowing and ebbing and flowing again. Historians have identified up to four “great awakenings” in U.S. history where religious conviction surged. In between were periods of backsliding. Today, we are in a period of steep decline.

Open antagonism toward faith is increasingly common in the U.S. There are now regular calls for crimping longstanding religious protections. New York Times religion columnist Mark Oppenheimer urged that the peak of the gay marriage debate was a good occasion to end the historic tax exemption for houses of worship. The insistence that expressions of faith must be expunged from national discussions, from education, even from sporting and other public events, is on the rise. “There are a lot of nonbelievers who want religious views kept out of the public square entirely. That’s a big problem,” pastor Tim Keller recently told Philanthropy.

Underlying this resistance to religion is an assumption that faith is not important to the functioning of our nation. It has little social value, according to this view, and may even be harmful to citizens and the republic in various ways. Rising numbers of Americans believe that religious activity can be stopped or pushed entirely into private sanctums without any public cost. Those Americans are mistaken. ([Zinsmeister, 2019](#))

Here are some of the many ways that Christianity impacts people in regard to giving, from the Zinsmeister article referenced above:

1. Pew Research Center investigators examined the behavior of a large sample of the public across a typical seven-day period. They found that among Americans who attend services weekly and pray daily, 45% had done volunteer work during the previous week. Among all other Americans, only 27% had volunteered somewhere.
2. The capacity of religion to motivate pro-social behavior goes way beyond volunteering. Religious people are more involved in community groups. They have stronger links with their neighbors. They are more engaged with their own families. Pew has found that among Americans who attend worship weekly and pray daily, about half gather with extended family members at least once a month. For the rest of our population, it's 30%.
3. Religious practice links us in webs of mutual knowledge, responsibility, and support like no other influence. Seven out of ten weekly church attenders told Pew they consider "work to help the needy" an "essential part" of their faith. Most of them put their money and time where their mouth is: 65% of weekly church attenders were found to have donated either volunteer hours or money or goods to the poor within the previous week.
4. Philanthropic studies show that people with a religious affiliation give away several times more every year as other Americans. Research by the Lilly School at Indiana University found Americans with any religious affiliation made average annual charitable donations of \$1,590, versus \$695 for those with no religious affiliation. Another report using data from the Panel Study for Income Dynamics compared Americans who do not attend religious services with those who attend worship at least twice a month. They found annual charitable giving for the church attenders was \$2,935, versus \$704 for the non-attenders.
5. People with religious motivations don't give just to faith-based causes – they are also much likelier to give to secular causes than the nonreligious. Two thirds of people who worship at least twice a month give to secular causes, compared to less than half of non-attenders, and the average secular gift by a church attender is 20% larger.
6. Religious Americans adopt children at two and a half times the overall national rate, and they play a particularly large role in fostering and adopting troubled and hard-to-place kids.
7. Local church congregations, aided by umbrella groups like Catholic Charities, provide most of the day-to-day help that resettles refugees and asylum seekers arriving in the U.S.
8. Research shows that the bulk of volunteers mentoring prisoners and their families, both while they are incarcerated and after they are released, are Christians eager to welcome offenders back into society, help them succeed, and head off returns to crime.
9. The educational alternative that draws most of the headlines today is charter schooling, which serves 3 million children. Much less often acknowledged is the fact that 3.8 million children are educated every year in religious schools in the U.S. There is evidence these religious schools offer qualitative advantages: their students experience less

violence and bullying and feel more secure, exhibit better citizenship skills, are more engaged with their community, and produce average SAT scores more than 100 points higher than public-school students.

10. Religious hospitals care for one out of every five U.S. hospital patients. Catholic institutions account for 16% of all hospital beds, and additional large health-care systems are run by Adventists, Baptists, Methodists, Jews, and other faith groups.
11. Faith-based organizations are at the forefront of both care and recovery for the homeless. A 2017 study found that 58% of the emergency shelter beds in 11 surveyed cities are maintained by religious providers – who also delivered many of the addiction, health care, education, and job services needed to help the homeless regain their independence.
12. Local congregations provide 130,000 alcohol-recovery programs, 120,000 programs that assist the unemployed, 26,000 programs to help people living with HIV/AIDS – one ministry for every 46 people infected with the virus.
13. Churches recruit a large portion of the volunteers needed to operate organizations like Habitat for Humanity, Meals on Wheels, America’s thousands of food pantries and feeding programs, Big Brothers, Big Sisters, the Red Cross, and other volunteer-dependent charities.
14. One strength of religious philanthropy is sheer numbers. There are approximately 345,000 congregations stretched across our nation. If you wander America, notes economist Brian Grim, you will pass 25 churches for every Starbucks you come across. The millions of decentralized services provided by those houses of worship include things like free or below-market space provided to community groups, preschool and daycare offerings, many types of social services, arts events, Boy Scout and sports-team sponsorships, and cash and in-kind support for neighborhood causes and needy individuals.
15. Studies of church closures conducted by Nancy Kinney and others find that shutting down a city congregation will often damage a neighborhood’s viability and socioeconomic health. Conversely, active churches, religious schools sponsored by churches, and church-aided neighborhood ministries can often have strong effects in stabilizing and revitalizing communities.
16. People of faith also behave differently. There is evidence that in addition to encouraging a “brother’s keeper” attitude that manifests itself in philanthropy and volunteering, religious participation also inculcates healthy habits that help individuals resist destructive personal behavior themselves. A classic study by Harvard economist James Freeman found that black males living in inner-city poverty tracts were far less likely to engage in crime and drug use if they attended church. Church attendance was also associated with better academic performance and more success in holding jobs. Follow-up studies found that regular church attendance could even help counterbalance threats to child success like parental absence, low school quality, local drug traffic, and crime in the

neighborhood.

17. Regular religious participation is correlated with many positive social outcomes: less poverty, fewer divorces and more marital happiness, fewer births out of wedlock, less suicide, reduced binge-drinking, less depression, better relationships. This is true among Americans of all demographic backgrounds.

Considering the fact that biblical teaching seems to be the strongest factor in generating true social concern for others, it would seem that the social justice movement should dump its Marxist ideology of class warfare, hatred, and victimology and preach Christianity instead. Also, the fact that the societal wealth necessary to support charity is best developed in an environment of freedom and capitalism implies that that capitalism mediated by Christianity is the best economic and moral foundation for society. Economic growth needs entrepreneurs who in turn require credit; the extending of credit requires morality – interest rates are partly a reflection of the underlying honesty and morality of a society. All of this will not achieve “heaven on earth” which is impossible due to human sin, but combined with democracy which reduces the potential abuses of government, it is the best that we can do. As Winston Churchill said, “Democracy is a bad form of government, except for all of the others which are worse.” Consider this testimony from an atheist:

Missionaries, not aid money, are the solution to Africa's biggest problem – the crushing passivity of the people's mindset. Now a confirmed atheist, I've become convinced of the enormous contribution that Christian evangelism makes in Africa: sharply distinct from the work of secular NGOs, government projects, and international aid efforts. These alone will not do. Education and training alone will not do. In Africa Christianity changes people's hearts. It brings a spiritual transformation. The rebirth is real. The change is good.

I used to avoid this truth by applauding – as you can – the practical work of mission churches in Africa. It's a pity, I would say, that salvation is part of the package, but Christians black and white, working in Africa, do heal the sick, do teach people to read and write; and only the severest kind of secularist could see a mission hospital or school and say the world would be better without it. I would allow that if faith was needed to motivate missionaries to help, then, fine: but what counted was the help, not the faith.

But this doesn't fit the facts. Faith does more than support the missionary; it is also transferred to his flock. This is the effect that matters so immensely, and which I cannot

help observing. The Christians were always different. Far from having cowed or confined its converts, their faith appeared to have liberated and relaxed them. There was a liveliness, a curiosity, an engagement with the world – a directness in their dealings with others – that seemed to be missing in traditional African life. They stood tall. Whenever we entered a territory worked by missionaries, we had to acknowledge that something changed in the faces of the people we passed and spoke to: something in their eyes, the way they approached you direct, man-to-man, without looking down or away. They had not become more deferential towards strangers – in some ways less so – but more open.

I don't follow this. I observe that tribal belief is no more peaceable than ours; and that it suppresses individuality. People think collectively; first in terms of the community, extended family and tribe. This rural-traditional mindset feeds into the “big man” and gangster politics of the African city: the exaggerated respect for a swaggering leader, and the (literal) inability to understand the whole idea of loyal opposition.

Anxiety – fear of evil spirits, of ancestors, of nature and the wild, of a tribal hierarchy, of quite everyday things – strikes deep into the whole structure of rural African thought. Every man has his place and, call it fear or respect, a great weight grinds down the individual spirit, stunting curiosity. People won't take the initiative, won't take things into their own hands or on their own shoulders.

Christianity, post-Reformation and post-Luther, with its teaching of a direct, personal, two-way link between the individual and God, unmediated by the collective, and insubordinate to any other human being, smashes straight through the philosophical/spiritual framework I've just described. It offers something to hold on to, to those anxious to cast off a crushing tribal group-think. That is why and how it liberates.

Those who want Africa to walk tall amid 21st-century global competition must not kid themselves that providing the material means or even the know-how that accompanies what we call development will make the change. A whole belief system must first be supplanted.

And I'm afraid it has to be supplanted by another. Removing Christian evangelism from the African equation may leave the continent at the mercy of a malign fusion of Nike, the witch doctor, the mobile phone, and the machete. ([Parris, 2008](#))

Ecumenicalism and Christianity

Some people are ecumenical, display bumper stickers such as “Co-Exist,” and feel that “all roads lead to God.” But life teaches us that some roads lead to disaster, so the idea that all roads lead to God is false even regarding things which we can see and touch. How much less is it true in things related to eternity which we can't see or touch? The Bible is the only book from God which has the historical credentials to demonstrate its divine origin. While it has been

criticized by progressives as a supposed source of oppression and slavery, that view is due to the cultural snobbery of our times and ignorance of what the Bible says and the societies to which the Bible was written. The standards of morality in the Bible call people to more than merely co-exist; rather the Bible tells us to “love our neighbor as ourselves.” See for example, Tim Hatch’s video, *Slavery, and the Bible* ([Hatch, 2023](#)).

All of the biblical authors were men, so were the writers of the books that were eventually collected into the Bible operating on their own with a possible chauvinist agenda, or did God somehow participate in the writing? In other words, is the Bible and its teachings on gender roles (as well as on many other subjects) the words of men or the words of God? This is perhaps the most critical issue of all because if the Bible is merely the words of men, then it could be alleged to have a chauvinistic bias as well as containing many other errors and inaccuracies. But if it is the words of God, and if God is the creator of everything and the architect of the human mind and body as stated in the book of Genesis, then the Bible is an objective source on the nature and purpose of males and females. It comes from above and beyond humanity, and from the one who designed our brains and who invented sexuality, so it is traditionally taken that the Bible is authoritative and inerrant in its original version, and therefore the current versions and translations can be trusted to the extent that they are true to the original.

In our day of tolerance and relativism, viewing the Bible in this manner is troubling to many because it implies that the Bible is the only book that truly reveals God’s nature and His will and purpose for humanity. For example, the current Pope disagrees with the above (Pope Francis is a Jesuit, and many Jesuits are Darwinists who reject the Genesis account of creation). Other holy books may contain elements of truth, but the Bible stands above them all as being the Word of God. Who am I or anyone to say that this is so? This author has no claim on absolute

truth and has come to this position only by extensive consideration of the alternatives, along with many others. But the issue is not having the majority position; rather it is considering the Bible's content and what it says about itself:

The grass withers and the flower fades when the breath of the Lord blows upon it. Surely the people are grass. The grass withers and the flower fades, but the word of our God shall stand forever. (Isaiah 40:6-7)

The Bible is therefore the exclusive source of divine truth and stands above all other authorities.

In regard to authorship, all of its content was written by individual males, but it also states in many places that the writers were inspired and guided by God. The clearest explanation of this is from the following texts:

But know this first of all, that no prophecy of Scripture is a matter of one's own interpretation, for no prophecy was ever made by an act of human will, but men moved by the Holy Spirit spoke from God. (2 Peter 1:20-21)

All Scripture is inspired by God and profitable for teaching, for reproof, for correction, for training in righteousness, so that the man of God may be adequate and equipped for every good work. (2 Timothy 3:16-17)

However, there are many other passages that echo the same theme – that the writer spoke the words of God on behalf of God, (for example, Isaiah 6:1; Jeremiah 1:1; Hosea 1:1; Joel 1:1; Amos 1:1; Obadiah 1:1; Jonah 1:1; Micah 1:1; Zephaniah 1:1; Haggai 1:3; Zechariah 1:1; Malachi 1:1; Romans 1:1; Galatians 1:1; Revelation 1:10-11; and Revelation 22:8, 10-11).

Unlike other ancient and contemporary seers and prophets, the authors of the biblical books did not write for their personal gain or benefit, and most of them were persecuted for what they said and wrote because their message was not a popular one. It was not what people wanted to hear because it attempted to correct the thinking and behavior of those to whom the message was addressed. Faith in the accuracy and reliability of the Bible applies to the original writing, and not necessarily to the copies and translations that have been made. Addressing that issue is a

large topic beyond the current scope, but in general we can have confidence that the original message of the Bible has been preserved, e.g., ([Sorensen, 2009](#), [2010](#)).

The books of the Bible have an amazing unity of theme and content, despite being written by 40 different authors over a span of around 1,600 years. It is the most popular book ever written and its publication numbers exceed that of any other book by orders of magnitude – so much so that the best seller lists never bother to mention it. But what assurance do we have that the Bible can be trusted? We can be assured by the fact that hundreds of prophecies have been realized; God tells us that he can be trusted and that is the proof. Approximately 2,500 prophecies appear in the Bible, and around 2,000 of these have already been fulfilled. The books of the Old Testament were written hundreds of years before the birth of Christ, but he is the subject of both the Old and New Testaments. There are over 300 prophecies from the OT about him that were fulfilled during his life, death, and resurrection. Here are a few of them:

1. He would be born in Bethlehem to a virgin.
2. He would come from the Israelite tribe of Judah.
3. He would spend time in Egypt.
4. He would be preceded by a forerunner.
5. He would be rejected by his own people.
6. He would be called a Nazarene.
7. He would speak in parables.
8. He would enter Jerusalem on a donkey.
9. He would be mocked and ridiculed.
10. He would be betrayed for thirty pieces of silver.
11. He would be falsely accused.
12. He would be silent before his accusers.
13. He would be crucified with criminals.
14. He would be given vinegar to drink.
15. His hands and feet would be pierced.
16. Soldiers would gamble for his garments.
17. His bones would not be broken.
18. His side would be pierced.
19. He would be buried with the rich.
20. He would be resurrected from the dead.

The probability of even some of the above being true of a man other than Jesus is so minute as to be meaningless. Furthermore, Jesus tells us that he is the only way to God – no other ways will work; “I am the way, the truth, and the life; no one comes to the Father but through Me” (John 14:6).

Some skeptics allege that Jesus was married to Mary Magdalene and had children with her, and they claim that the so-called Gnostic Gospels provide “new light” on the Bible. However, that is simply mendacious scholarship ([Sorensen, 2009](#), [2010](#)).

Humans were designed and created by God, and the Bible is God’s book to tell us how we should live, so it is important to understand and practice what the Bible has to say about marriage, relationships, and successful living.

Principles of Divine Nature

Before addressing marriage and relationships it is important to understand the nature of God. because we came from God and will return to Him (“The dust returns to the ground it came from, and the spirit returns to God who gave it.” Ecclesiastes 12:7). Theology is thus the most significant study of all because it involves our past (where we came from), our present (why we are here), and our future (where we are going). We can certainly learn things from science about the power and complexity of God, but that will not take us very far. Religions are man’s search for God, and like the story of the blind men who encountered an elephant and developed different theories about the elephant’s nature, each religion sees different aspects of what God could possibly be like. So, we need God Himself to tell us what He is like, and by extension, what we are like. That is what the Bible is all about – it will tell us things that we would have no other way of knowing.

The God of the Bible is triune, a multi-personality being that is beyond our comprehension. The fact that He is made up of three distinct personalities means that He innately understands relationships because He is inherently relational. God is “soul” (God the Father), “body” (God the Son – Jesus Christ), and “spirit” (God the Spirit). This means that God is not an “it,” not an impersonal force, not an amorphous spirit of nature, and not a distant entity that wound everything up and then let it go. His name is Jehovah which means “I am,” reflecting the fact that He has always existed and always will exist. Like us, He is intensely personal (Psalm 90:1).

Before everything else, God is love, and the core characteristic of His three-in-one relationship is love (“Beloved, let us love one another, for love is of God; and everyone who loves is born of God and knows God... God is love, and he who abides in love abides in God, and God in him” 1 John 4:7,16). G.K. Chesterton said, “Romance is the deepest thing in life – it is deeper than reality.” This quote needs to be unpacked. By “romance” Chesterton here meant “love” so what he is saying is that love is deeper than science, deeper than matter and energy, deeper than space, and deeper than anything we can sense and understand (Psalm 139:1-18). At the core, God is love, which is why we love and are called to love. Through the Bible we discover that God is actually seeking us (Revelation 22:16-17). As one Muslim said after becoming a Christian, “Allah wants me to die for him, but Jesus Christ died for me.”

Some people have had near-death (or post-death) experiences where they were clinically dead with no brain function, but nevertheless were able to observe doctors working to revive their lifeless bodies. They then had intense encounters with Jesus or other divine beings in which they felt surrounded by the God ‘s love which they try to describe but are generally unsuccessful in doing so (2 Corinthians 12:2-4). Many of them did not want to return but were sent back by

God because they had an unfinished purpose. See the movie *After Death* for a taste of their experiences ([Gray et al., 2023](#)). The movie and these experiences echo the transitory nature of this world, the importance of the world to come, and fact that the latter is more real than the former.

The world is passing away and also its lusts, but he who does the will of God abides forever. (1 John 2:17)

For we know that if our earthly house is destroyed, we have a building from God, a house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens. (2 Corinthians 5:1)

For momentary, light affliction is producing for us an eternal weight of glory far beyond all comparison, while we look not at the things which are seen, but at the things which are not seen. For the things which are seen are temporary, but the things which are not seen are eternal. (2 Corinthians 4:17-18)

After examining the love of God, we need to understand that He designed and created everything, including the fundamental nature of matter and energy as well as the nature of humanity as male and female (Genesis 1:1). All of that was done from the heart of God and as an act of love (Psalm 104:1-35).

Then God said, “Let Us make man in Our image, according to Our likeness; let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, over the birds of the air, and over the cattle, over all the earth and over every creeping thing that creeps on the earth.” So God created man in His own image; in the image of God He created him; male and female He created them. (Genesis 1:26-27)

The fall of man as described in Genesis 3 corrupted both nature and humanity, bringing cruelty, predation, malice, sin, and death came from, but nevertheless the awesomeness of God still shines through. If one’s interest is in any of the following, consider God’s involvement:

- *Astronomy* – God created the universe and all stars and planets.
- *Physics* – God created light, energy, quantum mechanics, string theory, and quarks.
- *Cosmology* – God created time, gravity, and the cosmic all.
- *Mathematics* – God created integrals, Fourier transforms, and all advanced math.
- *Computers and software* – God created logic, algorithms, databases, and parallel processing.
- *Engineering* – God is the ultimate designer and maker.
- *Aeronautics* – God created flight.

- *Biology* – God created all plants and animals.
- *Botany* – God created the flowers and trees.
- *Ecology* – God created ecosystems and their balancing characteristics.
- *Chemistry* – God created elements, molecules, and their capabilities.
- *Biochemistry* – God created DNA, genetics, and the cell.
- *Neuroscience* – God created consciousness, memory, and cognition.
- *Medicine* – God is the ultimate healer and sustainer.
- *Food* – God created agriculture.
- *Geology and gemology* – God created rocks, minerals, and gemstones.
- *Geography* – God created different places and environments.
- *History* – God is the creator of story and meaning.
- *Sports* – God created muscles and kinesiology.
- *Economics and business* – God is the ultimate producer.
- *Communication* – God created language, words, and the ability to express.
- *Romance* – God created desire, sex, and orgasm.
- *Art and music* – God created beauty, melody, and harmony.
- *Caregiving and mothering* – God is the ultimate nurturer.
- *Psychology and sociology* – God created people and thought.
- *Education and philosophy* – God is the source of all knowledge, wisdom, and truth.

Whatever we do and wherever we go, God has already been there and done it. Our challenge is to think God's thoughts after Him, live by His standards, explore the world, and give human expression to His glory by creating new works of art, music, engineering, etc. ("It is the glory of God to conceal a matter, but the glory of kings is to search out a matter" – Proverbs 25:2; "The nations will walk by His light, and the kings of the earth will bring their glory into it" – Revelation 21:24). Everyone in heaven will bring their own unique gifts and abilities into it including our male-female characteristics, just as men sing the low bass notes which provides the foundation and structure of the song, whereas women sing the high tenor notes which provides the beauty and the ecstasy of the music.

In the Bible God is always presented in masculine terms, so does God have a gender and is God a "He"? In general, the answer is no – not in the sense that we think of gender. God is a spirit and is therefore above and beyond sexuality. But in terms of qualities and characteristics He is both masculine and feminine – strong and nurturant, analytical and emotional, hard and

soft, determined and patient, tough and caring, and so on. But even though God as a spirit is genderless, the Bible always refers to God with masculine terms – “He,” “Him,” “His,” “the Father,” and “the Son.” God is never described as an “It.” There are several reasons for this:

1. The word “It” connotes non-personality whereas God is an intensely personal being just as we are. Our personality derives from His nature because according to Genesis we were created in His image.
2. The pronouns in human language are limited in their reference to either male or female. We do not have a pronoun that in one word describes a personal being that is beyond male and female and incorporates the characteristics of both, other than the word “God.”
3. The reference to God in masculine terms is *not* because men are better or more inherently valuable than women, but because of the distinct roles that God assigned to each sex. The main role assigned by God to men are provision, leadership, and authority, and to women, the roles of nurturance and care. This does not mean that the female roles are less valuable or less important because God fills those roles as well. Rather, we need above all to understand that God is our provider, our leader, and the authority to whom we are accountable – therefore God is designated in masculine terms.

The masculine delineation of God is done throughout the Bible in both the Old and New Testaments. It is woven deeply into the text and is inseparable from it, so efforts to feminize God corrupt and pervert the Bible, and there are consequences for those who do so (e.g., Deuteronomy 4:2; Matthew 5:17-19; Matthew 7:21-23; and Revelation 22:18-19). Marriage is used throughout to describe the intimacy of God’s relationship to people – in the Old Testament God is the husband and Israel is the wife, and in the New Testament Christ is the husband and the church is the wife. The symbol used for the end of days feast is a marriage supper (Revelation 19:7-9). As God’s people we are therefore to model the submission that a wife should have toward her husband in our relationship with God and in response to everything He provides for us, e.g., ([Sorensen, 2024](#)).

We need to acknowledge God’s power, greatness, and might, and how little we are in comparison to Him. Consider these scriptures: “Lift up your eyes on high and see who has

created these stars, and the One who leads forth their host by number. He calls them all by name, and because of the greatness of His might and the strength of His power, not one of them is missing” (Isaiah 40:26). “Behold, the nations are like a drop from a bucket, and are regarded as a speck of dust on the scales. All the nations are as nothing before Him” (Isaiah 40:15-17). At the end of time there will be an immense crowd of millions singing together (Revelation 5:11-13). For a taste of what this will be like, see the music videos in the [Videography and Bibliography](#) section below. God will eventually judge everyone based on how we have lived and what we have done.

Then I saw a great white throne and Him who sat upon it, from whose presence earth and heaven fled away, and no place was found for them. And I saw the dead, the great and the small, standing before the throne, and books were opened; and another book was opened, which is the book of life; and the dead were judged from the things which were written in the books, according to their deeds. Revelation 20:11-12)

In the meantime, for those who follow him: “Jehovah Nissi fights your battles, Jehovah Jireh meets your needs, Jehovah Rapha heals your body, Jehovah Shalom is your peace” (Chris Brown, 2023, Call the Name) (Romans 8:31-39). Some people wonder, “Why all of this worshiping God – He must want to have His ego stroked.” That is a warped perspective – God doesn’t need us to praise Him, rather we need to do it in order to acknowledge and thank Him for all that He had done for us. Having a thankful spirit is also one of the main cures for depression. In the same way God tells children to honor their parents because the child’s parents brought him or her into existence.

Finally, we need to appreciate the importance of His words to us in relation to the words and ideas of people: “The grass withers and the flower fades when the breath of the Lord blows upon it. Surely the people are grass. The grass withers and the flower fades, but the word of our God shall stand forever” (Isaiah 40:7-8). We are expected not only to listen to His words, but also obey them, and by extension to reject other words and ideas that are contrary to what God

tells us. He made us, so we are accountable to Him for what we do and how we live (Luke 6:46; John 14:15, 21). It's not that other words are insignificant – the thoughts and writing of many people are necessary for our education, but they pale in comparison to the importance of knowing God. When we understand His greatness, what else is there to attract our attention? In his address *The Weight of Glory*, C.S. Lewis expressed it as follows:

Indeed, if we consider the unblushing promises of reward and the staggering nature of the rewards promised in the Gospels, it would seem that Our Lord finds our desires, not too strong, but too weak. We are half-hearted creatures, fooling about with drink and sex and ambition when infinite joy is offered us, like an ignorant child who wants to go on making mud pies in a slum because he cannot imagine what is meant by the offer of a holiday at the sea. We are far too easily pleased.

If we take the image of Scripture seriously, if we believe that God will one day give us the Morning Star and cause us to put on the splendor of the sun, then we may surmise that both the ancient myths and modern poetry, so false as history, may be very near the truth as prophesy. At present we are on the outside of the world, the wrong side of the door. We discern the freshness and purity of the morning, but they do not make us fresh and pure. We cannot mingle with the splendors we see. But all of the leaves of the New Testament are rustling with the rumor that it will not always be so. Someday, God willing, we shall get *in*. ([Lewis, 1941](#))

Principles of Human Nature

We are made in the image of God, so we share many of the same characteristics, albeit in a lesser form (Genesis 1:26-27). Like God, we have a three-part nature – soul, body, and spirit, but of course with only a single personality. We also have difficulty disambiguating soul (i.e., mind) from spirit, and don't understand what they consist of and how they are connected to our bodies. Soul and spirit are essentially “software” that resides in our brain and controls our “hardware,” our bodies, and how all of these connect is a mystery. The soul and spirit live on long after the body is dead and in the words of Hebrews 9:27, “It is appointed for men to die once, and then the judgement.”

It is a serious thing to live in a society of possible gods and goddesses, to remember that the dullest and most uninteresting person you talk to may one day

be a creature which, if you saw it now, you would be strongly tempted to worship, or else a horror and a corruption such as you now meet, if at all, only in a nightmare. There are no *ordinary* people. You have never talked to a mere mortal. Nations, cultures, arts, civilization—these are mortal, and their life is to ours as the life of a gnat. But it is immortals whom we joke with, work with, marry, snub, and exploit—immortal horrors or everlasting splendors. ([Lewis, 1941](#))

However, we have a genetic abnormality that comes from our first ancestor which the Bible calls a “sin nature.” As discussed in the [History of Feminism](#) section above, psychology in general and feminism in particular is based on Rousseau’s idea that people are basically good, and that evil comes from society and private property. This is wrong – we have a genetic disposition to deception, selfishness, and other forms of evil (Jeremiah 17:9). We are certainly not as bad as we could be, but nevertheless everyone has a sin nature that emerges in various ways. This is easy to see even in little children who are naturally selfish and sometimes can be crueler than adults.

Freud’s concept of the “id” as the subconscious seat of desire and a self-seeking, potentially destructive entity in the human mind could well be the psychological identification and a scientific term for what the Bible calls our “sin nature.” But rather than allowing the id to control us, as Freud proposed, we need to do the opposite – to control and suppress the id through our “super ego” which is the Freudian term for our conscience and higher mind.

Contrary to Rousseau’s idea that individuals must be protected from society, it is the opposite – society needs to be protected from the individual, which is what the ten commandments are all about (Exodus 20:1-17). The most important commandments are the first and the last – loving God with all of our heart, and not coveting what belongs to others. The first commandment on loving God encapsulates the next four (making idols, taking God’s name in vain, and honoring the Sabbath and one’s parents). Likewise, the last commandment on coveting is the basis for the four preceding ones on adultery, murder, stealing, and lying, so it can be

summarized as loving others as well as oneself. Jesus taught that these two summary directives (loving God and loving neighbor as self) were the basis for the entire law (Matthew 22:37-40), so to the extent that we obey these two principles, we and others will be blessed (1 John 2:3-6) and we will have favor with God.

Based on the romantic movement, psychology tells us that feelings are all important, but the Bible tells us that obedience to its principles are all important, and that feelings will follow (Matthew 7:21-23; John 8:31-32). Our desires for justice come from God's desire for the same thing. Just as we seek justice when a crime is committed and demand that payment be made, so an atonement was necessary to satisfy the requirement of divine justice (Romans 6:23). This was accomplished by God Himself in the person of Jesus Christ coming into the world as a man, explaining God to us, and then dying on our behalf as a sacrifice and the atonement for human sin (Romans 5:6-11). Thus, we and the world can eventually be restored by God to a state of paradise (Revelation 21:1-7) but in the meantime we are to live in ways similar to the Irish after they were taught by St. Patrick:

Patrick's gift to the Irish was his Christianity – a Christianity without the sociopolitical baggage of the Greco-Roman world, a Christianity that completely enculturated itself into the Irish scene... It transformed Ireland into Something New – a Christian culture where slavery and human sacrifice became unthinkable, and warfare, though impossible for humans to eradicate, diminished markedly... New laws influenced by Gospel norms, inhibited conflicts severely by requiring that arms be taken up only for a weighty cause. ([Cahill, 1995, p. 148](#))

As these transformed warrior children of Patrick's heart lay down the swords of battle, flung away the knives of sacrifice, and cast aside the chains of slavery, they very much remained Irishmen and Irishwomen. This sense of the world as holy, as the Book of God – as a healing mystery, fraught with divine messages – could never have risen out of Greco-Roman civilization, threaded with the profound pessimism of the ancients and their Platonic suspicion of the body as unholy, and the world as devoid of meaning. It was on this sturdy insight that Patrick choreographed the sacred dance of the Irish sacramental life, a sacramentality not limited to the symbolic actions of the church's liturgy, but open to the whole created universe. All the world was holy, and so was all the body. ([Cahill, 1995, pp. 133, 135](#))

Shelly, Godwin, and other historic and current individuals who feel that marriage is evil are also wrong. The problem is not with the institution of marriage, rather, in the words of the comic strip character Pogo, “We have met the problem, and it is us.” The problem is the innate selfishness, darkness, and sin nature of the human heart. Law is necessary to identify and constrain evil, but it can’t cure it. Only God can cure our hardened hearts and heal our selfish nature so that we can live lives of love, and make marriage work as it was originally intended.

Principles of Love

In English we only have one word for love, which covers a wide swath of meaning. In contrast, Greek has three words: “eros” denoting romantic love and sexual desire, “phileo” denoting affection, and “agape” denoting a higher and selfless love – the love of God. Romantic (eros) love and affection (phileo) are largely feelings-based, whereas God’s love (agape) is decision-based and is not diminished by the behavior of the target individual. Agape love is a decision that we made, not a feeling that we have, so it is a matter of deciding to carry out the necessary practicalities rather than simply having nebulous desires which can come and go. The agape form of love is further defined for us in a passage that is often quoted at weddings: “Agape love is patient, agape love is kind and is not jealous, agape love does not brag and is not arrogant, does not act unbecomingly, it does not seek its own, it is not provoked, does not take into account a wrong suffered, does not rejoice in unrighteousness, but rejoices with the truth. It bears all things, believes all things, hopes all things, endures all things. Agape love never fails” (1 Corinthians 13:4-8).

Agape-type love is essential in marriage because love that endures must be based on a choice to love the other person despite how we feel or how they behave. If couples base their

love on feelings, the love will evaporate sooner or later as in Fawn Weaver's quote: "Happily ever after is not a fairy tale – it's a choice."

Understanding agape is also essential to developing personal security and stability, eliminating worry and anxiety, and dealing with feelings of inferiority (Matthew 6:25-34). When we fully understand and grasp the greatness of God (e.g., Isaiah 40:25-26), that God is personal just like we are (e.g., John 1:1-14), that He loves us with an everlasting love (e.g., Psalm 103:13-18), and that our future is secure because we are in His hands (e.g., John 10:27-30), then we have a basis for security that goes far beyond pension plans, 401K accounts, real-estate holdings, or anything material (Matthew 6:19-21; 1 John 3:1-3; 1 John 4:7-11). Agape, the kind of love that we are to practice in marriage and family so that trust is developed, and long-term relationships are possible. The world is passing away and everything that we see is temporal, except people (2 Corinthians 4:16-18, 1 John 2:17). "Those who wait for the Lord shall renew their strength, they shall mount up with wings like eagles, they shall run and not be weary, they shall walk and not faint." (Isaiah 40:31), "Though my father and mother forsake me, the Lord will take me up" (Psalm 27:10).

Principles of Forgiveness and Repentance

To obtain God's love requires us to understand the depth of our own sinfulness, and to ask for His forgiveness based on what Jesus Christ did by dying for us (e.g., Romans 5:6-11; 1 John 2:1-2). Those who feel self-sufficient and are self-righteous won't receive divine forgiveness because it requires the humility of admitting one's need and asking for God's help (John 14:6; 1 Corinthians 2:10-16). But there is no way of proving this, so faith in God is essential (Hebrews 11:6). "Faith never knows where it is being led, but it loves and knows the One who is leading." ([Chambers, 1963](#)). In this way we obtain the grace of God, and therefore

are forgiven (Ephesians 1:3-10). But we are likewise to forgive others; God's grace is removed if we fail to do so or choose not to live in a way that glorifies God (Matthew 6:14-15). Lack of forgiveness has many negative consequences: anger, guilt, stress, ulcers, high blood pressure, and many other physical and psychological maladies.

When we fully grasp and internalize the fact that God loves us and that we can be forgiven and right with God through Christ, we then have the basis for the emotional and future-related security that everyone craves and which is one of the main reasons that many look to psychology for answers. As in John Donne's poem *Death Be Not Proud*, we no longer need to fear death, and if we no longer fear death, what else is there to fear?

This requires a full appreciation of our need for divine forgiveness. When we understand that we are helpless to redeem ourselves and that human effort, government, and psychology will never produce heaven on earth, then we have the humility that is also mandatory, because God hates pride (James 4:4-10; Proverbs 6:16-19). These two elements – a divinely inspired confidence from understanding our great worth, and a humility that enables us to value and love others along with being self-responsible and self-controlled – are at the core of what we need to develop and practice for physical, psychological, and spiritual health. In the long run, our relationship with Christ is the only thing that matters, and in the meantime, we can trust that along with our own efforts God will supply our needs (Matthew 6:25-34). Oswald Chambers, a pastor of the last century, was a man with great spiritual insight who helps us understand that without Christ our efforts at self-improvement will fail because we need a new heart and a new birth from Him:

My experience is not what makes redemption real – redemption is reality. Redemption has no real meaning for me until it is worked out through my conscious life. When I am born again, the Spirit of God takes me beyond myself and my experiences and identifies me with Jesus Christ. If I am left only with my personal experiences, I am left with something not produced by redemption. But experiences produced by redemption prove

themselves by leading me beyond myself, to the point of no longer paying any attention to experiences as the basis of reality. Instead, I see that only the reality itself produced the experiences. My experiences are not worth anything unless they keep me at the Source of truth – Jesus Christ. ([Chambers, 1963](#))

We are not made for the mountains, for sunrises, or for the other beautiful attractions in life – those are simply intended to be moments of inspiration. We are made for the valley and the ordinary things of life, and that is where we have to prove our stamina and strength... When God gets us alone through suffering, heartbreak, temptation, disappointment, sickness, or by thwarted friendship – when He gets us absolutely alone, and we are totally speechless, unable to ask even one question, then He begins to teach us. ([Chambers, 1963](#))

Psychology tells us that we are naturally good, so guilt is supposedly a figment of our imagination. The issue of guilt was never mentioned in PhD level secular courses on counseling, despite the fact that it is one of major causes for anxiety and depression, and in some cases is also the cause of mental illness. Psychology and contemporary medicine tend to see problems as “diseases” rather than as “behaviors.” Diseases like colds and flus are accidents that happen to us and for which we are not responsible, whereas behavior is a matter of personal responsibility. For example, diabetes – like alcoholism – is called a “lifestyle disease.” Drugs and other medical procedures may be necessary, but the real solution requires a change in behavior (i.e., what the Bible calls repentance). Repentance does not mean self-flagellation, doing penance, or attempts at self-atonement. Rather, it means that we change our behavior so that we are no longer engaging in the practice that caused the problem in the first place, like an alcoholic refusing further drinks.

Freud’s solution for neuroses (i.e., human frustrations) was to have the id override the super ego, i.e., encouraging the sin nature to override the conscience. That is message of the world – “if it feels good, do it” – but that is the path of destruction (“There is a way that seems right to a man, but its end is the way of death” Proverbs 14:12). Christ leads us in the opposite direction – to have our super ego control the id. People can experience many of the physical and

psychological benefits of the Bible by observing its principles, but the id (the sin nature) is a powerful force within us, holding us and dragging us down; we will only gain the power necessary to truly overcome it through the Spirit of God and by means of the work of Christ.

We deify independence and willfulness and call them by the wrong name. What God looks on as obstinate weakness we call strength. There are whole tracts of our lives that have not been brought into subjection, and it can only be done by continuous conversion. Slowly but surely, we can claim the whole territory for the Spirit of God. ([Chambers, 1963](#))

The Spirit of God then works with us to discipline ourselves – to disciple our bodies, but even more so, to discipline our minds, as the Chambers quote above indicates.

We are profoundly psychosomatic, and what we think about and focus on has many physical and psychological consequences. Although mental illness can have genetic and biological roots, the cause may sometimes be behavioral and related to guilt, regret, and/or suppressed trauma. Jay Adams in his book *Competent to Counsel* cites the work of O. Hobart Mowrer whose approach was entirely secular, but who observed that the genesis for some mental illness was essentially an intellectual and emotional camouflage erected by individuals to hide and suppress guilt or trauma, both from themselves and from others. In other words, anxiety, depression, and even mental illness may be caused by a refusal to face and admit wrongs that were done either by us or to us. Adams cites several examples of encounters with patients in mental institutions that demonstrate the profound potential effects of guilt on mental health:

- “Steve,” a young college-age man, was diagnosed as a catatonic schizophrenic and seemed to be in a perpetual stupor. Communication with him was at first impossible, but after much repeated effort Steve finally told his story. He had developed a childhood pattern of avoiding responsibility, and when he went to college, he failed several courses due to non-performance. To hide his failure from parents and friends he feigned mental illness which became more severe as others felt sorry for him and his guilt increased. Eventually he was institutionalized. But after being confronted he finally faced his guilt, sought forgiveness from parents and friends, stopped his former patterns of behavior, and left the institution to resume normal life.

- “Mary” was a 30-something woman diagnosed as a severe manic-depressive. Her behavior was the opposite of Steve – when approached she would howl and scream to keep people away. Again, after a lengthy period of attempts at communication she finally told her story. Mary had had an affair with a next-door neighbor and was ashamed and afraid to tell her husband, but after confrontation and counseling she finally admitted what she had done and sought forgiveness. Mary likewise was then able to return to normal life.

Adams also provides examples of other individuals who engaged in bizarre behaviors due to guilt or resentment that could have been alleviated by forgiveness and repentance (i.e., changing behavior patterns to avoid repeating prior problems) ([Adams, 1970, pp. 26-40](#)).

Understanding that we are inherently sinful (i.e., we are controlled by the id) means that guilt is real and is not a figment of our imagination. It is caused by wrong thoughts and actions (Matthew 15:16-20), so forgiveness and repentance are essential for both physical and psychological healing. On the one hand, our will is necessary for us to function, but on the other hand, it can lead us into severe disfunction and evil.

In contrast to love, forgiveness, and repentance, the solutions offered by psychology to worry, fear, anxiety, depression, and suicide are drugs and counseling. Psychotropic drugs (i.e., drugs administered for various mental issues) may be necessary to help patients cope with schizophrenia, bipolar, OCD, suicidal impulses, and other mental conditions, especially in the initial stages of treatment. However, if the patient has an underlying and unresolved behavioral problem as discussed above, the drug will simply dull the patient and mask the issue. Most drugs also have side effects, so it is imperative to deal with any underlying issues rather than simply “popping a pill.”

Principles of Life Improvement

The Bible has many principles for having a healthy and satisfying life, so even a secular individual can derive much benefit from following them. Positive association between biblical

lifestyles and personal well-being has been repeatedly demonstrated. For example, the life expectancy of frequent religious service attendees is longer than for non-attendees, and death rates for several major diseases are much lower. People of strong faith tend to enjoy better mental health, higher levels of life satisfaction, greater personal happiness, and fewer negative psychological consequences from traumatic life events. Isolating the relationship between religious faith and well-being is complex, but mainly seems to be related to the lifestyle regulation and health-related behaviors which decrease the risk of disease, such as discouraging alcohol and drug abuse, promoting moderation, encouraging joy and gratitude, etc. Religious traditions discourage unnecessary risk-taking and deviant behaviors, provide guidance about sexual activities and family life, and shape other lifestyle choices so that people of faith eat better, exercise more, drink and smoke less (or not at all), and moderate their sexual behavior ([Everton & Schroder, 2019](#)).

Religion also can provide people with psychological resources that contribute to better health, such as rituals that help them cope when a loved one dies, an unexpected tragedy strikes, or a health problem arises. People can also gain a sense of self-worth and control by developing an ongoing personal relationship with a God who unconditionally loves and cares for them and with whom they can interact regularly through prayer, meditation, and other types of practices. Belief in God helps people assign meaning to potentially problematic situations, and the hope and optimism of personal faith promotes mental and physical health ([Everton & Schroder, 2019](#)). The book *None of These Diseases* documents the physical and psychological benefits of applying and obeying biblical directives.

Humbling oneself and giving up selfishness and materialism has the powerful result of both improving our marital and family connections as well as our relationship with God.

Consider these scriptures:

God opposes the proud but gives grace to the humble. (James 4:6; 1 Peter 5:5)

Then Hezekiah humbled himself for the pride of his heart, he and the inhabitants of Jerusalem, so that the wrath of the Lord did not come upon them in the days of Hezekiah. (2 Chronicles 32:26)

But when his heart was lifted up, and his spirit was hardened in pride, he was deposed from his kingly throne, and they took his glory from him. (Daniel 5:20)

Where do wars and fights come from among you? Do they not come from your desires for pleasure that war in your members? (James 4:1)

Pride goes before destruction, and a haughty spirit before a fall. (Proverbs 16:18)

Thankfulness was mentioned above as a powerful antidote to depression. Worry and anxiety stem largely from fears about the future and what will happen to us. God tells us in many places that our future is in His hands, and that we have no need to fear if we have placed our trust in Him. Consider these powerful statements from the Bible about the future and the potential peace they can bring:

Therefore, I say to you, do not worry about your life, what you will eat or what you will drink; nor about your body, what you will put on. Is not life more than food and the body more than clothing? Look at the birds of the air, for they neither sow nor reap nor gather into barns; yet your heavenly Father feeds them. Are you not of more value than they? Which of you by worrying can add one cubit to his stature?

Why do you worry about clothing? Consider the lilies of the field, how they grow: they neither toil nor spin, and yet I say to you that even Solomon in all his glory was not arrayed like one of these. Now if God so clothes the grass of the field, which today is, and tomorrow is thrown into the oven, will He not much more clothe you, O you of little faith?

Therefore, do not worry, saying, “What shall we eat?” or “What shall we drink?” or “What shall we wear?” For after all these things the Gentiles seek, and your heavenly Father knows that you need all these things. But seek first the kingdom of God and His righteousness, and all these things shall be added to you. (Matthew 6:25-33)

Do not lay up for yourselves treasures on earth, where moth and rust destroy and where thieves break in and steal, but lay up for yourselves treasures in heaven, where neither

moth nor rust destroys and where thieves do not break in and steal. For where your treasure is, there will your heart be also. (Matthew 6:19-21)

And we know that all things work together for good to those who love God, to those who are the called according to His purpose... What then shall we say to these things? If God is for us, who can be against us? He who did not spare His own Son, but delivered Him up for us all, how shall He not with Him also freely give us all things? Who shall bring a charge against God's elect? It is God who justifies. Who is he who condemns? It is Christ who died, and furthermore is also risen, who is even at the right hand of God, who also makes intercession for us. Who shall separate us from the love of Christ? Shall tribulation, or distress, or persecution, or famine, or nakedness, or peril, or sword? For I am persuaded that neither death nor life, nor angels nor principalities nor powers, nor things present nor things to come, nor height nor depth, nor any other created thing, shall be able to separate us from the love of God which is in Christ Jesus our Lord. (Romans 8:28, 31-35, 38-39)

Feminism and our society have magnified feelings as being all important, and that the guide to our behavior and morality should be how we feel (e.g., "How can it be wrong when it feels so right?"). But the Bible instructs us to deny our feelings if necessary and obey what God tells us; after we obey then feelings will come. God tells the people, "Obedience is better than sacrifice" (1 Samuel 15:22), and Jesus tells his disciples, "You are My friends if you do whatever I command you" (John 15:14).

However, principles are not enough to break physical and psychological addictions and sin patterns such as lust, envy, greed, gossip, deceptiveness, and guilt. These can have powerful holds on us. The founders of Alcoholics Anonymous realized this, so along with medical and counseling interventions, they incorporated an appeal to a "higher power," i.e., to God, as an essential step in their treatment plan. "What with our ultra-modern approach to everything, we are perhaps not well equipped to apply the powers of good that lie outside our synthetic knowledge" ([Anonymous, 1939, p. 3](#)). In addition to psychology and medicine we need the power of God; people need both human and divine help. We need to avoid the dual mistake of thinking that all mental illness is caused by sin, or that none of it is.

Divine help is indispensable in cases of demonic influence, oppression, and possession which cause symptoms of mental illness. Like God, demons (i.e., fallen angels) are also real beings with powers that can affect us if we give into their influence via Ouija boards, seances, sorcery, white or black magic, or other gateways to the occult. Only the power of God can free a person who has opened him or herself in that way. For more information see, for example, Malachi Martin – *Hostage to the Devil* ([Martin, 1992](#)), Peter Kreeft – *Angels and Demons* ([Kreeft, 1995](#)), Fr. Gabriele Amorth – *An Exorcist Explains the Demonic* ([Amorth, 2016](#)), and Ralph Sarchie – *Deliver Us from Evil* ([Sarchie & Cool, 2001](#)).

Gratitude

The positive power of gratitude has already been mentioned and this has been demonstrated in psychological studies that show gratefulness to God results in positive psychological well-being, the reduction of depressive symptoms, higher levels of hope, improved marital satisfaction, and better overall physical and mental health ([Fincham & May, 2021](#)).

Prayer

Prayer is communication with God. It is not magic or hocus-pocus – it is simply talking with God through the medium of speech and thought, implying that God knows our thoughts and knows everything about us. He understands our humanness and limitations (Psalm 103:13-14), and he has provided His Spirit to help us through the power of prayer (Matthew 7:7-11).

Prayer is especially important for couples. According to studies, only 11% of couples pray together daily (ignoring giving thanks at meals and crying out for help during crises) ([Nissley, 2019](#)). A daily habit of praying together regularly for resources, wisdom, and protection decreases the chances of marriage failure to less than 1%. A 1997 Gallup Poll stated that the

divorce rate among couples who regularly pray together is 1 out of 1,152, and more recent studies have confirmed this; 75% of Americans who pray with their spouses reported that their marriages are “very happy” compared to 57% of those who don’t. Couples who pray together are also more likely to report that they respect each other, discuss issues together, and even rate their spouses as skilled lovers ([Nissley, 2019](#)).

Prayer is especially helpful for people in high stress occupations such as teaching – studies suggest that teachers have greater mental health symptoms, and stress for them is around twice the level of the general population ([LaBarbera & Hetzel, 2015](#)). It is encouraged in alcohol treatment programs such as AA and its helpfulness has been demonstrated, e.g., ([Bai, 2021](#)). There are even cardiovascular benefits to prayer ([May et al., 2020](#)). However, there are many aspects of prayer that cannot be covered here; see, for example: *Prayer: Experiencing Awe and Intimacy with God* by Tim Keller ([Keller, 2016](#)).

Bible Reading

Studies have shown that there are many positive life characteristics developed when people regularly read the Bible. They are more forgiving, more likely to pray, serve others more often, and have a personal faith that enables them to better withstand the storms of life. It was also found that Bible readers give approximately 10 times more to charity than those who don’t, show an increased interest in welcoming immigrants into the community, befriend people of other races and religions, care for the environment, and advocate for those who are oppressed by society ([AmerBibleSoc, 2020](#)). These are all things that the social justice movement seeks but unfortunately it is generally hostile to the Bible, and surveys indicate that Bible reading is declining in America ([AmerBibleSoc, 2020](#)). Reading the Bible also influences the way that people interact with social media – how they present themselves online, how they engage with

others, what they post, the content they view, and using it less often with less overt hostility.

Another characteristic of Bible readers is an increase in positive emotions, such as hopefulness, encouragement, confidence, peacefulness, and love. Studying the Bible results in an overall improvement in holistic well-being and a corresponding decrease in anxiety and depression. As engagement with the Bible increases, prosocial behavior also increase ([AmerBibleSoc, 2020](#)).

There are many resources available for Bible study, either via print, online, and/or smart phone, such as the YouVersion app. There are personal, relational, and spiritual depths that can't be covered here, but are available and waiting for anyone who is willing (Revelation 22:17).

Church Attendance

Studies have also shown many benefits from church attendance especially when the Bible is taught. Attendance has been linked with a lower risk of all-cause mortality, suicide, and depression. For individuals who hold religious beliefs, church attendance may be a meaningful form of social integration that potentially relates to healthier behaviors, better mental health, greater psychosocial well-being, and greater longevity ([Chen et al., 2020](#)). This reflects the results of the “Blue Zone” studies discussed above.

Surrender and Action

Perhaps the most difficult call of Jesus to us is to surrender our lives to Him – this is the core issue that underlies all of the others. “If anyone desires to come after Me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross, and follow Me. For whoever desires to save his life will lose it, but whoever loses his life for My sake will find it. For what does it profit a man if he gains the whole world, and loses his own soul? Or what will a man give in exchange for his soul?” (Matthew 16:24-26).

It is not a question of giving up sin, but of giving up my right to myself, my natural independence and self-assertiveness – this is where the battle has to be fought... Very few of us debate that which is sordid and evil, but we do debate with the good. It is the good that hates the best and the higher up you get in the scale of natural virtues, the more intense the opposition to Jesus Christ.

Beware of refusing to go to the funeral of your own independence. The natural life is not spiritual, the supernatural can never become natural in us. If we do not resolutely sacrifice the natural, the supernatural can never become natural in us.

We go wrong because we stubbornly refuse to discipline ourselves, physically, morally, or mentally... The characteristics of individuality are independence and self-assertiveness. It is the continual assertion of independence that hinders our spiritual life more than anything else. ([Chambers, 1963, pp. 256-258](#))

This seems to contradict everything that our culture, both feminist and non-feminist, is telling us – “be yourself,” “loving yourself is the greatest love of all,” “the independent man,” etc. It also seems to be like Buddhism and nirvana – the negation of self, and the surrender of one’s being to the cosmic all. But this is quite different, and rather than the negation of personality it is its fulfillment. Note that personal discipline, responsibility, and choice are involved – it is not simply lying on a couch and meditating. We may quiet our souls and give up food, sex, or material things at times, but asceticism by itself is a trap and a fake spirituality (Colossians 2:16-23). True spirituality is allowing the Spirit of God to live in us by eliminating our resistance and the barriers we put up to God, so that the Spirit fuses with our personality, and we start living the way that God intended us to live. We become more real and purposeful, and become the individuals that God has wanted us to be all along. Understanding this also helps us to understand the nature of Christ during his time on earth. He was God (John 8:58) – the third person of the Trinity – but gave that up for 33 years to live like us and be an example by having the Spirit fused with his human personality. This explains the confusion that some people have concerning why Jesus called Himself the “Son of Man” – despite His divine nature he fully identified with our humanity. Nevertheless, it is Him and His words that are all important: “The words that *I* have spoken to you are spirit and life” (John 6:63). True and valuable asceticism is

thus not so much denying the body, as it is training the mind – eliminating negative and sinful thought patterns and focusing on things of value, both for this life and for eternity, e.g., ([Graiver, 2022](#)).

This prepares us to take action – to step up and fight God’s battles in the long war against the devil. Some people view Satan as a fictitious human invention, so Baudelaire’s quote is relevant here: “It is the greatest art of the devil to convince us that he does not exist.” Satan is a demonic personage, and through the ages he has employed various strategies and tactics to addict and destroy people, e.g., ([Sorensen, 2012](#)).

For we do not wrestle against flesh and blood, but against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this age, against spiritual hosts of wickedness in the heavenly places. Therefore, take up the whole armor of God, that you may be able to withstand in the evil day, and having done all, to stand.

Stand therefore, having girded your waist with truth, having put on the breastplate of righteousness, and having shod your feet with the preparation of the gospel of peace. Above all, take the shield of faith with which you will be able to quench all the fiery darts of the evil one. Take the helmet of salvation, and the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God, praying always with all prayer and supplication in the Spirit, being watchful to this end with all perseverance and supplication for all the saints. (Ephesians 6:12-18)

As the people of God, we are called to be good parents, good marriage partners, and good citizens. But these are not enough – we are also called in various ways to take action for God. This could be in the form of working for the poor, the sick, or the disadvantaged, in counseling and teaching, or in religious or political advocacy. One of Satan’s main contemporary weapons of societal destruction is gender feminism and the social justice movement which are especially attractive to him because they contain grains of truth amidst the lies. We are called, not to use violence, but rather to speak out against the evil of our times, using the weapons of prayer and the truth of the Bible.

Principles for Couples

When a person understands what they themselves really want and need, they stand a much better chance of success in life – either remaining single or selecting a partner they can stay committed to and enjoy life. Most people desire an intimate relationship with an individual of the opposite sex. Just as positive psychology was a call for a redirection from an undue focus on mental illness and abnormality, so this is a call to refocus psychology on biblical principles and on the vast majority of people who are heterosexual, rather than on transsexualism and the small minority.

Not all heterosexuals will be attracted to the type of relationship described herein which is male dominant and female submissive (MDFS). There are submissive males and dominant females in society as well as LGBTQ+ individuals and others who desire complete gender equivalence. However, the vast majority are heteronormative, and it is to them that this is addressed. Just as we need to live and let live, and accept people of different orientations, it would be a grave mistake to write off MDFS just because it is alleged to be out of step with the current culture – at many times throughout history culture has had to be saved from itself as is the case now. What follows is for the majority of people with a heterosexual orientation that is typically MDFS to a greater or lesser degree. But even so, there is no “one-size-fits-all” definition of how a relationship should be constructed, so the principles will need to be adapted.

The male-female coupling is the most intimate of all relationships – both man and woman are literally and figurately naked to their partner, and the partner will soon become aware of all the other’s flaws and character defects. Hence the need for love and forgiveness as described above. Elizabeth Gilbert’s quote is powerful here: “To be fully seen by somebody and be loved

anyhow – this is a human offering that can border on miraculous.” That miracle is what couples should aspire to – combining the mundane activities of life with a passion for each other.

In our technological society, where we think we know everything, we “know” less about male-female realities than we did a few generations ago. As previously discussed, the sexes are opposite in many ways so that each can meet the needs of the other and make up for what the other lacks. Women have what men want, and men have what women want – the idea is to give to the other what he/she wants so you in turn will receive what you want. Understanding male-female differences discussed above and the fact that they are immutable is essential to a successful male-female relationship. The Bible has several basic principles for couples:

- The wife is to submit to her husband.
- The husband is to love his wife.
- The husband and wife are to stay together and raise their kids together.
- The husband’s primary responsibility is to provide for and lead the family.
- The wife’s primary responsibility is to care for the family.

These are the simple principles on which a successful society can be built because if the families (the individual units of society) are successful then society will flourish. Husbands and wives satisfy each other, couples stay together, poverty is reduced, children are raised and loved in intact homes, and the pattern is repeated in subsequent generations. Gender feminism is one of the main sources of family and societal destruction, so we must dump those ideas and practices and instead have successful and vibrant marriages. It is interesting that Jesus’s first miracle was not to make any profound theological statement. Rather, it was performed at a wedding for a poor couple to make enough wine for all of the guests to enjoy.

When both males and females see their roles as different but also equal in value and complementary to each other, they can dispense with the vain posturing and shallow self-assertions that so many people do to prop up their own ego. Both realize “*I am somebody*, and I

don't need to reinvent myself to be valuable and special." An MDFS marriage can be flexible because it takes the desires of both partners into account. This, of course, requires discussion and compromise – not all desires can be realized or realized to the desired extent, but it avoids trampling on the wishes of one or both. It allows the partners to bring their wants out into the open so that they can be considered and given a fair hearing. If women are to feel affirmed in a more submissive role, then that role must satisfy and must provide a sense of value and worth to women. In other words, the concerns of women that led to the formation of the feminist movement must be addressed. This involves the wife (necessarily with the full cooperation of her husband) re-establishing the home as a primary place where the family lives, moves, and has their being. Following are some specific ways that this can be accomplished:

1. *In regard to children:* spending time with the kids, especially in their early and formative years. This will probably mean that the wife will need to cut back or possibly eliminate income producing activities so that she has the time and energy to invest in her children. The benefits for the children are immeasurable – more love, more security, more self-esteem, more of an adult role model, etc., but there are also more benefits to moms and parents – loving, self-disciplined, and respectful children, who are more of a joy to live with and care for. Kids are thus encouraged to spend more time with their parents, and the generation gap is minimized which also reduces behavior problems and provides a positive focus to a child's life.
2. *In regard to education:* taking an active role in the children's education. This means turning off the TV, controlling internet access and video games, and getting them involved in reading books and active play. Our current generation is in some ways much less educated than any prior one because the perspective of most people is shaped by only one source – media – which has an almost uniformly progressive and feminist bias. In other words, if we limit ourselves to mainstream media, we will in general receive only one perspective which largely influenced by the social justice system.

Home schooling is becoming a very popular alternative to private schools for parents who want a better education for their children. This may not be for everyone, but many who have done it feel that it is the best way for kids to be educated, at least through the middle school grades. The benefits of home schooling include: 1) better education; 2) more involvement in life skills and practical issues; 3) longer attention spans, less peer-dependency and greater maturity. Some have criticized home schooling because of its lack of socialization, but this can be addressed by getting the kids involved in community sports, arts, and/or music programs. In short, the couple invests themselves in people, and

especially their own children – rather than things. There are many home school co-ops available for specific subjects, and colleges are now expressing a preference for kids with a home school background.

3. *In regard to income production:* working part-time or developing a home-based business. The growth of the Internet has resulted in many new opportunities for businesses that can be run from home and can be conducted on a more flexible schedule. More corporations are also allowing employees to work from home in jobs where this is feasible, to reduce the cost of office space and to retain valuable workers.
4. *In regard to the marriage relationship:* having more time and energy for romance, sex, and interacting with children.

MDFS marriage is flexible and supports role reversals which are possible because the partners develop a deep sense of security, self-worth, and sexual identity fostered by the acceptance that the relationship provides. Therefore, Dad can “become Mom” at times, and vice versa. Furthermore, it allows the wife to take on characteristics of the dominant (being goal-oriented, organized, etc.) without threatening the man, because she still submits to his leadership. Likewise, the husband can take on characteristics of the submissive (being emotional, empathetic, nurturant, etc.) without threat of “losing his edge.”

“But I thought love meant equality,” she said, “and free companionship.”

“Ah, equality!” said the Director. “We must talk of that some other time. Yes, we must be guarded by equal rights from one another’s greed because we are fallen. Just as we all wear clothes for the same reason. But the naked body is still there underneath the clothes. Equality is not the deepest thing, you know!”

“I always thought that it was in their souls that people are equal.”

“You are mistaken,” he said gravely. “That is the last place where they are equal. Equality before the law—that is very well. Equality guards life, it doesn’t make it. It is medicine, not food...”

“But surely in marriage...?”

“Worse and worse,” said the Director. “Courtship knows nothing of it, and the consummation of marriage is a celebration of inequality...”

“I thought...” said Jane, and then stopped.

“I see,” said the Director. “... No one ever taught you that obedience—humility—is an erotic necessity... but you will see that obedience and rule are more like a dance than a drill, especially between man and woman where the roles are always changing.” ([Lewis, 1965, p. 148](#))

Ballroom dancing is an excellent analogy of MDFS marriage – the man leads and the woman follows, but sometimes they exchange roles. Those who have taken lessons know that if the man leads well, the woman will usually be able to follow him even if she can’t dance as well as he can. However, if the leader doesn’t know what he is doing, it just won’t work. But though the man leads, the woman’s role is essential, and is as important as his. To a great degree, dancing, like other aspects of life, is a display of female artistry and an appreciation of feminine beauty. When someone is first learning to dance, everything is technical, and the steps must be memorized and internalized. At the beginning couples may look mechanical because they have to focus on the footwork and try to remember all of the little details. But after they have learned the dance, their feet automatically know where to go, and the dancing become more effortless. Distracting and unnecessary motions are minimized, leaving more energy for the dance itself. An MDFS couple learns to sustain their relationship by – among other things – the elimination of distractions and a focus on the positive aspects of their life together. All dances require timing and choreography – there is a set of fixed motions that characterize each dance. But when a couple has learned the basic framework, they can add all sorts of improvisations and subtle movements which make their way of dancing unique. Some see frameworks as a limitation, but they are necessary to guide expression and to bring order out of chaos. Learning the framework and the principles discussed above actually creates freedom, a positive freedom where we express our creativity within the bounds of the framework, and therefore produce stability rather than confusion. When a man and a woman marry and are trained in “the real dance” of how to create a loving relationship, they can make beautiful and unique music together.

As in the C.S. Lewis' quote above, feminism and the related ideologies with their focus on rights and equality can only “guard life”; they seek to prevent people from being damaged by others. But in a marriage where there is total commitment, all barriers can and should be torn down so that the couple can give themselves completely to each other. This is the “food” necessary to nourish us, so that we don’t need all of the “medicine” of drugs, therapists, lawyers, remediation, daycare, and so on. C.S. Lewis indicated that God is a hedonist – “You will show me the path of life - in Your presence is fullness of joy, and at Your right hand there are pleasures forevermore” (Psalm 16:11). The drill is over – let the dance begin!

Although I conquer all the earth,
Yet for me there is only one city.
And in that city, there is for me only one house;
And in that house, a room;
And in that room, a bed;
And in that bed, a woman,
The shining joy and jewel of all my kingdom.
(Anonymous)

Selecting a Marriage Partner

Many people decide to live together or marry without understanding themselves and end up struggling for years with a spouse who doesn’t understand them or their needs. Better to understand yourself first (or at least start trying) before you take the plunge. Selecting a marriage partner used to be done by parents, but parental involvement is rare in the Western world. That is unfortunate because mate selection is one of the most important decisions that people make due to its long-term consequences. Mistakes made in job selection or even career choices are much more easily rectified with fewer consequences than a mistake made in selecting a mate. Young people need someone who is mature and objective in evaluating potential mates to avoid those who have personality problems such as selfishness, narcissism, low self-esteem, abusiveness, addictions, and other issues which may cause the marriage to flounder. That being said, given the

reality of human nature, no one is perfect, so any potential partner will always have some problems.

People are naturally selfish, and selfishness destroys relationships perhaps more than any other factor, so success in marriage means replacing selfishness with giving. This does not mean one's own desires are unimportant and need to be suppressed, but that our desires will best be fulfilled by giving rather than by demanding to receive. We must understand the conundrum of giving – that when we give to our partner and to others, they will in turn be incentivized to give to us. Giving produces appreciation in others which in turn inspires them to give to us.

Love Languages

An important aspect of giving to one's partner is to learn his or her "love language," which is the way that he/she best understands and appreciates expressions of love. Learning this requires both communication and observation as your partner may well have a different love language than yours. All elements should be employed at times, but people typically react more strongly to one of them ([Chapman, 1992](#)). The love languages are as follows:

- *Words of affirmation* – expressing affection and appreciation through words. This involves kind words, encouragement, and love notes which compliment them or point out what they do well.
- *Quality time* – spending time and giving undivided attention. This involves being present, focused on them, and actively listening.
- *Physical touch* – this involves sex but more than that, it involves touching, being close, giving massages, and physical intimacy.
- *Acts of service* – these are nice things done for your partner to help them in various ways that they request or would appreciate.
- *Receiving gifts* – expensive gifts are nice, but the value is not necessarily in the cost of the gift, rather it is in the time and effort involved. Gifts selected specifically for a partner communicate thoughtfulness.

The love language concept has been accused of perpetuating “heteronormality” but that is the point – heteronormality should be encouraged and perpetuated.

Sex

Some feel that the sexual paradigm of MDFS is tired, antiquated, and perhaps even deceased as a model for couples in the twenty-first century. But it is as alive and well as ever because its roots are deeply embedded in both the male and female psyche. Art and entertainment, which are expressions of our cultural soul, from time immemorial down to the immediate present, have routinely played off this theme. Consider the male-female relationships in the movies *Titanic*, *Braveheart*, *Last of the Mohicans*, *Dances with Wolves*, and *True Lies*, to name just a few. The male-female dynamic is the central drama of life.

The parts of our bodies that are sexual in nature reveal the essential male-female difference – the erect penis of the male is designed for penetration, the vagina of the female is designed to be penetrated, and the breasts of the female are designed for nurturance. Without a male erection and some degree of aggression on his part sex is not possible. The act of sex is thus inherently unequal – the man enters the woman which requires her surrender to him. This is biological reality, and it is also biological reality that orgasm, female sexual pleasure, comes from the act of surrender – the more fully that the woman gives herself to her man, the stronger her orgasms will be ([Robinson, 1959](#)).

The “standard” sexual position (with the woman on her back and underneath the man) is not the easiest sexual position, nor does it provide for maximum penetration. The reason it is the standard sexual position is psychological and not physical. It deals with something very deep and basic, which is likely to be shocking to some women and offensive or attractive to others. On reflection, its symbolic aspect is devastatingly obvious. The sleek female is the natural quarry and game for the male and the man has captured his quarry and can now enjoy her at his leisure. In this position the woman is permitted very little movement; she is his prisoner and cannot escape. She has been caught, and she lies there on her back pinned down by her captor, looking into his eyes and awaiting her penetration. This position best promotes male conquest and female

surrender, and therefore without question, it will remain the standard position. ([Norman, 1974, p. 33](#))

One of the most pernicious lies of our culture is that marital sex is lousy, and that to spice things up you need an affair or some other form of sexual outlet. But quite the contrary, to have an intense, beautiful, and a long-lasting series of sexual encounters, what you really need is intimacy, trust, relaxation, commitment, and a degree of secrecy and specialness between the partners. In other words, great sex really requires marriage, and every other form of sexual coupling will ultimately prove to be disappointing and unsatisfying, as well as potentially having disastrous medical, psychological, financial, and relational consequences. Of course, just being married does not guarantee a beautiful sexual relationship either. Couples often take each other for granted, and what is worse – will engage in behavior that destroys love, and disincentivizes their partner from wanting to please them. The challenge therefore is building a relationship in which we can enjoy and satisfy each other for a lifetime.

The essence of great sex is that it satisfies not only physically but also psychologically – it has little to do with technique, and everything to do with the couple's emotional and psychological environment – how they think about and treat each other. This is good news for both men and women, and especially for the latter, because attitude is much more important than figure; a few extra pounds are much less important than an eager and giving spirit.

Satisfying sex is therefore both a cause and an effect – it helps to establish intimacy in the first place, but also requires intimacy in order for it to flourish. When the man penetrates the woman it is much more than the simple joining of organs – plugging tab “A” into slot “B.” Rather, the man enters the woman to take possession of her and to express his rule over her. The woman surrenders herself to the man, giving him control of her body. It is the psychological

aspects of sex combined with the physical sensations that provide its sweeping power and intensity.

Such a sex act can serve as the physical meeting ground on which... a man and a woman can begin to construct an enduring emotional unity. The sexual encounter cannot perform its function when it is viewed as a trivial event of moral indifference with no purpose or meaning other than the production of sensation through the friction of body parts.
([Graglia, 1998, p. 8](#))

Women want to be loved and honored, but they also wish to be attractive to men, to be the object of strong male sexual desires, and to be sexually used by their man. When a woman feels loved and cherished, she is freed to surrender as her man's possession.

In all human beings there are exploitive elements, and elements of a desire to be an object of exploitation. In the crueler language of psychology, in every human being there are certain dominant or sadistic elements and certain submissive or masochistic elements. These differ in amount and degree among human beings, but they exist in all, and it is naiveté to deny them. Those with more or less of these elements are not better or worse than others. They are simply a reality of human nature.

Dominance and sadism are somewhat more pronounced in men, and submission and masochism in women, and indeed, given their biological makeup, this is what we would expect. A masochistic woman would tend to be more submissive to the authority of the male. She would expect him to lead her and, on some level, enjoy and find satisfaction in being dominated by him. A somewhat masochistic (i.e., submissive) woman therefore makes an extremely desirable wife and sex partner for a man. Instinctively he feels that she is vulnerable, that she is his quarry, and this will arouse him, improve his confidence and sexual performance and make him a better man. With such a woman, a man will become sexually aggressive, and will want to dominate her, possess her, own her, drive her wild with pleasure, make her helplessly his, and afterward, tenderly love and caress her. The submissive woman finds that this is exactly what fulfills her deepest longings as well. ([Norman, 1974, pp. 22-23](#))

In taking the woman the man communicates to her that she is his treasure and his possession, and that he means to conquer and have her. But it also tells her that he is dedicating himself to her, and that she will be the focus of his interest and attention. This is in direct contract to the sexuality promoted by feminists in which women are just as aggressive as men. Although this may initially be titillating, many men and women will find that that type of sexuality to be unsatisfying and perhaps even repelling. Men will reject it because an essential

psychological element of male sexuality for most men is not only penetrating the woman, but also her capture and conquest. If this element is partially or wholly missing, a man may not be aroused enough to achieve an erection which is essential to the whole enterprise, and he will not be very highly pleased if the nature of their sexual relationship inhibits his erectile capacity.

Women also commonly reject an aggressive female posture in sex because, 1) orgasm normally requires a woman to be relaxed, surrendered, and taken by the man, and 2) a woman's goal in sex is typically not merely her own pleasure, but also pleasing her man. The man is most deeply pleased when he conquers the woman, and as she responds by yielding herself to him. In other words, what excites him most is the woman's loss of control and willing surrender to him.

Now you have her in your arms; she is stripped and completely open to you; there is no visual or tactual barrier allowed to intervene between you. She is nude and bare; her beauty is completely exposed to you, and she is utterly yours! What a magnificent creature! What a joy and glory to take her! What pleasure to have her! What an exquisite joy to make her cry out with happiness, beg you to master her and then thoroughly yield herself up to you! He who makes love to less than such a creature is wasting his time. Together, husband and wife, by mentally and physically stimulating each other in this way can create extraordinary and incomprehensibly delicious sexual experiences for each other. ([Norman, 1974, pp. 145-158](#))

This does not mean that the male is always dominant. When both partners are secure in their own identities and in their love for each other, they can switch roles at times in ways that are mutually pleasing. Also, the sex experienced by the couple need not always, or even usually, be intense. Sometimes it is engaged in purely for purposes of relaxation or emotional closeness. But MDFS sexuality is always meaningful, and it is successfully engaged in only by partners who have deep bonds of intimacy and trust between them. This is at the opposite pole from the casual sex typified in movies and the media, where a boy and a girl do it in a motel and then drift apart.

The possibility of pregnancy is yet another reason why sex should be limited to married couples, so that when the wife does become pregnant, it can be a time of joy rather than fear,

anguish, and depression. Loving, mature, married couples are the best parents, because they are psychologically and financially ready to love the child and raise it. When a husband deeply penetrates his wife and impregnates her by shooting his seed into her open womb, it is a powerful and beautiful experience. A child conceived in this intense and passionate act will be loved all the more because of the wonder of the sexual relationship that brought him or her into being.

As tranquility moves to serenity and becomes more a part of a woman's character, she begins to realize what a miraculous and wonderful thing womanhood is and to be filled with wonder and awe at her capability to bear children. Her fantasies about becoming pregnant may excite her directly, and resentment toward him turns to gratitude for this richest of all potential gifts... As one woman became increasingly secure in her husband's love she described the change in their sexual relationship as follows: "Oh it was fun before, but now the idea that I might become pregnant makes me feel at one with the whole universe. There are almost no words to describe it." ([Robinson, 1959, pp. 52-53](#))

A giving wife does not resent being her man's sex object at times, because she understands that men derive their pleasure from sexual conquest. She also knows that men enjoy looking at women's bodies, and therefore she provides her own body for him to watch. Rather than resenting this, she will enjoy it, because she knows that she is also her man's beloved. In other words, her husband values her for both her body and her brains, and the wife can therefore give him her body without feeling that she is being trampled, used, or taken for granted. Likewise, a faithful man learns to focus his life in a monogamous direction, and centers his romantic and sexual attention completely on his wife, so that her affections are preserved. A husband who engages in extra-marital affairs poisons his own well and shoots his own feet off. Why not have an affair with your wife instead of other women?

To put my cards on the table, I am rather stick-in-the-muddish, and am sold on the institution of marriage, as it might be if not as it is. This does not mean that I am opposed to having affairs. I am highly in favor of it. I am particularly in favor of having them with one's wife.

A remarkable fact about marriage, seldom explicitly noted, is that it consists of one man and one woman. That is very sexy, to say the least. What a fantastic opportunity for intricate and delightful sexual experiences. The man and woman have each other all to themselves and their pleasure. They are free in a socially accepted institution to contrive the most exquisite enjoyments for each other.

To see a woman remove her clothing is an exciting experience. The problem with the professional strip tease is that it is a commercial and a cynical exhibition, and you don't get to grab the lovely lady afterwards. It is a tease, and therefore it is not a satisfying or fulfilling experience, but rather a frustrating one. But imagine the pleasure of being treated, privately, to this performance by an excited loving woman, who is eager that you make love to her. As her performance concludes, she dances lovingly and aroused into your arms. Man!

When two human beings can give each other such exquisite and mind-expanding excitements, it is natural for them to grow very close. They realize that such a partner is not simply another interchangeable unit of which most of our marriages seem to be composed. He or she is a jewel. ([Norman, 1974, pp. 15, 17, 25, 79](#))

Couples may want to have sexual adventures at times:

The husband and wife have an affair with each other. Ideally it takes place in a new locale, and preferably an exotic one. The husband and wife arrive separately. If they have enough money they can have separate accommodations, at least initially. If not, he will "pick her up" and they will share his accommodations. They do not know each other. She is a new woman to him, and perhaps she has changed her hair color, put on a new dress, but in any case, she is somehow new and different. They conduct themselves as if they were on a date. Just as a couple would ask each other many questions if they were considering marriage, so the couple rediscovers each other, and perhaps are reminded of all of the interesting things about their spouse that they had forgotten, and why they were attracted to that person in the first place. At the conclusion the husband proposes that his wife marry him. She accepts and they consummate their union.

The husband follows and pursues his wife, eventually capturing her. For example, this could take place at a shopping mall where the wife looks at merchandise and goes from store to store, while the husband watches and follows her. Eventually when he sees an opportunity, he takes her firmly by the hand, brings her out to his car, and they drive off together.

A small Roman banquet can be fun to prepare and serve, in which delicious and exotic foods and drinks may be served on a low table, or on the floor, with the guest (the husband) reclining on cushions. And that luscious, captivating, servant girl, with loose hair and golden earrings, in her brief tunic of red silk, fastened on her shoulder by a golden clasp, looks something like your wife. But now she is your concubine. When, during the banquet you want her, you may remove her garment, pull her down to the cushions beside you, and take her in your arms. ([Norman, 1974, pp. 135-136, 169-170, 148](#))

Sometimes people who play role-playing games, such as *Dungeons and Dragons*, get completely wrapped up and lost in the game. But role-playing games are not reality, instead they are a *refreshment for reality*. They are intended to provide occasional spice and excitement to the more mundane aspects of married life. They are a form of play – recreation between husband and wife. We take our sports seriously, and likewise sex play and the sexual aspects of an MDFS relationship should be taken seriously as well, because they are important. But it should also be fun, exciting, and thrilling.

In many marriages there is a “desire gap.” Men in general want sex more than women and are therefore frustrated when their wives don’t deliver. Dr. Michael Bonaventura believes that the necessary suppression of female sexual desire until marriage depresses sexual desire in women even after marriage. He then describes a therapy he has developed for helping women increase their libido, so it would seem to be possible for a woman to increase her sexual desire ([Bonaventura, 1996](#)). But even if her sexual desires do not match his, she should still seek to lovingly affirm him. Likewise, the man needs to have patience with his wife and moderate his desires when she is less able to respond. The bottom line is that both husband and wife should be patient and considerate of each other’s needs and seek to fulfill them to the extent that they are able to do so. Can sex actually be high and holy as well as erotic? That is the goal.

At this juncture, a woman begins to feel her full power, the power that comes from surrender. She realizes that far from being in a weak position in relationship to man, her position is so strong that she must be careful not to exploit it. She could deny her husband children or make his life miserable while giving them to him. Or she can make it the most beautiful and meaningful thing in both her life and his.

One woman wrote, “This feeling of power and glory was quickly followed by an intense feeling of humility. I thought of how I held within my body the power to bring him the greatest of joys or deprive him of it. And then I realized the terrible thing it would be if I ever misuse this power. For the first time I fully felt, despite my former lip service to the idea, the reason why marriage must be considered sacramental. The sexual relationship between husband and wife resulting in the mystery of birth goes far beyond human understanding. To participate in this mystery really requires the consecration of both. Any

lesser attitude toward it is like the laughter of mockery in a holy place.” ([Robinson, 1959, pp. 211-214](#))

People hearing the words “Christianity” and “sex” in juxtaposition may well consider them to be an oxymoron – two incompatible things. But on the contrary, sex is glorified in the Bible when it is practiced within the boundaries of a married relationship. God invented the whole concept of gender and sex – masculinity, femininity, and romantic fascination are all of divine origin. It is therefore troubling that Christians are sometimes hung-up and ashamed of sexual things. The Bible contains a book dedicated to romance and sex – the Song of Songs ([Sorensen, 2011](#)). Consider the hot sexuality in these biblical passages:

Drink water from your own cistern and fresh water from your own well. Should your springs be dispersed abroad, streams of water in the streets? Let them be yours alone and not for strangers with you. Let your fountain be blessed and rejoice in the wife of your youth. As a loving hind and a graceful doe, let her breasts satisfy you at all times; be exhilarated always with her love. (Proverbs 5:15-19)

Awake, O north wind, and come, wind of the south; make my garden breathe out fragrance, let its spices be wafted abroad. May my beloved come into his garden, and eat its choice fruits! I have come into my garden, my sister, my bride. I have gathered my myrrh along with my balsam. I have eaten my honeycomb and my honey. I have drunk my wine and my milk. Eat, friends; drink and imbibe deeply, O lovers! (Song of Solomon 4:16 – 5:1)

In the above passage the wife compares her body to a garden that she has prepared for her husband. She invites him to come in, enjoy her garden, and have her. He accepts the invitation and sexually possesses her. Other scriptures expand on this:

- Proverbs 5:15-19 instructs the husband to continually satisfy himself with his wife’s breasts, and literally encourages him to “get drunk” on her lovemaking. By extension a wife is instructed to continually provide her breasts to her husband and to intoxicate him with her body.
- 1 Corinthians 7:2-5 instructs couples to engage in frequent sexual intercourse.
- Hebrews 13:4 teaches that marriage is honorable and that the marriage bed is “undefiled,” i.e., whatever happens there is right, and sexual activity in marriage is always good and appropriate.

Biblical marriage and sexuality are the reestablishment of the “feminine mystique” that feminism has tried to tear down. Rather than eliminating the distinctions between the sexes, biblical sexuality is a celebration of the differences, in a way that ennobles both men and women and calls both to a higher standard. It is a renewing of the vision of females as princesses and queens, and males as princes and kings with all of the glories and responsibilities that those positions entail. In essence, it is the flowering of our gender and the fulfillment of our sexuality. It is the reestablishment of the true basis for male-female intimacy – the mutual satisfaction of desires in the context of a committed relationship. To put it in picture form, it is the attempt to enter into and live out in your own way the most powerful and enduring of all human fantasies, that have been celebrated in story and song since the dawn of time, in thousands of variations and permutations – the lord and the lady, the white knight and the fair maiden, the sheik and the dancing girl, Cinderella and Prince Charming, the cheerleader and the football star, Beauty and the Beast, the rajah and his concubine, the Princess Bride and the Dread Pirate Roberts, and many more. The goal is transformation – redirecting a man away from being a selfish boor into a white knight, who can fire the romantic imagination and sexual surrender of his woman and continue to inspire her for a lifetime. For the woman it redirects her from being an inhibited nag into a passionate lover that her man wants to come home to, and who has a richness of feminine character that is beautiful and attractive. This form of sexuality is therefore psychological dynamite, and the intense psychosexual pleasure it provides can addict and ruin immature people who are not prepared to engage in the relational aspects.

In reviewing various pornographic materials, one is struck by the fact that it rarely involves marital sex – instead it is focused almost entirely on perversion – affairs, incest, pedophilia, teen sex, sadism, orgies, group sex, rape, etc. The problem with pornography is that it

removes intimacy and makes sex shoddy, cheap, and trashy by objectifying the participants and rejects any meaning beyond the act itself. Pornography removes the highness and holiness of sex and hardens individuals. Unfortunately, many men and some women are hooked on it, and need to use the principles above to remove its hold their lives. But it should not just be removed – it needs instead to be replaced by good sex with one's partner, implying that the partner needs to understand and participate. The negative should be replaced by the positive.

The acronym often used for “kink” today (i.e., anything beyond vanilla sex) is “BDSM,” which is a clever combination of B&D (bondage and discipline), D/s (dominance and submission), and S&M (sado-masochism, or sometimes sexual magic). D/s is usually the mildest of the three in terms of the activities practiced, then B&D with its various forms of bondage and restraint, and finally S&M with its whips and chains. The huge interest in the movie *50 Shades of Gray* indicates the fascination people have with kinky sexual activities.

The growth and popularity of BDSM has followed the growth of feminism, and they are intimately related to each other. As society prods men and women into positions of equivalence, the natural desires of people for some degree of dominance and submission still require an outlet. In the BDSM world there are female dominants and male submissives, but like people in general, the orientation is mostly MDFS. The natural desires that people have for MDFS may even be strengthened and become an obsession, because feminism often tries to deny them and sweep them under the rug. BDSM-based clubs and societies have therefore become ways of expressing and dabbling in dominant/submissive sexual practices without getting too involved and without committing a person to a long-term relationship. Therefore, it is similar in nature to prostitution, i.e., relationships are typically “contractual”; they spell out what each will and will not do and may involve payment for sexual services.

Psychologists have often considered BDSM to be pathological, deviant, or abnormal, although there is little empirical evidence to support this claim. The Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM) has a tradition of pathologising BDSM despite the lack of supporting evidence because “normal” individuals would presumably not behave in a manner that risked their health. This assumes that all BDSM activities involve risky activities which is not the case, particularly as related to D/s ([Turley & Monro, 2018](#)).

Like pornography, the sexual practices of the BDSM world typically revolve around a sexuality that is focused purely on the physical and non-relational level; in other words, it is sex for the purpose of self-gratification. Such practices are usually short-term, often involve inflicting pain, and are typically non-monogamous (i.e., they may entail wife-swapping and other types of group or public sex). A typical BDSM relationship is therefore not compatible with marriage, and will damage it, because BDSM sexual practices can cause physical or psychological trauma, break down the trust between the partners, and open the door to jealousy and suspicion.

In reviewing this topic, the author was struck by the disparity and vehemence of opinion on this issue, possibly due to lack of understanding. In general, people seem to be either repulsed by BDSM or intensely attracted to it. On the one hand there are “conservatives” who are uncomfortable with the notion of sexual experimentation perhaps even within marriage, and suspicious of sexually related discussions and presentations. The conservatives may well include feminists who are intolerant of any form of female submissiveness. On the other hand, there are “liberals” who want to be completely free, to permit any and all types of sexual expression and orientation and see any restriction on sexuality as an evil. We are here proposing a middle ground, that retains the monogamous relationship of the conservatives, but within that bond it

adds the free sexual expression of the liberals. The goal is having the best of each position, while avoiding the worst of both. In other words, the goal is to gain an intense and sexually fulfilling monogamy, avoiding the sexual frustration of the conservatives as well as the negative consequences caused by the sexual profligacy of the liberals.

Therefore, some sexual practices that are associated with BDSM can rightly be included in a MDFS marriage relationship if both partners desire it – in particular, the B&D and the D/s aspects. Just because someone calls a particular sexual activity “kinky” does not mean that it is necessarily wrong or bad. Appropriate BDSM activities include: 1) those that can be done by the couple alone and in private, and 2) those that do not involve degradation or heavy pain. MDFS sex may be tarred with the same black brush that the harsher forms of BDSM receive. But its core reality is very different, because its aim is intimacy (rather than merely individual satisfaction), mutual pleasure (rather than individual power trips), and the preservation of monogamy (rather than group sex or involvement with others). They can help provide the element of sexual ecstasy and satisfaction that people often seek, because the dominance of the male and the submissiveness of the female are heightened in the experience.

Submissive participants’ powerlessness was framed as a multi-faceted erotic experience, consisting of both the psychological act of submission, and the physical and psychological consequences of this action. In terms of the act of submission, all submissive participants mentioned the removal of responsibility as a particularly erotic aspect of submission. The notion of not having to make choices or take decisions was particularly appealing, and participants described this lack of responsibility as a pleasurable contribution to the sexual experience.

As the US and the UK are liberal countries, this appears on the surface, to be an incongruous concept from which to derive sexual pleasure; however, it is only erotic within the fantasy of the relationship. In the context of the BDSM scene, submissive partners must obey dominant partners and submit to their power, and the removal of free will in this context is an erotic experience for the participants. Allowing this to happen during BDSM leads participants to attest to wonderful, unexpected sexual experiences, as submissive partners are unable to refuse the dominant’s wishes and are therefore able to engage in sexual practices they would otherwise be inhibited against. This must occur, of course, within the realms of fantasy and consent.

Anticipating the sexual scene was a common erotic element among the submissive partners, where they would imagine all the potential possibilities that the dominant partner had in store for them. This often occurred when participants were restrained or blindfolded, and they felt particularly powerless to influence the scene. This was framed as erotic by many of the participants as it enhanced feelings of fear and vulnerability and emphasized their own position of powerlessness and helplessness. Anticipation was also framed by many submissive participants as a kind of foreplay, whereby the anticipation and excitement of what is to follow is sexually arousing. ([Turley & Monro, 2018](#))

But sex by itself is not enough, and indeed, without the romantic trust relationship described above, the sex will lose its ecstatic psychological aspects. The vulnerability and helplessness that lead to powerful orgasms in women are negated if there is actual fear and a lack of trust. Psychology articles and resources on various aspects of sex and BDSM include: ([Harmon-Jones & Winkielman, 2014](#); [Hawley & Hensley, 2009](#); [Holvoet et al., 2017](#); [Moser, 2016](#); [Renaud & Byers, 2005](#); [Vall et al., 2014](#); [Wright, 2018](#)).

Sex is important, but nothing is more important and worthy of our passion than our relationship with God. Our ultimate destiny is to “shine as the stars.” As Isaiah said, “For you shall go out with joy, and be led forth in peace. The mountains and the hills before you shall burst into song, and all the trees of the field shall clap their hands” (Isaiah 55:12). But life on earth is prosaic, and for most people it largely consists of and is based on a marriage relationship. Individual males and females produce the children who will form the future society and eventually take over from their parents, and it is individual couples, rather than some amorphous social entity, who will prepare – or fail to prepare – their children to function in society. Most of the significant areas of civilization and culture, such as economics, education, law exist because of the inherent drives by moms and dads to protect their family and satisfy its needs. Therefore, the construction of solid marriage relationships is the most important task in society’s preservation of itself.

Marriage from the Christian perspective is even deeper than this - it is intended to mirror the relationship of God to His people. This also includes the sexual aspects of our being, which are part and parcel of human nature. Why can't we have a passion for God, a passion for our marriage partner, and a passion for a deep sexual relationship? Why not the best?

The Man/Husband

A woman typically wants security and romance from her man – to feel protected, cherished, provided for, appreciated, and loved, and for him to focus on her to the exclusion of other women. Men are naturally competitive, and their lives are typically focused on achievement and career – those traits should be employed for her benefit. His main job is to provide physical, financial, and emotional security for her and for their family, which is what nature already inclines him to do. However, men are also naturally polygamous and have a weakness for women who give themselves, so making his wife secure also means being faithful to her and not having affairs with other women, even when she is not satisfying him. The marine motto – “semper fidelis” meaning “always faithful” should be the man's motto because faithfulness inspires trust, and a woman wants and needs to be able to trust her man. Untrustworthy men inspire feelings of betrayal and contempt in women – they are like wishy-washy teen boys chasing skirts and panting after girls. They lack the maturity and self-control of real men, and women want real men who are both dominant and caring. George Gilder wrote, “Masculinity is always a gaffe in the world of social science” ([Gilder, 1986, p. 156](#)). The real man rejects this attempt to remake him into a female, and instead, he is confidently male, and sees himself as “the man” in both business and romantic relationships.

When people think of a dominant man, they would probably picture a tall, dark, rugged guy, wearing a leather jacket, and riding off on a Harley into the sunset. This picture may be

accurate, but in most cases it isn't. He could be a banker or a baker and wear a suit or a pair of overalls. He may be a macho hockey player-type, but on the other hand, he may be un-athletic. But he needs to be mature, with a spirit of confidence, self-control, vigor, and intensity. What is truly important is what is on the inside rather than the outside. A dominant man needs a woman to give his life purpose and meaning – if he doesn't have a wife and family to lead, protect, and provide for, to what use will he put his energies? A submissive wife focuses on her man and gives his life meaning and purpose; in surrendering to him, she gives him the greatest gift that a woman can give a man – affirmation of his masculinity and gratitude for being the man that he is. Men are vulnerable and crave this affirmation; if it doesn't come from his woman, he will seek it elsewhere, and potentially ruin himself with alcohol, drugs, promiscuity, or overwork.

A "real man" understands women and seeks to meet his wife's needs for companionship, intimacy, and conversation. The typical desire of a woman's heart is to be special to one man, and therefore he treats his wife as his only one, who is precious and worthy of honor. He also knows that in order for his wife to fully submit to him, he has to stop chasing other women and focus his attention on her, so he avoids entanglements with other females.

A "real man" leads his family, helps his wife, thanks her for what she does, and is intimately involved in the care and discipline of their children. He is the leader and authority in the home, but without being domineering, demanding, or dictatorial. The biblical directive is for a man to love his wife in the agape sense which means that he is to be a servant leader (Ephesians 5:25-33). Being a servant leader is the opposite of being bossy or overbearing. A servant leader is gentle and reasonable – he commands respect by words of affection, affirmation, and gratitude, and by his actions in serving his family; his respect is earned rather than demanded (John 13:13-16). But gentleness must also be balanced by firmness and

decisiveness so that family members are not enabled in bad habits, which is a serious problem in many families especially when the father is missing.

Many men are lazy and passive, and they think their job is over when they come in the door at night. They leave all of the work and worry of children and home life to the woman, and still want her to respect and serve him. This forces the woman to take an unequally large share of the responsibility, because no one else is there to carry the ball and make critical decisions regarding home life, which in the long run, are some of the most important ones. Such a man cannot be truly dominant, because the woman will eventually lose respect for him and begin to resent the one-sided nature of their relationship. By contrast, the true dominant is fully involved, has a hands-on style of management, and knows what is going on in the lives of his wife and children. He strives to maintain a balance between all of the conflicting pressures for his time and attention. He is a servant-leader, and he talks things over, counsels, helps, encourages, reproves, gets involved, and shows love in practical ways. A true dominant doesn't become "Mr. Mom," but he helps with the housework, fixes the leaky faucet, and in many other ways shows his love by action. He therefore earns his wife's respect, as well as the right to call on her to obey and surrender to him.

Unlike our current educational system that is often focused around "self-esteem" for the individual and is trying to remove anything that could damage a person's ego (such as giving a child poor grades for poor work), a dominant man knows that true self-esteem can only come from actual accomplishments. An article on education in *Time* magazine contained the following quote: "In the past few years, reformers have embraced a disarmingly simple idea for fixing schools. Why not actually flunk those students who don't earn passing grades?" ([Cloud, 1999](#)). A dominant man has a sense of purpose – he sets goals, is organized, works hard, and has plans for

the future. His plans may not all work out, but he is flexible enough to rework plans and abandon them if necessary and pursue another course. He knows where he is going in life, and therefore is able to inspire others to follow him.

Agape love also means that the man should encourage his wife to blossom – to grow in directions that she desires, providing those directions don't compromise the family and their relationship. Men should emulate the fatherhood of God – being trustworthy, responsible, patient, kind, and caring, while at the same time being masculine and authoritative. That is the biblical challenge for men – to be a loving patriarch and to rebuild “responsible patriarchy” which feminism has torn down. He then needs to train his sons to do the same (Proverbs 22:6, Proverbs 15:20; Proverbs 17:25).

The Woman/Wife

A man typically wants affection and sex from his woman. He wants to conquer his world which includes sexually conquering her. As discussed above, the more fully she surrenders, the more powerful and satisfying her orgasms will be. Men “win” by conquest, and women “win” by surrender – the woman wins her man by “losing” to him and giving herself to him in sexual surrender. As previously mentioned, the conundrum of giving means that the traditional woman will typically be much more successful in relationships with men than the feminist, because the latter resists surrender and wants to retain her independence, e.g., ([Doyle, 2001](#)).

Woman will always be a romantic dreamer, a weaver of inner reveries, of tapestries of thought that give her whole personality its richness and flavor. In love, as in life, man is a doer, an aggressive achiever. Woman is the passive one; she is the dreamer who values the man's achievements, who creates the need for his achievement and gives color and glory to it through her appreciation of it. ([Robinson, 1959, p. 118](#))

I need to be with a man in part to discover who I am and what I will become. I feel that some parts of myself are held formless, waiting for the man to give me shape and direction. I've noticed as I talk to different men, that there is a subtle rearrangement of the molecules of my being in order to be pleasing. I would mold myself to his

expectations and try to become what I think he needs me to be. This is not conscious: I am not acting or being deceitful. I think it is my submissive female self, straining to find, within the limits of my psychological flexibility, the most pleasing configuration for that particular man. (Internet quote).

A man also wants his woman to respect him (hopefully he is worthy of her respect) and to care for him in feminine ways, which is what is what nature already inclines her to do – her man should be at the center of her care. This involves one of the most incendiary words in the English language – submission (Ephesians 5:22-24). Our generation tends to associate the word “submissive” with “incompetent,” and “weak”; but it is the exact opposite – a submissive woman is “competent” and “strong.” A wife being submissive to her husband is one of the most intelligent things she can do, as it will directly benefit her. Rather than viewing submission in negative or suspicious terms it should be seen as a positive way to conquer and keep her man. Just as men tend to be polygamous and have to resist that temptation, women tend to be controlling and have to resist that temptation. Submission is simply a woman being feminine and using the strength of her feminine nature. There is great power in femininity and women succeed by giving, but her power is eviscerated when she overtly seeks power in the marriage relationship. When she challenges her man for dominance, she poisons him against her. “The wise woman builds her house, but the foolish tears it down with her own hands” (Proverbs 14:1). The husband will either turn into mush and become despicable; or he will become more aggressive, and she becomes the target of his aggression; or he loses interest and becomes less involved. In our feministic milieu many men have become passive-aggressive, lapsing into an uninterested passivity, but at times becoming overtly hostile. When the Bible speaks to men and women regarding marriage such as in Ephesians chapter 5, it always addresses the wife first. In other words, she should submit to her husband to draw him into loving her.

It is important to understand what submission does and does not mean. It does not mean being a lesser person, a doormat, or a punching bag – a woman suffering abuse should leave the man and not make excuses for him. The Greek word in the Bible means to arrange oneself under authority, as a vice president to a president. Both individuals have equal value, but different roles and different levels of authority. Feminists claim that by submitting to a man a woman opens herself to being abused. If the man already has an abusive nature, then the woman would likely be abused whether she is submissive or not and should leave the relationship. Also, the Bible doesn't specify how or to what degree the woman should submit. It states a general principle but is intentionally vague on the details, which accommodates diversity in personality and background so that each couple can work out the details in ways that are mutually pleasing to them. There is a broadness that allows each couple to find their own level. Consider the following biblical profile on the ideal wife who is both strong and submissive:

A wife of noble character who can find? Her worth is far above rubies. The heart of her husband trusts in her, and he will have no lack of gain. She brings him good, not evil, all the days of her life... She opens her mouth in wisdom, and the teaching of kindness is on her tongue... She watches over the affairs of the household and does not eat the bread of idleness. Her children arise and call her blessed; her husband also, and he praises her, "Many women have done well, but you exceed them all." Charm is deceptive and beauty is fleeting, but a woman who fears the Lord is to be praised. Give her the reward she has earned and let her works praise her at the city gate. (Proverbs 31:10-31)

Some women (and men) are outwardly submissive because they feel degraded or worthless. Their inward feelings of debasement lead to a resigned passivity, which bears a superficial resemblance to submission. But this is not true submissiveness, because it is not joyful, happy, peaceful, or edifying. It is rather an attitude that has been forced onto a person, or a condition that through circumstances an individual has allowed herself or himself to sink into. By contrast, the true submissive woman is so because she desires to be, and because it is pleasurable for her and her husband.

I do know that for 42 of my 42 years I was rebellious against men, with the attitude of “who do you think YOU are” and I refused with everything in me to submit unless it was in my best interest. What I did not see, until about 2 months ago, that the biblical verses of submitting were in my best interest. My entire relationship has changed for the better, so much better, since I decided to try it God’s way. All my life I longed for a man to cherish me, and not until I accepted the submissive role, according to the Bible, did I feel cherished by the man in my life. I discussed this with a minister, and he said, “When all else fails follow the manual’s instructions, because it works.” (Internet quote)

In my humble opinion, submission is the ultimate form and practice of placing trust in another person... Submission is not simply a sexual act for me. Far from it actually. It is a mindset that stays with me at all times. It is a feeling of safety and security that helps define me as a person. It is the knowledge that I am truly loved and cherished, cared for. It is certainty. It is love. (Internet quote)

It is so strange how, by giving myself up to my husband, I have never felt more free. To surrender myself to him on every level allows my soul to breathe, to fly, to be released. My submission to him is the greatest gift I ever gave to myself.” (Internet quote)

Submission, to me, is many things. I think to start with it was about the feeling of release I got from having sex in a submissive way – it enabled me to let go and enjoy myself as I’d never been able to before... But now, it’s something different... Submission has become more about the peace I get inside me... It is the calm, contented feeling I get from knowing that, at last, after so many years of not fitting in, I have found my place in the world. (Internet quote)

The woman who is truly spirit-filled will want to be totally submissive to her husband. Submission is God’s design for woman. Christ’s example teaches that true submission is neither reluctant nor grudging, nor is it a result of imposed authority. It is rather an act of worship to God when it is a chosen, deliberate, voluntary response to a husband. ([LaHaye, 1998](#))

Ideally the husband should be dominant to some degree, and the wife should be submissive to him to some degree. The word “should” is used here not in a moral sense (i.e., a woman should not be *obligated* by law to submit), but rather in a pragmatic sense, because of the benefits to her, and because it is wise for her to do so. A woman’s submission to her man paradoxically provides her with a great emotional freedom and a good deal of control over him. She binds the man to her with bonds of love and devotion. To harm someone who surrenders in this manner is a violation of basic male instincts – like kicking a puppy. Instead, the woman’s vulnerability generates a nurturing response from the man. He wants to be dominant, but at the same time, to make her happy and to satisfy her.

Most heterosexual men, I believe, think that one of the most important functions a woman serves is as a sex object. That is a good quality in men that well serves traditional women, for it is what gives us power over men, and enables us to demand that we become a great deal to them before we will allow them to use us in sex. There is nothing wrong with being a sex object; it can be very gratifying. The moments when I became the objective of my husband's sexual attentions are the most enjoyable of my life... What is wrong is to be a sex object, and nothing more. ([Graglia, 1998, pp. 160-161](#))

This is a call for the natural propensities of the sexes to be respected. Following is a summary of the practical benefits to submission for women:

- Elimination of barriers and new incentives to romance – the man will have a new desire to cherish his woman because of her submission to him.
- Better and more loving communication.
- Less tension and bitterness because power struggles are reduced. This does not mean that the wife abdicates and says nothing. On the contrary, both partners discuss their concerns and really listen to each other.
- A deep peace and tranquility.
- Less worrying, fretting, and complaining.
- A stronger sense of self-worth, because the couple can now focus on affirming the other rather than defending turf.
- More marital oneness and cooperation.
- A freeing of energies that can be applied to more family interaction, additional income producing activities, etc.
- More satisfying sex for both.
- Less likelihood of infidelity with all of the attendant problems – distraction, resentment, fighting, bitterness, depression, jealousy, substance abuse, financial drain, and divorce.

Women often react to competition from other females in exactly the wrong way. They typically get upset with the man, blame him, and give him the cold shoulder. That reaction may be appropriate at times, but if a woman persists in that vein, it more-or-less guarantees that her man will look elsewhere for satisfaction. A submissive wife's reaction to other females should not be shock and horror – “how could you ever look at someone else like that!?” but rather, “don't look at some other woman – watch me, and have me!”

Submission also does not prescribe what role women should take and does not require that everyone conform to some fixed pattern – a woman may go off to work and still be submissive to her husband in home life. If the family needs additional income or if the woman

feels that a career is necessary for her own psychological well-being, then so be it. She may have a job/career or primarily be a homemaker – both choices are honorable. But people are more important than money and children need parents, so the priority for women should be with her children, especially in their early years (1 Peter 3:1-6; Titus 2:3-5).

The finest flower blossoms in her joy of giving the very best of herself to her husband and to her children. She never resents this need in herself to give, and she never interprets it as a burden or an imposition on her. It pervades her nature like the color green pervades the countryside, and she is proud of it and delights in it.

The mature woman... is not at all jealous of her husband's work, and her joy and satisfaction in the fulfillment of her own destiny make other personal achievements pale for her, and any other considerable use for her energies is almost a waste. The last vestiges of her envy of the male and of his role in life disappear. How, she wonders, with this marvelous capability of hers could she ever have depreciated the role of women and wanted what men have? ([Robinson, 1959, pp. 46, 53, 213, 215](#))

Feminists will point out that if we give approval to the authority of men in marriage relationships, then it will not be limited to marriage relationships. We would, in effect, be approving patriarchy in the society at large. They rant about returning to the stone age when women were chattel and slaves to men. The answer is that, on the contrary, a more traditional and patriarchal view of sex roles would be a very positive and healthy thing for our society, especially if it were combined with movements like Promise Keepers which calls men to account and instructs them to be committed and loving leaders. If there were a significant return to more MDFS marriage relationships, it would (perhaps dramatically) mitigate the problems that are now plaguing our society. Furthermore, as the last thirty years have shown us, men for the most part do not oppose the advancement of women in the professions, and do not try to hold them back. Much more significant are the desires, aspirations, and motivations of women themselves.

If women have reason to rage, it is not because science has set at naught their hard-won struggle toward equality; their wrath should rather be directed at those who have sought to misdirect and deny them their very essence. Many women in the last thirty or forty years have been brought up to believe that they are or should be “as good as the next man,” and in the process they have endured acute and unnecessary pain, frustration, and disappointment. They were led to believe that once they had shaken off the shackles of

male prejudice and oppression – the supposed source of their second-class status – the gates of the promised land of equal achievement would be thrown open. Women would be free at last to scale and conquer the commanding heights of the professions. Instead, in spite of the greater emancipation in terms of education, opportunity, and social attitudes, women are not noticeably “doing better” than they were thirty years ago. Mrs. [Margaret] Thatcher is still the exception that proves the rule. ([Moir & Jessel, 1991, p. 6](#))

Principles for Homosexuals

An issue of increased importance in contemporary society is what God thinks of homosexuality and transgenderism, and how Christians should regard it. As indicated above, the *inclination* to homosexuality may be natural due to intrauterine conditions when the fetal brain is being formed. On the other hand, it is not normal. God created us as male and female (Genesis 1:27) so the binary nature of sex and gender are rooted in creation. Heterosexuality is therefore the norm. Biblical examples include marriage and sex depicted in the Garden of Eden (Genesis 2:23), the first sin marred that relationship (Genesis 3:12), an entire book of the Bible is about sex and romance (The Song of Solomon), the incarnation of Jesus was a conception by the Holy Spirit (Luke 1:35), his first miracle was at a wedding (John 2:11), and the church is the bride of Christ (Revelation 22:17). One of the most grievous biblical sins is adultery because it is likened to idolatry – being unfaithful to God (e.g., Genesis 6, Exodus 32, Numbers 25, and many NT references). One’s sex is integral to one’s identity even after death; biblical characters in the intermediate state (Samuel, Elijah, and Moses) or after resurrection (Jesus) apparently retained their sexual identity as men even though their bodies had died.

Nevertheless, in our broken world abnormalities occur and as stated above, homosexuality is natural but not normal, so homosexual *inclinations* are not wrong or sinful because individuals may have been born that way. Likewise, there are many other inclinations or temptations that people have, such as a tendency toward anger, lust, greed, envy, violence, etc.

and those inclinations are also not wrong. Temptation in and of itself is not sinful, rather it is giving into the inclination/temptation and the practice of it that is wrong. Homosexual practice is therefore wrong according to the Bible (e.g., Leviticus 20:13). The words “homosexual” and “gay” do not appear in the Bible because those terms were invented much later, but the concept of “a man who has sex with another man” is ancient and was familiar to all biblical writers.

Viewing the *practice* of homosexuality as wrong does not come from individual Christians or institutions – it comes from the Bible, so those who want to argue that practicing homosexuality is acceptable will have to argue with God rather than people (e.g., Romans 1:26-27). The limits on human and animal nature in the form of speciation (i.e., the limits of interbreeding), our male and female nature, and rules by which we should live (e.g., the Ten Commandments) all come from God who intentionally imposed these limits on us and all of nature, not to restrict us, but to allow us to become the best that we can be. Unfortunately, people are rebellious, and in hundreds of different ways try to avoid, minimize, and even destroy the limits placed on us by God. But fighting against God doesn’t end well (“Who are you, O man, to reply against God? Will the thing formed say to him who formed it, ‘Why have you made me like this?’” Romans 9:20). Our challenge instead is to live and bloom within the limits that God has placed on us, trusting Him that He knows what he is doing, and that His will is the best.

Gays have attempted to “discover” homosexuals in the Bible and have alleged that King David, Paul the Apostle, and even Jesus were gay. But that is pure fantasy and does a great disservice to strong relationships between men. In the case of King David, it is alleged that his relationship with Jonathan (the son of King Saul and heir to his father’s throne) had homosexual overtones. But there is no evidence for that whatsoever. In fact, such a liaison would have been hard to hide and would have given David a lot of problems in winning the support of the people,

because the law banned homosexuality. The Bible is very honest about David's foibles and goes into great detail on the historical consequences of his adultery with Bathsheba, but there is no suggestion of any homosexuality. With Jesus and Paul there is even less evidence, and the only factor that can possibly be cited is the fact that neither of them married, and both had strong friendships with other men. But men often develop intense friendships with each other that have no sexual component whatsoever, and they would be completely repelled at the suggestion that sex played a part in their relationship. Lionel Tiger in his book *Men In Groups* shows that after the bond between mother and child, male-to-male bonds are the strongest in society ([Tiger, 1998](#)). Suggestions that all strong male-male bonds have, ipso facto, a homosexual component is ludicrous. Gay historians have also tried to find evidence for the acceptance of homosexuality in western history and point especially to Greek society as accepting of pederasty. It is certainly true that some males at that time engaged in sex with boys as well as girls, but classical scholars have refuted the notion that homosexuality was generally approved by Greek society. For example, Sir Kenneth Dover stated, "Plato condemns all homosexual copulation," and Gregory Vlastos in his book *Platonic Studies*, writes, "Plato saw anal intercourse as 'contrary to nature'... a degradation not only of man's humanity, but even of his animality" ([Vlastos, 1981](#)).

The Bible tells us that "All have sinned and come short of the glory of God" (Romans 3:23), so straights should accept gays and vice versa, in the same way all people are to be accepted without regard to race or gender, even if we do not approve of things that people do. We don't persecute adulterers or people that engage in other sin patterns, so in the same way gay individuals should never be hated or persecuted; the *practice* of homosexuality is not better or worse than any other sin. On the other hand, gay pride and the celebration of homosexuality is wrong in the eyes of God, as is the glorification of any sin pattern because it encourages others to

engage in it. Just as feminists attempted to create hatred in women against men, so transgender advocates are attempting to create hatred in gays against straights. The following scripture is a serious warning to proponents of transgender ideology, queer theory, and gender feminism:

Why do the nations rage, and the people plot a vain thing? The kings of the earth set themselves and the rulers take counsel together against the Lord and against His Anointed, saying, “Let us break Their bonds in pieces and cast away Their cords from us.” He who sits in the heavens shall laugh, the Lord shall hold them in derision. Then He shall speak to them in His wrath and distress them in His deep displeasure. (Psalm 2:1-5)

In regard to the specific issue of gender dysphoria in youth, the Bible does not directly address transgenderism, but nevertheless we can use its guidelines to help us. Christians are called to love God above all and our neighbor as ourselves, so we need to act in a manner that is consistent and is in the best interests of others. All people are created in the image of God and deserve love and care, particularly those who are suffering. Therefore, we can empathize with the desire to destigmatize gender dysphoria. Gender roles, whether assigned by culture or by biblical standards, can exacerbate the stress in someone who does not fit their gender stereotype. There clearly are biblical and societal exceptions – not all people live in a complementary relationship. Some, either by choice or by circumstance, never marry, and the Apostle Paul even describes the ability to remain single as a gift from God (1 Corinthians 7:7). But these are exceptions. Does being transgender or nonbinary also fall into the category of a legitimate exception to the pattern? There are essentially three approaches that Christians have taken ([Yarhouse, 2020](#)).

1. The *integrity* approach holds that God created a binary of sex and gender, and any deviation from that binary is sin, so the goals of treatment must be conformity of gender to one’s biological sex. If that is not possible, then the dysphoria must be a burden to carry and cannot be helped. While the attraction of the integrity position is that it takes scripture seriously and strives to live by what it says, those holding it must be careful to fully appreciate the possible biological causes of the condition and the inability of some people to relieve their dysphoria without transitioning. While there are some people who have detransitioned as part of their religious conversion, one cannot extrapolate from a few examples to all who suffer from gender dysphoria.

2. The *diversity* approach holds that the gender binary in creation was descriptive, but not prescriptive. Therefore, a spectrum of sex and gender is not a disability but part of the diversity in creation. This position is consistent with the WPATH and APA standards of care, which describe gender incongruence as an aspect of diversity, not pathology. The attraction of this position is the evident love and concern that it holds for those who suffer from gender dysphoria. But depathologizing gender incongruence is unhelpful if the treatment for it is so radical that it involves loss of fertility, disfiguring surgery, and lifelong hormone treatments. Furthermore, this position is biblically questionable and seems to defy the standards of God, because it accepts homosexuality as a biblically valid lifestyle.
3. The *disability* approach, like the integrity approach, holds to a binary of gender, but recognizes that we live in a fallen world, and sometimes we need to make allowances for that fact. Sometimes sex and gender are incongruent, and the dysphoria cannot simply be wished away or endured. Because suicide rates in gender dysphoric individuals are high both before and after transitioning, it is important to understand the consequences of various options and not be forced into anything, especially if there are irreversible consequences. In the case of teens it may well be advisable to wait

This approach benefits by comparing transitioning for gender dysphoria to treatment for other health conditions. Christians would not encourage a same sex attracted person to act on their impulses because the Bible forbids sex outside of marriage. Furthermore, the fact that there is a biblical prohibition indicates that it is possible to withstand temptations (1 Corinthians 10:13). A possible comparison may be made to an individual with cancer. We support cancer treatments that may require the removal of a body part or the use of chemotherapeutic drugs that will affect one's quality of life because these treatments achieve the greater goal of saving the patient's life. This approach also maintains a holistic view of people, so that where possible, consistency between gender and sex is maintained. Many transgender people instinctively agree, and this explains why they undergo hormonal treatments and/or surgeries to relieve their dysphoria to re-align gender to sex. The challenge is in knowing what should be changed when there is incongruence or whether the feelings of incongruence are temporary. Do we maintain a conservative approach, doing only as much as is needed to relieve the dysphoria (if that is possible), or is the goal a full transition?

Knowing how to respond to gender dysphoria can become especially difficult when the dysphoria is severe – what should loving parents do? There are no easy answers to that question other than understand the situation and the options, and then pray and seek God's will. Part of the answer lays in rejecting the identity that Western culture is forcing on us – that identity is inherently sexual and that we must express our sexuality in explicit ways. Incongruent and dysphoric individuals may thus profit from Linda Seiler's testimony of how she wanted to be a

boy from her earliest years, was sexually attracted to girls, and how she avoided transitioning and found satisfaction by redirecting her desires ([Seiler, 2023](#)).

Principles of Counterfeits

In our day of new age and designer religion people are attracted to many different quasi-religious concepts. Along with the criticism Christianity as non-scientific has come a plethora of science fiction as religion (e.g., *Star Trek*, *Star Wars*, *Avatar*, etc.), as well as more traditional cults. The world is full of deception, including religious groups that counterfeit Christianity in various ways. Examples are the Unification Church, Scientology, Worldwide Church of God, Heaven's Gate, Rajneeshpuram, Children of God, the Peoples Temple, Aum Shinrikyo, Order of the Solar Temple, Branch Davidians, the Rosicrucians, and others. There are also non-religious groups that nevertheless have religious overtones such as Twin Flames and NXIVM. Such groups may be oriented around religious concepts, politics, self-help, self-awareness, multi-level-marketing, conspiracy theories, or labor/sex trafficking, and they often promise personal fulfillment, increased wealth, sexual liberation, and everlasting romance.

Some groups have an extensive “theology” that supplies answers to religious questions and must be absorbed by converts. For example, Scientology teaches that the subconscious mind (the Freudian “id,” the Christian “sin nature,” and the Scientologist “reactive mind”) is the source of personal conflict. Everyone has “engrams” (neuroses or sins) for which they are not responsible, but nevertheless must be dealt with by purchasing and reading Scientology literature, confession to Scientology authorities, and working for the organization ([Augustine, 2024](#)).

Cults typically seek to “break” people through exaggerated conformity and obedience. Warning signs include:

- Veneration of narcissistic and authoritarian leaders
- Required labor and involvement in group activities
- Continual requests for payments and/or the purchase of expensive course materials
- Spying on other individuals and reporting their behavior to group authorities
- Social and/or political polarization by requiring the adoption of one perspective
- Isolation from family and friends and/or making enemies of them
- Sexual coercion
- Mind control type activities and identity change (undue influence)
- Threats and coercion if an individual leaves

Such groups usually deny the deity of Christ and some are truly demonic. Pathologies may include identity confusion, anxiety and depression, psychosomatic symptoms (headaches, etc.), anger, guilt and shame, increased dependency, fears and phobias, sleep disorders and nightmares, eating disorders, fear of intimacy and commitment, distrust of self and others, loss of friends and family, delusions and paranoia, and loss of meaning and purpose. Obedience to demonically inspired groups brings people into bondage, whereas obedience to God brings people into increased freedom and self-control. Christ calls to us but never forces us – following Him is a decision that we must freely make.

Conclusions

In the [Hypothesis](#) section above and at the outset of this dissertation, a series of questions was proposed for which answers were desired:

1. “Is it possible and/or desirable for a male to become female or vice versa?”

The answer is generally no. Gender is binary due to its biological nature and for most people it is completely equivalent to an individual’s sex. Nevertheless, there are biological conditions that result in a small percentage of intersex individuals, where a person’s brain wiring doesn’t correspond to their body. Intersex is thus “natural” but not “normal” and heterosexuality is the norm in 99% of individuals. Intersex individuals need to be treated with respect just like everyone else, and for them as well as for others who are severely dysphoric, gender change may be desirable. But the vast majority of people are straight and promoting homosexuality and transgenderism is causing pathologies as described above.

2. “How did American society get to where we are today in terms of male-female relationships?”

We got to where we are today through the historical challenges to religion, the sexualization of society, and the rise of the modern view of self. This was accompanied by the five waves of feminism which modified and warped male-female relationships, as well as the social justice movement with its teaching of Critical Theory, Intersectionality, and White Privilege. The first wave designated herein as “workplace feminism” had positive elements, as it generated more freedom and opportunities for women. The second through the fifth waves designated herein as “gender feminism” were negative as they separated gender from sex and pushed the sexual revolution, resulting in many social pathologies that have afflicted Western society.

3. “What impact has feminism had on psychology, and how has that impact been felt in society?”

The field of psychology has been overtaken by gender feminists who through censorship and cancel culture have sought to eliminate any contrary views. The impact on society is that the pathologies caused by gender feminism are excused and not blamed for the damage that has been done, allowing it to continue and fester. In general, whatever gender feminism opposes, we need more of.

4. “What negative impacts has gender feminism had on society?”

The major impact and the chief source of male-female pathologies is that marriage and the formation of male-female relationships has been damaged, resulting in many other associated problems.

5. “What value is there in traditional and/or religious alternatives to feminism?”

This was also covered in detail above. There are significant reasons for traditional and religious alternatives to a gender feminist approach because such relationships fit much better with both males and females as these alternatives acknowledge and celebrate the innate differences between the sexes. Thus, such relationships are better in many ways, such as increasing happiness and wealth, improving children, reducing depression, etc.

We conclude that gender feminism is pathological. It’s time that people stop ignoring and accepting this Venus fly trap that is poisoning society and seriously begin to confront it.

Areas for Future Research

There are a number of potentially fruitful areas for additional research based on this dissertation:

1. Research and develop ways to confront and reduce gender feminism without damaging workplace feminism.
2. Research and develop creative ways that marriage can be encouraged, that husbands will stay with their wives, and wives will serve their husbands.
3. Research and develop ways to encourage spirituality and obedience to godly principles in the general population.
4. Quantify the degree of feministic bias in psychology.
5. Quantify the female decrease in marital happiness and satisfaction from feminism.
6. Perform additional studies to determine and quantify the degree of feminism in women creating hostile sexism in men (stalking, rape attempts, etc.)
7. Perform additional studies regarding aspects of male-dominant, female-submissive relationships from a positive perspective.
8. Perform additional studies on American women to determine the factors that increase Subjective Well Being.
9. Perform additional studies to quantify the difference and the strength of desire between men and women as related to careers and earning money.
10. Research the degree to which the depression and suicidal inclinations of homosexuality are related to internal conflicts as opposed to societal criticism.

11. Quantify the extent to which rapid onset gender dysphoria is caused by femvertising and feminist media.
12. Consider male-female neurobiology and relationships from a teleological rather than an evolutionary perspective.

Appendices

Funding Feminist Ideology and Turning Disease into Profits

Money is necessary in order to implement the societal changes desired by gender feminism, transgenderism, and the social justice movement. It is needed to create spokesmen who can cast the message into palatable terms (e.g., turn “abortion” into “healthcare”), to lobby existing politicians and elect new ones, to influence the medical and psychological communities, and create businesses that will provide continuing funding. The dramatic transformation of Western society required money, and lots of it, and it has largely been generated under the rubric of creating and treating disease.

A current example of this is Attention Deficit Disorder (ADD) and Hyperactivity (ADHD) which describe restless and disruptive behavior in children who have difficulty focusing their attention. These were two of the many new classifications that were added to the mental illness manual under the direction of Dr. Robert Spitzer, a professor of psychiatry at Columbia University. This resulted in thousands of kids being treated with drugs, primarily Ritalin. However, Dr. Spitzer eventually admitted that in many cases these kids did not have any mental disorder and the ADD/ADHD diagnosis was simply childish exuberance ([Hope, 2007](#)). Given the increase in student misbehavior and the inability of schools to discipline kids, the use of drugs may be inevitable, so the question then turns to why student misbehavior is increasing considered in the section on [Feminism and Social Pathologies](#) above. The point here is the creative use of real or perceived crises in order to fund social change.

Rockefeller and Big Pharma

The original pattern for turning disease into profit was done by John D. Rockefeller and later by the Rockefeller Foundation. Following the breakup of the Standard Oil monopoly in 1911, Rockefeller used the fortune generated from his oil and gas business to establish the pharmaceutical industry (i.e., “big pharma”). At that time petrochemicals made from oil were discovered, which also included pharmaceutical drugs made from oil. Rockefeller saw this as an opportunity to create a new empire. However, there was a problem – at the time, traditional, herbal, and natural medicines were very popular in America and many doctors and medical schools were using holistic medicines and natural remedies. Rockefeller needed a way to eliminate this competition and create an effective monopoly in medicine as had been done with oil. One of the keys to the plan was that petrochemicals which, unlike natural medicines, could be patented, presenting enormous opportunities for profit. While the pharmaceutical industry has created many lifesaving and valuable drugs to treat a variety of conditions, its quest for power and profit also has a dark history.

Rockefeller teamed up with Andrew Carnegie, another millionaire, who sent a man from the Carnegie Foundation to visit every medical school in the country. A report was then issued calling for the restructuring of American medicine, and especially the elimination of natural remedies in favor of pharmaceuticals. Medical schools teaching things such as naturopathy were instructed to change and more than half of the medical colleges in the country closed. In an early form of cancel culture non-compliant doctors were demonized. Rockefeller and Carnegie then offered huge grants to medical schools and hospitals so long as they taught and practiced the use of pharmaceuticals, as well as ensuring compliance by accepting Rockefeller agents on their boards of directors. Those who went along with the program were funded, and those who didn't

were crushed. In this manner, all medical colleges were homogenized with doctors all learning the same thing – how to use and prescribe drugs.

Rockefeller went even further in the effort to consolidate his control by taking over the AMA as the gatekeeper of medical thought, as well as the FDA which controls the approval process for new drugs. For example, chemotherapy is the only legal drug treatment for cancer. Therefore, doctors for decades were trained in these methodologies and never mentioned diet and lifestyle factors, because they were taught only to prescribe drugs, perform surgeries, and other medical procedures. All of this was revealed in the 1953 Fitzgerald congressional report which uncovered big pharma as “a conspiracy of alarming proportions... Public and private funds have been thrown around like confetti at a country fair to close up and destroy clinics, hospitals, and research laboratories which do not conform to the viewpoint of medical associations.” The Rockefeller Foundation has continued its funding of a variety of globalist and socialist initiatives ([Rouhandeh, 2020](#); [UniverseInsideYou, 2020](#)).

It is only in recent years, and against institutional pressures, that diet and homeopathic medicine have staged a comeback. In the meantime, the Covid pandemic further illustrated the huge power of the pharmaceutical industry which earned billions from vaccines for which they received immunity from prosecution and cover-ups of their effects by the Center for Disease Control (CDC), World Health Organization (WHO), and various officials, e.g., ([Hevesi, 2021](#)).

Planned Parenthood

Margaret Sanger was instrumental in the 1942 formation of Planned Parenthood, but the organization still had small monetary resources. However, they had the backing of the Rockefeller Foundation and used a similar funding technique but improved on the Rockefeller formula. Rather than requiring a large starting fortune, all of their millions would be derived

from government support and mandates from education and the public schools. So as previously mentioned, the SIECUS organization (Sex Information and Education Council of the United States) was launched in 1964 to develop a public-school sex-ed curriculum. This became the goldmine for Planned Parenthood – taxpayer funds were first used to promote an increase in out-of-wedlock pregnancies, and then the organization generated large profits from the resulting abortion demand. The abortion industry, which is highly lucrative, is thus heavily involved with sex education. Non-directive sex education typically produces out-of-wedlock pregnancies, thus guaranteeing a large stream of abortion revenue. Affiliated feminist groups have fought long and hard for the complete protection, secrecy, and taxpayer funding of abortions, and Planned Parenthood has brought suit against a number of school boards throughout America that have tried to establish abstinence-based curricula ([Panzer, 1997, p. 10](#)). The fox not only guards the henhouse, but has also designed it, constructed it, and managed to protect it with a virtual fence of legal barbed wire, thereby maintaining for itself a ready supply of hens, and much of this is at the expense of taxpayers. In many cases they even have abortion shuttle services bringing girls directly from schools, and, by law, without their parent’s knowledge. It then funneled money back into political campaigns and lobbying efforts to seek taxpayer funding for all abortions ([Newman, 2020](#)). During the years of 2019 to 2021 Planned Parenthood received \$1.54 billion in direct payments from Medicare, Medicaid, and the Children’s Health Insurance Program ([Christenson, 2023b](#)).

Gender Transition

The gender transition industry is using similar tactics as both Rockefeller and Planned Parenthood to generate profit and to cement their influence. Transgenderism was largely driven by academia but was subsidized by foundations. One of the largest amounts was provided by

Jennifer Pritzker, a MtF transgender, who gained money through inheritance of the Hyatt hotel fortune. She/he then donated millions to universities, hospitals, and activists promoting queer theory. J.B. Pritzker, his cousin, and the Democrat governor of Illinois, generated legislation to force gender theory into the education and direct Medicaid funding into transgender surgery. Pritzker used government funds to push hospitals into promoting gender transitioning. Children in the hospital are exposed to kink, BDSM, and sexual prosthetics in the manner of Alfred Kinsey and Mary Calderone. Outreach programs in public schools facilitate the support of gender diversity and teaching the nonbinary nature of sexuality in classrooms, and schools are encouraged to keep these activities secret from parents. These programs have gone nationwide with funding provided by taxpayers through the support of the NEA and the education establishment ([Rufo, 2023](#)).

Steps in Gender Transitioning

The World Professional Association for Transgender Health (WPATH) has laid out guidelines to determine if an individual should be considered as a candidate for treatment that may ultimately involve surgery ([Hadj-Moussa et al., 2017, 2018](#)):

- The individual's gender dysphoria is persistent and well documented through a period of counseling (typically at least three months).
- The individual has the capacity to make a fully informed decision and the ability to consent for treatment and is the legal age of majority in the country of treatment.
- Hormone treatments are administered. If they are not sufficient to alleviate dysphoria then surgery can be considered, but hormone treatments should be given for at least one year before surgery is contemplated.
- For surgery the individual's medical or mental health comorbidities, including any psychiatric disorders, must be "reasonably well controlled" if chest surgery is anticipated, and "well controlled" in the case of genital surgery. Surgery should not be performed on actively psychotic patients.

The initial step is confirmation that the patient meets the criteria for gender dysphoria, as assessed by mental health professionals and possibly by psychotherapy for at least three months before any other steps are taken. As indicated above, there are often significant comorbidities with gender dysphoria, which should be addressed in the counseling phase. On the other hand, there are concerns about the efficacy of “conversion therapy” counseling with children and/or parents ([Coleman & al, 2012](#)). If counseling has been seriously attempted but has failed to relieve dysphoric symptoms, the next step is hormone treatments. Gonadotropin-releasing hormone analogs are given which prevent the production of estrogen in females and testosterone in males. Then opposite sex hormones are prescribed: female-to-male (FtM) patients receive testosterone, and male-to-female (MtF) patients are given estrogen.

Reviews of the effects of hormone treatments on gender dysphoria, quality of life, and psychological functioning have found mixed results as well as consequences that can be

permanent ([Eckert, 2021](#); [Van Leerdam et al., 2021](#)). Facial shape and body contours are altered, and non-genital surgery may be necessary to change the outward appearance so the patient can “pass” as the opposite sex in public. These include hair removal, voice modification, facial feminization/masculinization, body contouring, fat redistribution, and/or mastectomy. Estrogen treatments have also been associated with adverse consequences such as blood clots.

Pressure from transgender activists has been resisted by some parents, but waiting until puberty or adolescence can make an eventual transition more difficult, as the development of sex characteristics such as breasts, bone structure, and body hair are more unlikely to undo, making it more difficult for an individual to appear as the opposite sex after transitioning. The individual would also experience a more extended time of social consequences and distress before transitioning. Therefore, puberty blocking drugs have been used to delay the onset of puberty and adolescent development, with the goal being to buy time for dysphoric children before the physical changes occur that could exacerbate their dysphoria. Puberty blockers also eliminate the need for surgical procedures to treat the secondary sex characteristics that develop in puberty, but the side effects include a reduction in height, weight gain, and reductions in bone density ([Mahfouda et al., 2017](#)). A systematic review found problems with the use of puberty blockers and numerous ways in which our understanding of blocking this process is incomplete ([Vrouenraets et al., 2015](#)). In response to a lawsuit filed by Keira Bell, who was prescribed FtM hormone therapy but later detransitioned, the British High Court banned the prescription of puberty blockers to patients below the age of 16, citing their inability to provide truly informed consent ([RoyalCourt, 2020](#)). Sweden does not initiate treatment for children under 16 and requires a court order to initiate treatment in children from 16 to 18 ([Gauffin et al., 2021](#)).

Puberty blockers shut down the action of the hypothalamus, which is an almond-sized structure in the brain. It is one of the most primary structures we have and controls all of the other hormonal structures in the body – sexual development, emotions, flight or flight

response, etc. If someone were to ask me where to look for the divine spark in each individual, I would say that it is in the hypothalamus. To shut down that system is to shut down what makes us human. ([Rufo, 2023](#))

On the other hand, a recent survey of American providers of transgender therapy found that medical interventions before age 18 had overwhelming support ([Hughes & al, 2021](#)).

WPATH has also issued a statement supporting treatment of gender dysphoria in children.

If hormonal drugs fail to relieve dysphoric systems, the next step is surgery. In the case of FtM individuals the goal is remove the breasts and then to produce a phallus which can become erect, allow for standing urination, and have both tactile and erogenous sensation. Unfortunately, none of the available surgeries can accomplish all these goals ([Hadj-Moussa et al., 2019](#)). There are two main options for FtM genital surgery. Metoidioplasty is the least complicated and involves clitoral enlargement via hormone therapy and then using local skin and tissues to construct a penis and scrotum. While this option maintains sensation and allows standing urination, the newly created phallus is small and typically does not provide the ability for penetrative sex. The other option is phalloplasty, in which tissue is taken from other parts of the body (forearm, back, leg, or groin) and grafted. This procedure is more technically challenging, complex, and therefore risky. Phalloplasty typically results in a larger phallus and also allows for standing urination, but erogenous sensations are poor or non-existent. Penetrative sex is possible only if an inflatable prosthesis is used or if bone or cartilage is added during the surgery. The latter option means that the new phallus will be permanently rigid, which causes other complications. Due to the amount of tissue required for phalloplasty, the donor site will be scarred and considerably altered, but despite these challenges, FtM genital surgery is reported to have a relatively high level of satisfaction in resolving severe dysphoria ([Ruppin & Pfafflin, 2015](#)).

In the case of MtF individuals the goal is to remove the penis and construct a vagina that can achieve pleasurable penetrative sex. A vagina can be surgically built but pleasurable sex is not yet possible. There are two options for building a vagina, but neither of them results in a surface that works for penetrative sex. In a normal vagina the interior walls contain an epithelium that is designed for withstanding abrasions as well as providing lubrication during intercourse, due to the seeping of fluid through the epithelium. A vaginal interior can be constructed by grafting part of the small or large intestine, but these tissues are designed for nutrient absorption, not to withstand abrasion. The other option is to use skin from the penis and perineum to construct the vagina. This surface is better able to handle abrasion but does not produce any fluid for lubrication. Also, the amount of skin is limited restricting the depth of the vagina. The construction of the labia majora and a clitoris with erogenous sensitivity are easier but building the labia minora is challenging. Complications of the surgery are common and wide-ranging, often requiring secondary procedures. Pain in intercourse is also common as well as urinary incontinence, and urinary tract infections ([ClevelandClinic, 2022](#); [Hadj-Moussa et al., 2017](#)). Genital surgery in MtF removes the testes and in FtM removes the ovaries, which means the individual will be infertile and will need to take sex hormones for life. There are other potential medical complications of hormone replacement drugs such as gallstones ([Mercola, 2023](#)). Here is a description of the process from the Oregon Health & Science University whose specialty is genital surgery.

Surgeons first cut off the head of the penis and remove the testicles. Then they turn the penile-scrotal skin inside out and, together with abdominal cavity tissue, fashion it into an artificial vagina. Robotic arms put through small incisions around the belly button and the side of the belly in order to create the space for the vaginal canal between the bladder and the rectum. But the procedure is plagued with complications: wound separation, tissue necrosis, graft failure, urine spraying, hematoma, blood clots, vaginal stenosis, rectal injury, fistula, and fecal accidents. Patients must stay in the hospital for an extended period for wound healing and the draining of fluids. After returning home patients must continue hormone treatments and manually dilate their surgically created “neo-vagina” in

perpetuity, otherwise the tissue will heal and the cavity will close... A less common but more symbolically apt surgery performed at the same center is known as “nullification” in which a smooth, continuous skin covering from the abdomen to the groin is created after the castration or vaginectomy. In other words, the genitalia are replaced by nothing. ([Rufo, 2023](#))

In regard to detransitioning, according to a study of 100 dysphoric individuals who transitioned but later detransitioned, the following reasons were cited ([Littman, 2021](#)):

Reasons for transitioning:

- I wanted others to perceive me as the target gender (F 77%), (M 77%)
- I thought transitioning was my only option to feel better (F 73%) (M 68%)
- My body felt wrong to me the way it was (F 73%) (M 68%)
- I didn’t want to be associated with my birth sex (F 74%) (M 61%)
- It made me uncomfortable to be perceived romantically/sexually as a member of my birth sex (F 71%) (M 58%)
- I thought transitioning would eliminate my gender dysphoria (F 62%) (M 71%)
- I felt I would become my true self (F 61%) (M 71%)
- I identified with the target gender (F 58%) (M 77%)
- I thought transitioning would lessen my gender dysphoria (F 65%) (M 58%)
- I felt I would fit in better with the target gender (F 56%) (M 65%)
- I felt I would be more socially acceptable as a member of the target gender (F 55%) (M 36%)
- I felt I would be treated better if I was perceived as the target gender (F 51%) (M 45%)
- I saw myself as a member of the target gender (F 44%) (M 58%)
- I thought transitioning would reduce gender-related harassment or trauma I was experiencing (F 51%) (M 16%)
- I had erotic reasons for wanting to transition (F 13%) (M 39%)
- Other (F 13%) (M 10%)

Reasons for detransitioning:

- My personal definition of female or male changed, and I became more comfortable identifying as my natal sex (F 65%) (M 48%)
- I was concerned about potential medical complications from transitioning (F 58%) (M 29%)
- My mental health did not improve while transitioning (F 45%) (M 36%)
- I was dissatisfied by the physical results of the transition or felt the change was too much (F 51%) (M 16%)
- I discovered that my gender dysphoria was caused by something specific (abuse, mental health condition, etc.) (F 41%) (M 32%)
- My mental health was worse while transitioning (F 39%) (M 29%)

- I was dissatisfied by the physical results of the transition or felt the change was not enough (F 32%) (M 36%)
- I found more effective ways to help my gender dysphoria (F 36%) (M 23%)
- My physical health was worse while transitioning (F 30%) (M 36%)
- I felt discriminated against (F 17%) (M 36%)
- I had medical complications from transitioning (F 17%) (M 23%)
- I had financial concerns about paying for transition care (F 16%) (M 19%)
- My gender dysphoria resolved (F 15%) (M 16%)
- I resolved the specific issue that was the cause of my gender dysphoria (F 9%) (M 13%)
- I realized that my desire to transition was erotically motivated (F 1%) (M 16%)
- Other (F 28%) (M 19%)

Victims of Cancel Culture

There are many examples of cancelled academics from the recent past who were the victims of gender feminism and social justice. Following is a partial list:

7/5/2023 - Lois Banner - University of Southern California. In a talk at the Berkshire Conference of Women Historians, Professor Banner said that she would have had an easier career if she were black. She allegedly made other comments perceived to be “homophobic” and “anti-Muslim.”

6/30/2023 - Ann Atkinson - Arizona State University. Atkinson organized an event featuring conservative speakers Charlie Kirk and Dennis Prager.

5/8/2023 - David Richardson - Madera Community College. Professor Richardson served Jeremy’s Chocolate at an open house event at Madera Community College. Jeremy’s Chocolate is associated with the conservative news outlet The Daily Wire.

5/5/2023 - Kenneth Zucker - Archives of Sexual Behavior. Zucker published an article examining rapid onset gender dysphoria. This is the hypothesis that many cases of gender dysphoria, particularly in young people, are caused by social pressure rather than biology.

April 2023 - Nicholas Perrin - Trinity International University. In a fundraising letter, President Perrin connected a Nashville school shooter’s transgenderism with his violent actions.

3/27/2023 - Will Moravits - St. Philip’s College. Moravits held class discussions on LGBTQ+ issues and police brutality that made at least one student “uncomfortable.” According to a student, Moravits claimed that the LGBTQ+ movement contains many pedophiles.

3/24/23 - Katherine Bergeron - Connecticut College. President Bergeron scheduled a fundraiser at “Florida’s Everglades Club, which has long been accused of discriminating against Black and Jewish people.” She has also been accused of “administrative overreach, micromanagement and a lack of transparency.”

3/5/2023 - Michael Joyner - Mayo Clinic College of Medicine. Professor Joyner said that males have higher testosterone than females, and that this difference affects their performance in sports.

1/2023 - Johnson Varkey - St. Philip's College. Varkey taught that sex is determined by X and Y chromosomes. He has also been accused of "religious preaching, discriminatory comments about homosexuals and transgender individuals, anti-abortion rhetoric, and misogynistic banter."

11/2022 - Liz Wheeler - Gonzaga University. Gonzaga University, a Jesuit Catholic institution, refused to allow a pro-life event by the campus Zags for Life group. Zags for Life wanted to host Catholic pro-life speaker Liz Wheeler with assistance from Young America's Foundation, but the campus ministry office denied the request.

10/17/2022 - Steve Sviggum - University of Minnesota. In a Board of Regents meeting, Sviggum asked whether UMN Morris is "too diverse."

10/2022 - Matthew Garrett - Bakersfield College. Tenured Bakersfield College history professor Matthew Garrett said he and other faculty members of a free speech coalition were targeted with false allegations after they asked questions during a campus diversity meeting last October.

9/14/2022 - Christy Hammer - University of Southern Maine. Professor Hammer stated in class that there are only two sexes.

8/2/2022 - Maitland Jones, Jr. - New York University. Professor Jones taught organic chemistry, a notoriously difficult "weed-out" course for would-be chemists and med-school applicants. Students complained that Jones' course was too difficult.

7/27/2022 - Clarence Thomas - George Washington University. After Supreme Court Justice Clarence Thomas voted to overturn *Roe v. Wade*, over ten thousand people petitioned for him to be fired from his position at George Washington University, where he taught a constitutional law seminar.

7/24/2022 - Kristin Collier - University of Michigan. Students protested and staged a walkout of Dr. Collier's speech at the University of Michigan Medical School's White Coat Ceremony, citing her pro-life views. Students previously petitioned UMich's administration to cancel the event.

7/18/2022 - Timothy P. Farage - University of Texas, Dallas. In response to a news story reporting that most monkeypox patients are homosexual men, Professor Farage tweeted, "Can we at least try to find a cure for homosexuality, especially among men? Homosexual men have anal sex, which can lead to a variety of diseases."

6/29/2022 - Mya Little - University of Houston. Little was a candidate for the Student Government Association (SGA) Supreme Court. She expressed her Christian beliefs, including citing a Bible verse, in her opening address to the SGA, prompting some senators to condemn her for her "bias."

6/14/2022 - Patrick Provost - Laval University. At a conference hosted by Reinfo Covid Quebec, Provost said that the risks of administering mRNA COVID vaccines to children outweigh the benefits.

5/24/2022 - Bryan Cullen - Duke University. Dr. Cullen received an email from his department announcing a mandatory DEI training, to which he replied “My initial reaction is I refuse to engage in left-wing Maoist political propaganda workshops.” A Duke PhD student also claimed that Cullen made racist and homophobic comments in a 2018 guest lecture.

4/18/22 - Devin Buckley - Harvard University. Dr. Buckley was scheduled to give a talk at Harvard about British romanticism and philosophy. The talk was then canceled after the university learned that Buckley is on the board of the Women’s Liberation Front, an organization that affirms the importance of biological sex despite the claims of transgender ideology.

2/19/2022 - Gregory P. Schulz - Concordia University Wisconsin. Professor Schulz wrote an essay for Christian News titled “Woke Dysphoria at Concordia,” where he wrote that the school has experienced “dysphoria because it is coming under the influence of Wokeism (that is, a potent cocktail of Progressivism, Neo-Pragmatism, and Marxism).”

2/2022 - Maggie DeJong - Southern Illinois University-Edwardsville. DeJong made various posts on social media that offended her progressive peers. These posts allegedly cause “emotional harm” and “worried” the students.

1/2022 - Richard Bugg - Southern Utah University. Professor Bugg declined to refer to a so-called “nonbinary” student using “they/them” pronouns.

11/24/2021 - Scott Yenor - Boise State University. In a speech at the National Conservatism Conference, Professor Yenor critiqued feminism and the practice of professional fields actively recruiting women.

11/1/2021 - John Kormendy - University of Texas at Austin. Professor Kormendy published a paper titled “Metrics of research impact in astronomy: Predicting later impact from metrics measured 10-15 years after the PhD.” Some readers found that the paper would “further bias against women and minorities” in the field of astronomy.

10/25/2021 - Sophia Nelson - Christopher Newport University. Ms. Nelson tweeted “regarding a DC comic book character. She wrote, ‘I don’t get why this is necessary. I don’t! What if Christian parents of children reading comic books don’t want their kids exposed to bi-sexual characters? This is being pushed on kids.’”

9/30/2021 - Dorian Abbot - University of Chicago. Professor Abbot was scheduled to deliver Massachusetts Institute of Technology’s prestigious Carlson Lecture. He then came under fire for various statements he has made criticizing Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI) policies in higher education, arguing instead for a merit-based system of academic advancement.

3/23/2021 - Donna Hughes - University of Rhode Island. In an article for 4W, a “fourth-wave feminism” blog, Professor Hughes critiqued what she calls the “trans-sex fantasy.” She writes, “The ‘gender identity’ movement is canceling people’s free speech and

academic freedom for anyone who doesn't fall in line, speaks out in opposition, or even calls for the right to debate."

3/7/2021 - Janice Neil - Ryerson University. Ryerson journalism students issued a public letter accusing the school of failing to represent and support Black, Indigenous, people of color and LGBTQ students in the program. The letter said the school has contributed to an unsafe learning environment rife with discrimination that has left students traumatized.

2/10/2021 - Jay Bergman - Central Connecticut State University. Professor Bergman sent letters to every public-school superintendent in his home state of Connecticut, warning them against implementing history curricula based on The New York Times' "The 1619 Project." In response, Daniel P. Sullivan, the superintendent of Putnam County schools, sent a letter to Interim President of Connecticut State Colleges and Universities Jane Gates and President of Central Connecticut State University Zuma R. Toro, calling Bergman's letter and other writings "extremely inappropriate" and "extremely problematic." He also wrote that Bergman's letter will help "continue to perpetuate ... racist rhetoric." In response, Presidents Gates and Toro condemned Bergman's letter ([Acevedo, 2023](#)).

Definitions of Terms

Following are the definitions of important terms and concepts used in this document:

Binary & Nonbinary – The former indicates that sex and gender are distinctly male or female, and the latter indicates that they may be various combinations of male or female.

Capitalism – an economic system generally characterized by the value of private property and the freedom to engage in entrepreneurial activities – producing and selling goods or services with relatively little government control. People are free to develop their own capital (source of wealth) and use it to start businesses as well as invest in the businesses of others via the stock market. Government’s role in a free enterprise system is not to control businesses and make decisions for them. Rather it is primarily the delineation and enforcement of rules to make sure that the system is fair, and to make sure that people at the bottom are provided for. Taxation under capitalism is lower, but there are fewer free government benefits and services than in socialistic systems. Capitalism encourages personal initiative and self-responsibility which enriches society, but also results in some people being more successful than others. Wealth in a capitalist society is therefore not evenly distributed, but unlike socialism it provides societal wealth so that the less fortunate can be cared for. Capitalism was first championed by writers such as Adam Smith (*The Wealth of Nations*, 1776), and by contemporary economists such as Ludwig von Mises, Milton Friedman, and Thomas Sowell.

Unlike socialism which sees economics as a “zero-sum game” (if there is a winner there must also be a loser), free enterprise views economics as “win-win.” It begins with an entrepreneur who has an idea for a new product or service, and who borrows or invests his own capital to get the business started. But in order to get and keep the business going the

entrepreneur or management team needs to hire people and pay them wages. Those people in turn then have money to spend on the products and services of other businesses, and the entire society eventually grows and is enriched. Contrary to the notions of social justice, which alleges that America got its wealth from materialistic hoarding, imperialism, and slavery, the economic success of the West in general and of America in particular was and is based on capitalism and the hard work necessary to make the products and services that people want and need to buy. The American economy improved after slavery was banned. Free enterprise is the “invisible hand” described by Adam Smith that enriches society.

Conflict Theory – a comprehensive view of the causes and nature of conflict, and crime which sometimes results from conflict. It views conflict as normal, unavoidable, and in some cases beneficial, because it allows individuals, families, and societies to adapt to changing conditions. What is interesting is comparing conflict theory to a Marxist view of conflict, as Marxism is the theoretical basis of critical theory, social justice, and gender feminism. ([Walsh & Jorgensen, 2020, pp. 96-98](#)).

Concept	Conflict Theory	Marxism
Origin of conflict	Generated by many factors, regardless of the underlying political and economic system.	Stems from the powerful oppressing the powerless (bourgeoisie oppressing the proletariat in capitalism, whites oppressing blacks in racism, and men oppressing women in feminism).
Nature of conflict	Is socially useful, necessary, and cannot be eliminated. However, conflict may devolve into criminal behavior, which should be penalized.	Is socially bad and must be eliminated by socialistic systems. Socialism therefore must be established.
Major participants in conflict, and social classes	Conflict takes place everywhere, between all sorts of interest groups. There are a number of different classes in society defined by their relative wealth, status, and power.	Two opposing sets classes are defined – the owners of the means of production and the workers (classic Marxism) Whites and Blacks (racism), and males and females (feminism). These are engaged in the only conflicts that matter.

Concept of the law	The law favors the powerful, but not any one particular group. The greater the wealth, power, and prestige a group has, the more likely the law will favor it.	It is the tool of the ruling class that criminalizes the activities of the workers, Blacks, and women harmful to their interests, and ignores its own socially harmful behavior.
Concept of crime	Defined by traditional sources of morality (e.g., the ten commandments and common law), with the addition of laws passed by interest groups in power to favor themselves.	Some view crime as the revolutionary actions of the downtrodden, others view it as the socially harmful acts of “class traitors,” and others see it as violations of human rights.
Cause of crime	The selfishness of human nature along with the distribution of political power that leads to some interest groups being able to criminalize the acts of other interest groups.	The dehumanizing conditions of capitalism, racism, and patriarchy.
Cure for crime	As long as human nature exists and as long as some groups have more power than others, crime will exist. Since selfishness as well as interest and power differentials are part of the human condition, crime will always be with us.	With the overthrow of the capitalist mode of production, and with the elimination of white and male supremacy, the natural goodness of humanity will emerge, and there will be no more criminal behavior.

Critical Theory (CT) – a philosophy that sees societal and political reality through the lens of conflict between social classes where one side wins and the other loses. It is based on the writings of Karl Marx, and essentially divides people into two categories – the oppressors and the oppressed ([Marx & Engels, 1848](#)). The Marxist disciple Antonio Gramsci further developed this concept and termed it “cultural hegemony.” He indicated that “a complex interlocking of political, social, and cultural forces” was employed by oppressors who maintained control not only through coercion but also through the voluntary consent of the oppressed to maintain peace and the status quo ([Felluga, 2015, pp. 127-128](#)). But Marx himself was primarily concerned with economics, specifically with establishing socialism to replace capitalism. As socialistic societies imploded and repeatedly failed, others who ignored the disasters inflicted by socialism sought to adapt Marxist ideas to the issues of race, gender, and homosexuality. Perhaps the most well-known group was the Frankfurt School (the Institute for Social Research in Frankfurt, Germany) who were concerned with issues causing inequality. They believed that the current social reality

was broken and applied the oppressor/oppressed paradigm as the only valid way of viewing social issues ([Baucham, 2022, pp. xiii-xiv](#)).

CT is also based on postmodern philosophy (see below) which proposes that truth is relative and can be recast as each individual desires – I have “my truth” and you have “your truth.” A quote from CT literature explains this: “An approach based on Critical Theory calls into question that objectivity is desirable or even possible” ([Sensoy & DiAngelo, 2017, p. 29](#)). CT is thus a worldview and a religious belief system that rejects any other perspective and insulates its adherents from guilt about the negative consequences of their ideas ([Baucham, 2022](#)). Regardless of a person’s philosophical position they typically think that other views are wrong, but CT takes this one step further – other views should not even exist. Thus, American society is becoming increasingly polarized, and the sides are unwilling to even hear each other.

CT as applied to racial issues became known as Critical Race Theory (CRT) which holds that racism is inherent – systemic in the legal, economic, and educational institutions of the United States, and that American culture was based on and seeks to maintain social, economic, and political inequalities. CRT views American society as a hierarchical structure of power and privilege created by white males and designed to oppress Blacks and females. Racism has thus come to be defined as “systemic white privilege” rather than as an attitude held by some individuals. White people, and especially white males, are thus demonized as inherently and incorrigibly racist, as well as asserting that no one else is racist and there is no such thing as anti-white racism. CRT also asserts “white male supremacy” and “white privilege” – that having white skin and being male automatically means that one has privileges denied to non-whites, and that white people should be continually held guilty for their skin color, and males for their gender ([McIntosh, 1989](#)). This inverts the vision of a just society where, in the words of Martin Luther

King, “people will not be judged by the color of their skin, but by the content of their character.” ([King, 1963](#)). CT is therefore incompatible with the Declaration of Independence and the US Constitution.

CT as applied to gender and LGBTQ+ issues is known as Critical Social Theory (CST) and has the same characteristics with the addition of the idea of “intersectionality.” This seeks to promote victimology and measure the level of discrimination against a person by the patriarchal system as the intersection of race, sex, sexual orientation, and disability. So, if an individual is black, female, lesbian, and disabled she suffers from four intersecting layers of oppression. CST holds that only victims of oppression are allowed to tell their stories, and the more levels of oppression an individual is experiencing, the more valid, true, and believable their stories are. White supremacy in action has supposedly led to “white fragility” where whites are said to experience anxiety and discomfort from their innate superiority and entitlement. CT closes the loop for its adherents to shut off any debate by explaining that when a white male denies that he is racist, he is just exposing his white fragility. ([DiAngelo, 2011](#)). Gender feminism uses the same concepts and applies them to the male-female dynamic.

Feminism is thus identified and associated with anti-racism; social justice advocates speak of a unification with all elements of social justice – race, orientation, gender, and transgender. As before, there is a ceaseless striving for equity (i.e., total equality with men, resulting in the superiority of women) and the associated elimination of gender norms, sexism, and the objectification of women. LGBTQ+ also seeks equity and superiority through the gay pride movement.

Darwinism – in 1831 Charles Darwin joined the exploratory voyage of the HMS Beagle which sailed to the Galapagos Islands off the coast of Ecuador. There he noticed that the finches on one

island had larger and stronger beaks in order to crack the tougher nuts there. Those finches would have been the ones more likely to pass their genetic payload on to their progeny, whereas those with weaker beaks would have starved to death and thus be eliminated from the finch gene pool on that island. From this observation Darwin proposed that all organisms evolve, so that changes in an organism that make the organism more viable are reflected in its offspring, and therefore in the organism's gene pool. The word "evolution" thus denotes changes in populations of organisms; small, incremental changes such as what Darwin observed are brought about by environmental alterations, mutation, time, chance, and survival-of-the-fittest. This type of change has been termed "micro-evolution" and is universally accepted as biological reality. However, in Darwin's 1859 book *On the Origin of Species*, he expanded this concept into a theory that all higher life forms evolved from lower ones strictly based on the factors mentioned above. This is known as "macro-evolution" or "universal common descent," and herein is referred to as "Darwinism," differentiated from the more general term "evolution."

Darwinism alleges that all life came from simple single-celled organisms swimming in the ocean, which begs the question, "Where did the ocean and the single-celled organisms come from?" Technically, the explanation of how life supposedly came into being from non-life is known as "abiogenesis" and is treated by Darwinists as a distinct topic. But they typically allege that there was no designer or creative intelligence, so abiogenesis is therefore an essential aspect of Darwinism and is treated as such in this document.

Equality – a very "loaded" word – how equal is equal? As F.A. Hayek said, "There is all the difference in the world between treating people equally and attempting to make them equal." The desire of gender feminists as well as social justice advocates is for a forced equality, especially of power and money, using the power of government to take power and money away from those

who have it (generally identified as white males) and transfer it to those who have less (non-whites and females). Rather than equal opportunity, the goal is “equity” meaning equal outcomes for all. Equal outcomes are an impossibility, given the radical differences between people, but gender feminists demand that society continues to strive for it. However, the real feminist goal is superiority over men – for women to have all the perquisites of both males and females.

Feminism – another “loaded” word that has several connotations, e.g., ([Mitchell, 2017](#)). For our purposes it shall be used to denote *gender feminism* as opposed to *workplace feminism*.

A general principal of American political heritage is that everyone shall be free to have and pursue “life, liberty, and happiness,” so women are and should be as free as men to seek what they desire, be it children and family or career (and whether or not a career is seen as traditionally masculine or feminine). Equal pay for equal work has been American law since 1963, and this should not continue to be a subject for debate. Furthermore, males and female are of equal value, both in the eyes of God as well as society, so abuse, harassment, and stalking of women should not be tolerated. These elements comprise *workplace feminism*, what is also referred to as the first wave. In contrast, *gender feminism* is a desire for total equality, equivalence, and equity. It is largely based on Critical Social Theory, so it seeks to subvert and destroy male power, which to them is embodied in economics by capitalism, and in society by patriarchy ([Walsh & Jorgensen, 2020, p. 101](#)).

There are different proponents of gender feminists who may be either female or male. Some are more radical than others in their views and some are more concerned with patriarchy rather than capitalism, or vice versa. But their general goal is to tear down elements of society that they view as patriarchal, and to eliminate capitalist economic systems by replacing them with socialism.

Gender feminism implies androgyny and bisexuality, in which women become more masculine and men become more feminine both in their nature and in the roles they play; like Critical Theory it is a religious belief system that has been adapted by its adherents. Thus, there is often an unstated pro- and anti-feminist debate regarding the distinction between gender and workplace feminism, encapsulated in the general question, “If feminism is so good, why is it also so bad?” An example of this in book form is *Who Stole Feminism? How Women Have Betrayed Women* ([Sommers, 2012](#)).

Gender Incongruence and Gender Dysphoria – incongruence indicates that there is a difference between an individual’s biological sex and his or her inner sexual identity. Dysphoria indicates a sense of distress resulting from gender incongruence.

Intersex – the term is used to indicate people who are *biologically* mis-sexed. There is a variety of conditions that can cause this which are related to developmental issues in the womb and before birth. These individuals have genitals, chromosomes, or reproductive organs that don’t match their sex, or they may have traits of both. This is true of approximately 1% of the American population ([ClevelandClinic, 2022](#)), and some may have inclinations to homosexuality. In this document the term “intersex” is be used for all of these variations, but in particular to designate individuals whose gender (as defined by their brain) does not match their birth sex due to biological reasons.

Misandry – Dislike or hatred of men.

Misogyny – was formerly defined as “dislike or hatred of women,” but has come to mean “anyone who opposes feminism.”

Patriarchy - “rule by the father.” Prior to the 1960s it was generally perceived as a positive aspect of responsible male behavior – men leading and caring for their families. But just as the term “misogyny” has been redefined, “patriarchy” has now come to designate a long-running scheme by men to oppress women and keep them down through social conventions such as marriage, religion, and economics. As described by feminists, “The Patriarchy” is a societal system and a long-term conspiracy where masculine traits such as competitiveness, autonomy, and aggression are highly valued, and feminine traits such as cooperation, connection, and nurturance are appreciated but downplayed. Even the female desire for beauty has been characterized by feminists as a male conspiracy ([Wolf, 1990](#)).

Postmodernism – a relatively new movement in philosophy (some would criticize it as “born yesterday”) but with older roots. The term was originally coined in 1870 and essentially meant a dissatisfaction with the direction of culture – either a rejection of the traditional or a questioning of the modern (Wikipedia, <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Postmodernism>).

The origin of postmodernism goes back to the ideas of Jean-Jacques Rousseau, a Swiss/French philosopher and social critic of the eighteenth century, who believed that people are naturally good. However, people are also evil to a lesser or greater degree, and Rousseau’s explanation was that evil comes from society and in particular from private property and the profit motive. Thus, the inequality generated by private property and the profit motive is the source of evil according to Rousseau. Therefore, he rejected the teachings of the church regarding the basic nature of humanity and was the inspiration for later writers such as Charles Darwin, Karl Marx, V.I. Lenin, and others.

The main contemporary proponents of postmodernism were the twentieth-century philosophers Jacques Derrida and Michael Foucault. Derrida developed a methodology known as *deconstruction* to analyze and criticize literary works. He was skeptical of and rejected any “grand narrative” of history and human nature such as Christianity and believed that such narratives were the means by which moral and political control was exercised, as in Karl Marx’s quote, “Religion is the opiate of the masses.” Grand narratives were therefore to be replaced by one’s own private truth and belief system – hence the connections between postmodernism and critical theory.

The mutability of truth in postmodernism typically applies only to the internal aspects of humanity – emotions, feelings, thinking, and theology. So while the intellectual base of truth has been eliminated and the ballast of past wisdom rejected as “too white” and “too male,” there has been a corresponding elevation of belief in science as the only sure repository of truth (and furthermore only science that is politically correct¹³). This is ironic given the fact that scientists have often been spectacularly wrong ([Book, 2020](#)), and continue to be so ([Ritchie, 2020](#)). Ritchie’s book is especially applicable here as he is a professor of psychology; he illustrates the very human nature of science in general and psychology in particular, and details the fraud, bias, negligence, and hype that has sometimes characterized research, particularly when government and other sources provide the funding. Both of these books, in turn, were based on the groundbreaking book *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* by Thomas Kuhn, who detailed the reluctance of scientists to question whatever is politically correct at the time ([Kuhn, 1962](#)). Kuhn’s book is one of the most quoted works in the history of science. His revelation was not

¹³ This is illustrated by the contempt heaped on scientists who raise doubts on issues of political correctness, such as vaccines, climate change, Darwinian evolution, abortion, and gender feminism. For example, President Biden recently called people who question the narrative on global warming, “lying dog-faced pony soldiers.”

about science itself but rather about human nature and the explication of the “psychology” of scientists. What he demonstrated is that far from a “search for truth,” most scientists like the rest of us basically engage in efforts to prop up our existing biases, and to agree with the existing theories. The phenomenon of people only listening to those that they agree with applies to scientists and academics in equal measure. Furthermore, the more credentials and degrees that people have, the more convinced they will be that they are right, even if they are wrong.

Many have also criticized postmodernism as nihilistic, because after rejecting all grand narratives there is nothing to provide meaning to people beyond their own appetites – “Let us eat and drink for tomorrow we die.” Nevertheless, postmodernism remains popular, especially when combined with other concepts such as meditation and Eastern religion. Philosophy and morality are more “caught” than they are “taught,” as most is absorbed from the surrounding culture, so postmodernism is possibly the most common worldview of Western society today. It is especially appealing to teenagers and young adults who by nature tend to question the wisdom of their parents and the milieu in which they grew up, the more so if they came from broken homes with missing parents, e.g., ([Shaw, 2003](#)).

Sexual orientation – the direction of an individual’s sexual interest, towards people of the opposite sex, the same sex or both – the tendencies of a person’s sexual attraction considered as a whole.

Sexism – like misogyny this is another term which has been redefined due to feminist influence. It used to mean the societal preference for, or the dominance of, males over females, but has come to mean citing any difference between the sexes.

Socialism – an economic system generally characterized by government control in which economic decisions are made more by government officials than by private individuals. Socialism encourages collective responsibility and a “rights” mentality where the provision of material goods is viewed as an obligation of society rather than a personal responsibility. It provides more free benefits and services but at the cost of higher taxation and less freedom; it seeks to equalize wealth by taking it from the more productive and giving it to the less productive. Socialism was championed by writers such as Karl Marx, politicians such as Vladimir Lenin, and by contemporary economists such as John Maynard Keynes.

To its adherents, socialism is an effort to create what they consider to be a secular “heaven on earth” – a society without God in which there is no private property, no masculine competitiveness, no social hierarchies, no hoarding of wealth, everything is shared, everyone lives at peace with the environment, and everyone has the same income and has everything that they need. This is the dream of songs such as John Lennon’s *Imagine*. But given human nature it has been impossible to implement, and some of the desires are inherently invalid.

No society has ever been purely socialist or purely capitalist – the economic system of every society has elements of both and may lean more to the right (toward capitalism and related elements such as the stock market) or to the left (toward socialism and elements such as welfare and public education). Those on the right tend to be suspicious of government and bureaucracy, while those on the left tend to be suspicious of business, profit, and private property.

Karl Marx, the founder of socialism, exists as a symbol as much as a historical person, but it is instructional to consider his life. He was a bum who rarely worked and sponged off others his entire life. He was often drunk and stank – Marx even considered making soap a symbol of the bourgeoisie. He was a “thinker” who sat in his chair in the British Museum and

pontificated on the life of the working man. He wrote of the toil of the workers in cotton factories, but with no seeming understanding of the labor and investment necessary to construct factories, to manage them, and to sell the eventual products. Marx also did not consider that men were voluntarily leaving farms to work in the factories because the pay was steady and there was one day off a week, which was better than life on the farms of that time. Ironically, Frederick Engels, the man who sent the money that Marx lived on, got his wealth from cotton mills. Engel's family owned a cotton mill and Engels hated his job and working for his father, so sending money to Marx in order to promote communism was his revenge ([Benjamin, 2021](#)).

Marx and his wife had seven children, three or four of whom died in childhood from malnutrition because their father didn't provide for them, and two of them later committed suicide. Despite being someone who was intellectually standing up for the working class, Marx had little sympathy for those in need. He impregnated his maid and then abandoned her child, refusing to support him. He was also a racist and antisemite – he hated Jews and believed that Blacks were inferior ([Benjamin, 2021](#)).

Marx was a “professional envier,” so it is no surprise that his social and political theories are based on envy – continually wanting what others have, feeling that society owes you a living, and seeking to bring everyone down to your own level – these are core concepts. Socialism is essentially “institutionalized envy” such as the liquidation of the kulaks under Lenin and Stalin because they were wealthier and had “two horses rather than only one.” Some have concluded that Marx's theories were his psychological excuse for and the rationalization of his own negligence and irresponsibility, e.g., ([Benjamin, 2021](#); [Cross, 2021](#)). Here is Marx's legacy:

In the name of the Marxian vision of a “new society” and a “new man,” socialist and communist revolutions led to the mass murders, enslavement, torture, and starvation of tens of millions of people around the world. Historians have estimated that in the attempt to make that “new” and “better” socialist world, communist regimes have killed as many as 200 million people in the twentieth century. ([Ebeling, 2017](#)).

Examples of the failures of socialism:

- China under Mao instituted a program known as “The Great Leap Forward” which was an effort to equal and overtake American and European steel production. Chinese peasants were ordered to create “back yard blast furnaces” to employ the entire rural population. But the production of steel requires higher temperatures and more exacting conditions, so the products of this effort was useless blocks of pig iron. Furthermore, peasants were forced to melt down their existing iron farm tools and the lack of tools along with the diversion of labor from farming meant that food was not being grown and harvested, which less to mass starvation, e.g., ([Zhisui, 1994](#)).
- Cuba under Castro has been an economic disaster – living conditions are bad and getting worse. Malnutrition is rampant, as evidenced by the presence of beriberi, a disease that leads to blindness. Food is scarce unless you’re among the governing elite and environmental degradation in Cuba is equally alarming, e.g., ([Leef, 2023](#)).
- Israel during kibbutz times was very socialistic but has abandoned it, e.g., ([Muravchik, 2002](#)).
- North Korea under Kim Il Sung has been a permanent source of poverty and trouble, as the government continually threatens nuclear missile attacks in return for food for its people, e.g., ([Lankov, 2015](#)).
- Russia under Stalin sought to equalize the peasantry which led to the persecution and death of the “kulaks” who were peasants wealthier than others. Millions were killed, e.g., ([Ulam, 1973](#)).
- Many other countries that have been afflicted by socialistic dreams of “heaven on earth” could be cited such as Argentina, Cambodia, Tanzania, Venezuela, and Zimbabwe.

Social Justice – a movement and a collection of groups that were stigmatized in the past in various ways and degrees through slavery, abuse, targeting, etc. The groups consist of race, gender, and transgender, and the fact that they were – and in some ways still are – stigmatized is a valid concern and gives credence to the movement. However, the philosophy and worldview of many adherents is Marxism and Critical Theory, as discussed above. For example, the Black Lives Matter group is avowedly Marxist, and had its roots in the Weather Underground movement that sought to overthrow the U.S. government ([Steinbuch, 2020](#)).

The term “Social Justice” is a misnomer in that it is not about justice or fairness in a legal or personal sense (such as compensation for an injury), but rather about a desire to correct past injustices by taking resources away from those who are *alleged* to have benefitted and giving them to those who *allegedly* were harmed. The essence of the social justice movement is equal outcomes, as opposed to equal opportunity; its primary objective is to control society to ensure equality of social and economic outcomes. Actual justice implies impartiality and non-discrimination as symbolized by the blindfolded lady of justice carrying scales, but today’s social justice is concerned with racial and gender quotas, identity politics, affirmative action, reparations, and other forms of “positive” discrimination based on group membership, e.g., ([Ambrosch, 2019](#)). It considers existing law as a tool of the privileged who use it as a means of oppression. For example, they cite the large number of incarcerated black males as *prima facie* evidence of white supremacy and racial discrimination, and thus seek to defund the police and consider criminal behavior by members of the oppressed class as acceptable ([Walsh & Jorgensen, 2020](#)).

However, it is impossible to equalize people. This is certainly true between men and women as discussed above but is also true in an overall human sense. In the words of Thomas Sowell,

Given the innumerable factors influencing the current well-being and misfortunes of individuals and groups, the presumption of being able to disentangle all these factors and determine how much is due to the injustices of history is truly staggering. ([Sowell, 1995](#))

The implicit assumption of social justice is, were it not for injustices, equal outcomes would be the norm. But since people differ in myriads of ways, there is no reason to expect equal outcomes – such equality or equity is impossible ([Ambrosch, 2019](#)). Some people will always be

more entrepreneurial, disciplined, driven (or the reverse – risk-averse, lazy, and passive) than others.

Social justice has demanded that everyone proceed in lockstep with its dictates. The business face of social justice is DEI (diversity, equity, and inclusion) policies and administrators that have essentially been forced on corporations. People are accused of “microaggressions” such as using the wrong pronoun, using the term “housewife,” indicating that racists could be black as well as white, etc. For example, a Massachusetts hospital is implementing policies to deny care to patients who engage in: “Words or actions that are disrespectful, racist, discriminatory, hostile, or harassing... They will not be tolerated” ([Farthing, 2024](#)).

None of this implies that racism and sexism don’t exist or doesn’t matter, but assuming a single-cause solution is wrong and extremely unwise for society. Unfortunately, social justice, being true to its roots in critical theory, refuses to consider any other options.

Transgender or Trans – designates individuals who have “gender incongruence” – feelings that they either are or should be the opposite gender. These feelings of incongruence may be minor or major, in which case they could be classified as “gender dysphoria.” Feelings of gender incongruence may be due to fact that an individual is intersex (i.e., biologically mis-sexed), or may have environmental causes. There is a large and hostile debate regarding the huge increase in individuals claiming gender dysphoria – to what extent their incongruence is real is or generated by social media, transgender advocacy, and feminist advertising. The term “transgender” can also be used to indicate individuals who have transitioned to the other gender, via hormone therapy or surgery.

Afterword

Like most kids, I grew up surrounded mainly by others of similar ethnicity and economic circumstances – white and lower middle-class. Our family was certainly not devoted to social justice, but my mother’s parents and my father had emigrated from Denmark. He was therefore a newcomer to America, and I always felt that no one was inherently better, and everyone was of equal value, regardless of their skin color or ethnic background. The eventual race riots and the associated unrest troubled me, and my thought was, “We’re all just people; why can’t we get along?” I was not a fighter and not drawn to direct involvement, but my sympathies were with oppressed black people. However, as I grew older, I began to see the connections between social justice and Marxism, first in the church and then in society, and my opposition to it grew, as Marxism is inherently simplistic and wrong. It’s a hard thing to be simultaneously for something and also opposed to it, and I struggled to articulate my thoughts in an atmosphere that has grown increasingly totalitarian and hostile to disambiguating actual injustice from the system that has been erected to supposedly combat it. My experience with feminism is similar – desiring that women be free to live as they desire, but at the same time opposing a movement that encourages abortion, attacks patriarchy and marriage, promotes female aggression, trashes homemaking, and creates poverty, and family dysfunctionality.

Like many boys, I had flings with pornography – it was initially intensely attractive but eventually disappointing and sometimes repelling. Movies with sexual themes, especially European ones, usually affected me the same way – promising fulfillment that was never delivered, and leaving me with an emptiness, and sometimes a feeling of revulsion instead – like being titillated with bunnies in the Playboy Mansion and then finding out what Hugh Hefner’s life was really like – a jaded, lonely, dirty old man who is now buried next to Marilyn Monroe –

his female equivalent. As a teenager I didn't understand this conundrum, and why what is reputed to be the epitome of human experience could also be so shoddy and empty. It was not until becoming an adult that I understood D.H. Lawrence's powerful quote from *Phoenix*: "Pornography is the attempt to insult sex, to do dirt on it." Having gone through a long maturation and discovery process makes one much more sensitive to the implications of early childhood propaganda. As Arthur Schopenhauer said, "There is no absurdity so obvious that it cannot be firmly planted in the human head if you only begin to impose it in childhood, by constantly repeating it with an air of great solemnity."

Thankfully, I never had any experiences with prostitutes, but I read and saw enough about prostitution to understand its appeal to males. Strip tease shows are frustrating in that you see the girl but can't get her, but prostitution is even worse – you get the girl but then discover that you don't really have her. She hasn't really given herself to you, and there is no real love, desire, or care – just a mercenary transaction from which you may get an STD. In seeking what is said to be the ultimate in human fulfillment one may well find emptiness and a gnawing, unfulfilled desire. What are we to do if reaching the mountain peak turns out to be a depressing letdown, and we may as well have stayed in the valley? That is the conclusion of both #MeToo and #MGTOW.

I came to despise narcissism and the associated selfishness in romance and male-female relationships – to avoid the beauties and seek a normal girl, a girl-next-door type, who would give herself to me eagerly and willingly. We would have a deep intimacy; I would make her happy, she would make me happy, and we would have intense sex, perhaps like Michael Corlione and Apollonia in *The Godfather*. This type of powerful sexual relationship requires commitment and a long-term orientation for it to flower. In other words, it requires marriage. It is

depicted in a few movies such as *Braveheart*, *Dances With Wolves*, and *The Last of the Mohicans*, but in my younger days I was stupider and didn't yet understand the complexities.

So I sought to resolve the mystery of why the most fulfilling form of sexuality is relatively rare and seems to be growing rarer in Western culture. It was only after exploring the foundations of feminism that I began to understand why so many people settle for crumbs and miss the feast. Leftists are obsessed with equality, the self, and with free and uninhibited sex – from ten thousand feet this may seem very attractive. However, as you get closer, you realize that like the *Brave New World* of Aldous Huxley, they have eviscerated, twisted, and perverted sex and turned it into a political weapon; their ideology becomes all the more repulsive.

The topic of this dissertation has been a polemical treatment of gender feminism, not from a moral perspective but rather from the negative results that it has inflicted on Western society. As indicated above, a moral critique would not carry any force, because morality has been fundamentally redefined and therefore cannot be used as a framework for debate. The core issue is not simply gender feminism, but the movement from the mimetic to the poietic; from the moral self to the psychological self; from the power of ideas to the power of images; and from the long historical process that has resulted in redefinition of self as the sole determiner of truth and morality, accompanied by the separation of gender from sex.

This assessment is late in the game; it seems as if leftist forces are winning, and turning back the tide may be impossible. For the Christian, this reinforces the idea that this world is not our true home – we are just passing through; there never were “good old days” – life always has been and always will be a struggle. The goal is not necessarily to turn back the tide, but to be a voice encouraging a return to transcendence, chivalry, nobility, and honor – toward a

commitment to Christian doctrines and ethics and away from psychology and sympathy as the source of morality and truth. A return to God, marriage, and family for anyone willing to listen.

If there is a historical precedent for Christianity today... it was the second century world [of persecution] which laid down the foundations for the later successes of the third and fourth centuries. [The church survived] by existing as a close-knit, doctrinally bounded community that required her members to act consistent with their faith and to be good citizens of the earthly city, as far as good citizenship was compatible with faithfulness to Christ. ([Trueman, 2020, p. 407](#))

The real bottom line for me is that I began to see that sexuality and our intense attraction to it was not only a reality to be experienced, but also a future to be anticipated, in ways that exceed the erotic and in which human imagination as yet cannot conceive. What I really wanted was not only a connection with wife and family, but also a connection with the God who was the maker of heaven, earth, and sexuality – who designed my brain, and who will eventually “make all things new.”

Quotes and Poems

Male-Female, Marriage, and Sexuality

The most popular labor-saving device for women today is still a husband with money.
~ Adams, Franklin P.

Although I conquer all the earth,
Yet for me there is only one city.
And in that city, there is for me only one house;
And in that house, a room;
And in that room, a bed;
And in that bed, a woman,
The shining joy and jewel of all my kingdom.
~ Anonymous, from ancient India

Courtship – a man pursuing a woman until she catches him.
~ Anonymous

Feminism is the idea that women are free when they serve their employers, but slaves when they serve their husbands and children.
~ Anonymous

Feminism killed chivalry.
~ Anonymous

Feminists hate me because I am capable of forming my own opinions without their help.
~ Anonymous

Government (n) – non-consensual S&M with the 2nd amendment as the only safe word.
~ Anonymous

Hypocrisy: demanding that the government stay out of your bedroom and your womb while simultaneously demanding they pay for birth control and abortion.
~ Anonymous

Man who doesn't want to take care of a kid: deadbeat dad. Woman who doesn't want to do the same: pro-choice.
~ Anonymous

Marriage is an attempt to change a night owl into a homing pigeon.
~ Anonymous

Marriage is like twirling a baton, turning handsprings, or eating with chopsticks. It looks easy until you try it.

~ Anonymous

Marriage is the price men pay for sex,
Sex is the price women pay for marriage.

~ Anonymous

Most of these love triangles are wrecktangles.

~ Anonymous

Stop waiting for your prince in a white horse. Go and find him. The poor bastard might be lost, stuck on an island, or something.

~ Anonymous

Women today are not satisfied. They want men, but all they find are little boys.

~ Anonymous

In a great romance, each person basically plays a part that the other really likes.

~ Ashley, Elizabeth

It is as absurd to say that a man can't love one woman all the time as it is to say that a violinist needs several violins to play the same piece of music.

~ Balzac

Marriage is our last, best chance to grow up.

~ Barth, Joseph

If we stopped treating manhood as something shameful, we might end up with fewer men we are ashamed of.

~ Caballero, Being

Romance is the deepest thing in life. It is deeper than reality.

~ Chesterton, G.K.

Variability is one of the virtues of women. It obviates the crude requirements of polygamy. If you have one good wife, you are sure to have a spiritual harem.

~ Chesterton, G.K.

Man is the head of the family; woman the neck that turns the head.

~ Chinese Saying

There are times when parenthood seems to be nothing more than feeding the hand that bites you.

~ De Vries, Peter

The thing that impresses me most about America is the way parents obey their children.

~ Duke of Windsor, The

The sexual embrace can only be compared with music and with prayer.

~ Ellis, Havelock

The true test of civilization is not the census, nor the size of cities, nor the abundance of crops, but the kind of man the country turns out.

~ Emerson, Ralph Waldo

The most natural aphrodisiac for a man is a beautiful woman, passionately asking to be enjoyed.

~ Frances, Brendan

Marriage is the most natural state of man, and the state in which you will find the most happiness.

~ Franklin, Benjamin

Husbands are like fires. They go out if left unattended.

~ Gabor, Zsa Zsa

To be fully seen by somebody, then, and be loved anyhow – this is a human offering that can border on miraculous.

~ Gilbert, Elizabeth

A major part of love is commitment. If we are committed to someone, if I'm committed to loving you, then it's not possible for me to "fall out of love."

~ Hooks, Bell

Sex is the poor man's opera.

~ Italian Proverb

You see an awful lot of smart guys with dumb women, but you hardly ever see a smart woman with a dumb guy.

~ Jong, Erica

If you screw up your family, not much else matters.

~ Kennedy, Rose

I looked on child rearing not only as a work of love and duty but as a profession that was fully as interesting and challenging as any honorable profession in the world and one that demanded the best that I could bring to it.

~ Kennedy, Rose

When you hold your baby in your arms the first time, and you think of all the things you can say and do to influence him, it's a tremendous responsibility. What you do with him can influence not only him, but everyone he meets and not for a day or a month or a year but for time and eternity.

~ Kennedy, Rose

As motherhood is the greatest and most natural God-given gift for women for posterity, it would seem that the birth and rearing of children, in the way which to us seems most ideal, would be the most satisfying and the most rewarding career for a woman.

~ Kennedy, Rose

What greater aspiration and challenge are there for a mother than the hope of raising a great son or daughter?

~ Kennedy, Rose

To my mind, there was no one in the world like my father. Wherever he was, there was magic in the air.

~ Kennedy, Rose

No one will ever win the battle of the sexes – there's too much fraternizing with the enemy.

~ Kissinger, Henry

Women complain about sex more than men. Their complaints fall into two categories: 1) not enough; 2) too much.

~ Landers, Ann

What to the non-feminist view looks like love and romance looks a lot like hatred and torture to the feminist.

~ MacKinnon, Catherine (Toward a Feminist Theory of the State)

My husband is German. Every night I dress up like Poland and he invades me.

~ Midler, Better

Whenever there is a group of young people, there is a republic. With marriage the system changes. Married couples want order, safety, peace, and quiet. They wish to live as a family in a family – in an orderly household, and they seek for a genuine monarchy.

~ Novalis

When a man takes an interest in a woman's body, she accuses him of only taking an interest in her body, but when he doesn't take an interest in her body, she accuses him of taking an interest in another woman's body.

~ O'Rourke, P.J.

Leaving sex to feminists is like letting your dog vacation at the taxidermist.

~ Paglia, Camille

Feminism has become a catch-all vegetable drawer where bunches of clingy sob sisters can store their moldy neuroses.

~ Paglia, Camille

Brevity is the soul of lingerie.

~ Parker, Dorothy

There is only one happiness life, to love and be loved.

~ Sand, George

Marriage is popular because it combines the maximum of temptation with the maximum of opportunity.

~ Shaw, George Bernard

The soul of a woman lives in love.

~ Sigourney, Lydia H.

By all means marry; if you get a good one, you'll become happy; if you get a bad one, you'll become a philosopher.

~ Socrates

If we had more feminine women there would be less unemployment, divorce, delinquency, and other evils.

~ Stayt, Isabelle (of the Campaign for the Feminine Woman - 1983)

The American girl makes a servant out of her husband and then finds him contemptible for being a servant.

~ Steinbeck, John

Man for the field, woman for the hearth,

Man for the sword, woman for the needle,

Man with the head, woman with the heart,

Man to command, woman to obey,

All else confusion.

~ Tennyson, Alfred Lord from the poem "The Princess"

I would rather spend one lifetime with you, than face all the ages of this world alone.

~ Tolkien, J.R.R.

Happily ever after is not a fairy tale – it's a choice.

~ Weaver, Fawn

Psychology and Philosophy

Nothing will work unless you do.

~ Angelou, Maya

Practicing psychiatry without faith in God is like meeting a hungry man and giving him a toothpick.

~ Anonymous

It is not necessary to understand things in order to argue about them.

~ Beaumarchais, Pierre

If we need an atheist for a debate, we go to the philosophy [or the psychology] department. The physics department isn't much use.

~ Griffiths, Robert (Heinemann Prize in mathematical physics)

There is nothing so absurd or ridiculous that has not at some time been said by some philosopher.

~ Goldsmith, Oliver

It speaks for that habit of substituting the psychological for the moral, of interpreting a spiritual condition as a kind of behavior that has so bedeviled our century.

~ Richard Pevear (translator of *Notes from the Underground* by Fyodor Dostoevsky, Vintage Classics, 2021)

There is no absurdity so obvious that it cannot be firmly planted in the human head if you only begin to impose it before the age of five, by constantly repeating it with an air of great solemnity.

~ Schopenhauer, Arthur

Spirituality and Theology

Science can tell us how to do many things, but it cannot tell us what ought to be done.

~ Anonymous

It is the greatest art of the devil to convince us that he does not exist.

~ Baudelaire, Pierre Charles

Jesus knows our world. He does not disdain us like the God of Aristotle. We can speak to Him and He answers us. Although He is a person like ourselves, He is God and transcends all things.

~ Carrel, Alexis (Nobel Prize in Medicine and Physiology)

The Christian ideal has not been tried and found wanting; it has been found difficult and left untried.

~ Chesterton, G.K

For myself, faith begins with a realization that a supreme intelligence brought the universe into being and created man. It is not difficult for me to have this faith, for it is incontrovertible that where there is a plan there is intelligence – an orderly, unfolding universe testifies to the truth of the most majestic statement ever uttered – ‘In the beginning God.’

~ Compton, Arthur (Nobel Prize in Physics)

It may seem bizarre, but in my opinion, science offers a surer path to God than religion.

~ Paul Davies (Physicist)

Science without religion is lame, religion without science is blind.

~ Einstein, Albert

“You accept the historical Jesus?”

“Unquestionably! No one can read the Gospels without feeling the actual presence of Jesus. His personality pulsates in every word. No myth is filled with such life.”

~ Einstein, Albert (from an interview with the Saturday Evening Post)

It now seems to me that the findings of more than fifty years of DNA research have provided materials for a new and enormously powerful argument to design.

~ Flew, Antony (Professor of Philosophy)

The first gulp from the glass of natural sciences will turn you into an atheist, but at the bottom of the glass God is waiting for you.

~ Heisenberg, Werner (Nobel Prize in Physics for the creation of quantum mechanics)

I believe in God. It makes no sense to me to assume that the Universe and our existence is just a cosmic accident, that life emerged due to random physical processes in an environment which simply happened to have the right properties. As a Christian I begin to comprehend what life is all about through belief in a Creator, some of whose nature was revealed by a man born about 2000 years ago.

~ Hewish, Antony (Nobel Prize in Physics)

Call on God, but row away from the rocks.

~ Indian proverb

If you study science deep enough and long enough, it will force you to believe in God.

~ Kelvin, Lord William

When the whole world is running towards a cliff, he who runs in the opposite direction appears to have lost his mind.

~ Lewis, C.S.

For the scientist who has lived by his faith in the power of reason, the story ends like a bad dream. He has scaled the mountains of ignorance; he is about to conquer the highest peak; as he pulls himself over the final rock, he is greeted by a band of theologians who have been sitting there for centuries.

~ Jastrow, Robert

The exquisite order displayed by our scientific understanding of the physical world calls for the divine.

~ Kistiakowsky, Vera (physicist)

I am proud to be a Christian. I believe not only as a Christian, but as a scientist as well. A wireless device can deliver a message through the wilderness. In prayer the human spirit can send invisible waves to eternity, waves that achieve their goal in front of God.

~ Marconi, Guglielmo (Nobel Prize in Physics and the inventor of the radio)

Faith is not something that goes against the evidence, it goes beyond it. The evidence is saying to us, 'There is another country. There is something beyond mere reason.'

~ McGrath, Alister E.

I have a fundamental belief in the Bible as the Word of God, written by those who were inspired. I study the Bible daily.

~ Newton, Sir Isaac

Who created these laws? There is no question but that a God will always be needed.

~ Parker, Barry (cosmologist)

Being an ordinary scientist and an ordinary Christian seems perfectly natural to me. It is also perfectly natural for the many scientists I know who are also people of deep religious faith.

~ Phillips, William D. (Nobel Prize in Physics)

There can never be any real opposition between religion and science; for the one is the complement of the other.

~ Planck, Max (Nobel Prize winning physicist)

For many years I have believed that God is the great designer behind all nature... All my studies in science since then have confirmed my faith. I regard the bible as my principle source of authority.

~ Prance, Sir Ghilleen T. (knighted British botanist and ecologist, Fellow of the Royal Society)

When confronted with the order and beauty of the universe and the strange coincidences of nature, it's very tempting to take the leap of faith from science into religion. I am sure many physicists want to. I only wish they would admit it.

~ Rothman, Tony (physicist)

The common belief that the actual relations between religion and science over the last few centuries have been marked by deep and enduring hostility is not only historically inaccurate, but actually a caricature so grotesque that what needs to be explained is how it could possibly have achieved any degree of respectability.

~ Russell, Colin (Historian of Science)

From the perspective of the latest physical theories, Christianity is not a mere religion, but an experimentally testable science.

~ Tipler, Frank (Professor of Mathematical Physics)

At least this is the way I see it. I am a physicist. I also consider myself a Christian. As I try to understand the nature of our universe in these two modes of thinking, I see many commonalities

and crossovers between science and religion. It seems logical that in the long run the two will even converge.

~ Townes, Charles Hard (Nobel Prize in Physics)

I build molecules for a living. I can't begin to tell you how difficult that job is. I stand in awe of God because of what he has done through his creation. My faith has been increased through my research. Only a rookie who knows nothing about science would say science takes away from faith. If you really study science, it will bring you closer to God.

~ Tour, James (Nanoscientist)

If God didn't exist, it would be necessary to invent him.

~ Voltaire

When it comes to the origin of life there are only two possibilities: creation or spontaneous generation. There is no third way. Spontaneous generation was disproved one hundred years ago, but that leads us to only one other conclusion, that of supernatural creation. We cannot accept that on philosophical grounds; therefore, we choose to believe the impossible: that life arose spontaneously by chance.

~ Wald, George (Nobel Laureate in medicine and physiology)

Videography and Bibliography

This is a partial list of resources and books that have influenced the author on the subjects of theology, psychology, male-female relationships, romance, sex, parenting, education, philosophy, economics, politics, and science.

Music Videos about Heaven

- Brown, Chris. (2023). Call the Name, Jehovah.
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=xhyi3H7beEA>
- Lenos, Annie & Shore, Howard. (2002). Into the West
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=La5XOF1bOdc>
- Johnson, Jenn. (2023). I Will Sing of the Goodness of God.
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=n0FBb6hnwTo>
- Phillips, Craig & Dean. (2023). The Great I Am.
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=dGv5d8EE34k>
- Tomlin, Chris. (2023). Holy Forever.
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=hZcrSa6pjs4>

One of the comments given on the YouTube page under this video is as follows:

“I was homeless, got into drugs, and went into prisons. Then I got to know Jesus, and He changed my life. Now I have a home, a wife, a lovely daughter, and a new identity. I am a child of God. Hallelujah!”

Movies with Traditional Male-Female Themes

Avalon
Beauty and the Beast
Blade Runner
Bourne Identity, The
Braveheart
Chronicles of Narnia
Dances With Wolves
Die Hard
Fiddler on the Roof

Firm, The
Island, The
It's a Wonderful Life
Last of the Mohicans, The
Last Samurai, The
Lord of the Rings
My Big, Fat, Greek Wedding
Officer and a Gentleman
Overboard
Piano, The
Princess Bride, The
Raiders of the Lost Ark
Romancing the Stone
Tender Mercies
Titanic
Troy
True Lies
Uncle Tom II: An American Odyssey
West Side Story
Water World

Non-Fiction Books

Darwinism, Biology, and Science

- Ashton, J.F. (2000). *In Six Days: Why Fifty Scientists Choose to Believe in Creation*. Master Books
A book detailing the views of a number of PhD level scientists who believe in Biblical creation.
- Behe, M.J. (2006). *Darwin's Black Box: The Biochemical Challenge to Evolution*. Simon & Schuster
The classic book that launched Intelligent Design as a challenge to Darwinism.
- Behe, M.J. (2007). *The Edge of Evolution: The Search for the Limits of Darwinism*. Free Press
A biochemical view of how far Darwinism could go in the origin of species – not very far.
- Dembski, W.A., (2004). *Uncommon Dissent: Intellectuals Who Find Darwinism Unconvincing*. ISI Books
Essays from people disagreeing with Darwinism and challenging it.
- Gonzalez, G. & Richards, J.W. (2004). *The Privileged Planet: How Our Place in the Cosmos is Designed for Discovery*. Regnery Publishing

The classic book on how the planet Earth is unique and the search for exo planets.

Lubenow, M.L. (1992). *Bones of Contention*. Baker Books

A book surveyed the history of paleontology from a biblical perspective.

Tipler, F.J. (1994). *The Physics of Immortality: Modern Cosmology, God, and the Resurrection from the Dead*. Doubleday

An examination of immortality from the viewpoint of physics.

Tipler, F.J. (2007). *The Physics of Christianity*. Doubleday

An examination of Christianity and miracles from the viewpoint of physics.

Wells, J. (2000). *Icons of Evolution: Science or Myth?* Regnery Publishing

A book exposing the myth of Darwinism.

Wells, J. (2011). *The Myth of Junk DNA*. Discovery Institute

A book exposing the myth of junk DNA

Economics, Politics, and History

Cahill, T. (1996). *How the Irish Saved Civilization*. Doubleday

A fascinating glimpse into the history of Irish civilization and its impact.

DeSoto, H. (2000). *The Mystery of Capital: Why Capitalism Triumphs in the West and Fails Everywhere Else*. Perseus Books

A much-needed work on the problems of capitalism in the third world – why things haven't worked and what needs to change in third world governments.

Gilder, G. (1984). *The Spirit of Enterprise*. Simon and Schuster

How business can be the source of blessing.

Gilder, G. (1993). *Wealth and Poverty*. Institute for Contemporary Studies, 1993

How wealth is really created, and how poverty can really be reduced.

Hazlitt, H. (1996). *Economics in One Lesson*. Laissez Faire Books

The classic book on the realities of economics and how government screws it up.

Lankov, A. (2015). *The Real North Korea: Life and Politics in the Failed Stalinist Utopia*. Oxford University Press

A deep look at the twisted world of North Korea and its leadership.

Mackay, J. & Sisodia, R. (2014). *Conscious Capitalism: Liberating the Heroic Spirit of Business*. Harvard Press

An explanation of how business and capitalism can best benefit society, by the CEO of Whole Foods.

- Massie, R. (1992). *Peter The Great*. Ballentine Books
A highly readable account of Russia in the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries under Peter the Great, who was one of the most amazing men of history. Many consider Massie's work to be one of the best historical books ever composed.
- Muravchik, J.M. (2002). *Heaven on Earth: The Rise and Fall of Socialism*. Encounter Books
The history of the rise of the kibbutz movement in Israel and failure of socialism.
- Murray, C. (1984). *Losing Ground: American Social Policy 1950 through 1980*. Basic Books
The seminal book on the failure of the welfare system, by a Reagan-era government official who details the failures of the Great Society welfare programs.
- Nash, R.H. (1986). *Poverty and Wealth: The Christian Debate Over Capitalism*. Crossway Books
A response to Christian advocates of socialism such as Ron Sider.
- Nilson, U. (2007). *What Happened to Sweden While America Became the Only Superpower?* Nordstjernan Forlag
A book exploring the history of economics in Sweden vs. America.
- Sowell, T. (1995). *The Vision of the Anointed – Self-Congratulation as a Basis for Social Policy*. Basic Books
Thomas Sowell is one of the brightest economists of our times and has written many books on economics, poverty, and social justice.
- Sowell, T. (2007). *A Conflict of Visions: Ideological Origins of Political Struggles*. Basic Books
- Sowell, T. (2011). *Economic Facts and Fallacies*. Basic Books
- Sowell, T. (2013). *“Trickle Down Theory” and “Tax Cuts for the Rich”*. Hoover Press
- Sowell, T. (2014). *Basic Economics*. Basic Books
- Sowell, T. (2020). *Barbarians inside the Gates*. Hoover Press
- Sowell, T. (2021). *Conquests and Cultures: An International History*. Basic Books
- Ulam, A. (1973). *Stalin: The Man and His Era*. Garzanti
An excellent and comprehensive history of the Soviet Union during the days of Stalin – from the communist revolution through his death in 1953.

- Yunis, M. (2001). *Banker to the Poor*. Public Affairs
A book by the Nobel award winning economist who went from being a socialist academic to being the banker who invented microfinance and helped thousands.
- Yunis, M. (2010). *Building Social Business: The New Kind of Capitalism that Serves Humanity's Most Pressing Needs*. Public Affairs
A continuation and generalization of Yunis' prior book to the economies of the third world.
- Zhisui, Li. (1994). *The Private Life of Chairman Mao*. Random House
A revealing look at the life of Mao Tse Tung and communism in China such as the disaster of the Great Leap Forward, written by Mao's private doctor.

Feminism and Social Justice

- Baucham, V.T. (2001). *Fault Lines: The Social Justice Movement and Evangelicalism's Looming Catastrophe*. Salem Books
The best book on the problems and evils of the social justice movement.
- Colapinto, J. (2006). *As Nature Made Him: The Boy That Was Raised as a Girl*. Harper
An expose of the work of John Money and his attempt to change a boy into a girl.
- Davis, P.G. (1998). *Goddess Unmasked: The Rise of Neopagan Feminist Spirituality*. Spense Publishing
An excellent history of magic, spiritism, the development of the Goddess movement, and its connections with feminism.
- Everett, C. (1991). *The Scarlet Lady: Confessions of a Successful Abortionist*. Wolgemuth & Hyatt
An inside look at the abortion industry from a woman who ran an abortion clinic.
- Gallagher, M. (1989). *Enemies of Eros: How the Sexual Revolution is Killing Family, Marriage, and Sex and What We Can Do About It*. Bonus Books
An insightful book from a feminist woman who started to understand the implications of what she had been taught.
- Gilder, G. (1986). *Men and Marriage* (revised and expanded edition of *Sexual Suicide*). Pelican
The classic book on the impact of feminism and the disasters it has created.
- Graglia, F.C. (1998). *Domestic Tranquility: A Brief Against Feminism*. Spence Publishing
A book from a female critic of feminism on how marriage can be improved.
- Grant, G. (1988). *Grand Illusions: The Legacy of Planned Parenthood*. Wolgemuth & Hyatt Publishers

An expose of Planned Parenthood – where the organization came from, who they are, and what they do.

- London, Oli. (2023). *Gender Madness: One Man's Devastating Struggle with Woke Ideology and His Battle to Protect Children*. Skyhorse
A man who became a woman and then detransitioned in order to find himself and became increasingly alarmed at the recruitment of kids by the transgender movement.
- Mitchell, B. (1989). *Weak Link – The Feminization of the American Militar*. Regnery Gateway
A study of the largely negative effects of feminization on the U.S. military.
- Morgan, E. (1973). *The Descent of Women*. Bantam.
A study of the results of feminism.
- O’Leary, D. (1997). *The Gender Agenda - Redefining Equality*. Vital Issues Press.
A book on the fallacy of male-female equality.
- Podles, L.J. (1999). *The Church Impotent: The Feminization of Christianity*. Spense Publishing
A study of the history of Bernard of Clairvaux, Mariology and their negative impacts on the Catholic Church.
- Soh, D. (2020). *The End of Gender: Debunking the Myths about Sex and Identity in Our Society*. Threshold Editions
A book on the biological reality of sex differences from the perspective of a neuroscientist.
- Sommers, C.H. (1994). *Who Stole Feminism? How Women Have Betrayed Women*. Simon & Schuster
A study detailing the damage that feminism has caused in women’s lives.
- Sowell, T. (2001). *The Quest for Cosmic Justice*. Free Press
- Sowell, T. (2009). *Black Rednecks & White Liberals*. Encounter Books
- Sowell, T. (2009). *Civil Rights: Rhetoric or Reality?* Harper
- Sowell, T. (2019). *Discrimination and Disparities*. Basic Books
- Sowell, T. (2023). *Social Justice Fallacies*. Basic Books
- Tooley, J. (2003). *The Miseducation of Women – A Spirited Assault on the Hidden Curriculum that Works to Women’s Disadvantage*. Iven R. Dee.
A critique of feminist education.

Male-Female Differences and Patriarchy

- Goldberg, S. (1973). *The Inevitability of Patriarchy*. Morrow
The classic book on the reality of patriarchy and male dominance from the perspective of anthropology.
- Goldberg, S. (1993). *Why Men Rule: A Theory of Male Dominance*. Open Court
An updated version of Goldberg's classic.
- Mead, M. (1977). *Male and Female*. Morrow (originally published in 1949)
A look at American society and male-female relationships from the perspective of an anthropologist.
- Moir A. & Jessel, D. (1991). *Brain Sex: The Real Differences Between Men and Women*. Dell
The foundational book on the differences between the sexes and their biological nature, as well as explaining the origin of intersex.
- Moir, A. & Moir, B. (1999). *Why Men Don't Iron: The Fascinating and Unalterable Differences Between Men and Women*. Citadel Press
An updated version of Moir's classic.
- Vincent, N. (2006). *Self-Made Man: One Woman's Year Disguised as a Man*. Pelican
A female reporter's account of one year spent as a man (without any sex changes) to provide perspective on how the other side lives.

Marriage, Romance, and Sex

- Bonaventure, M. (1996). *Why Can't a Woman be More Like a Man?* Summit Publishing
A workbook for couples on achieving romantic and sexual harmony.
- Burton, R. *Arabian Nights, The Perfumed Garden, and others*
The classic works on sexuality and male-female relationships from an Arab viewpoint.
- Curtis, B. & Eldredge, J. (1997). *The Sacred Romance*. Thomas Nelson
A Christian view of romance and sexuality.
- Douglas, N., & Slinger, P. (1989). *Sexual Secrets: The Alchemy of Ecstasy*. Inner Traditions International
Secrets of sexual ecstasy from a variety of oriental sources.
- Doyle, L. (2001). *The Surrendered Wife: A Practical Guide to Finding Intimacy, Passion, and Peace with a Man*. Fireside Books

A former feminist finds satisfaction with her husband through surrendering to him.

Eldredge, J. (2001). *Wild at Heart: Discovering the Secret of a Man's Soul*. Thomas Nelson
A Christian view of romance and sexuality.

Gray, J. (1993). *Men are from Mars, Women are from Venus: A Practical Guide for Improving Communication and Getting What You Want in Your Relationship*. Harper Collins
A classic book on male-female differences in regard to relationships.

Gray, J. (1997). *Mars and Venus in the Bedroom: A Guide to Lasting Romance and Passion*. Harper Collins
A classic book on male-female differences in regard to sexuality.

Handford, E.R. (1995). *Me? Obey Him? Sword of the Lord*
An exploration of submission and answers to practical questions from wives, from a Christian perspective.

Hartley, W.F. (1986). *His Needs, Her Needs: Building an Affair-Proof Marriage*. Revell
A Christian view of romance and sexuality.

Kreidman, E. (1991). *Light His Fire, and Light Her Fire*. Dell
Attitudes and ideas for couples on improving marriage and making it exciting.

Lasch, C., (1977). *Haven in a Heartless World: The Family Besieged*. Basic Books
A penetrating analysis of the effects of feminism on society, and how the haven of home life is under attack.

LaHaye, B. (1998). *The Act of Marriage: The Beauty of Sexual Love*. Zondervan
A treatment of sexuality in marriage, from the Christian perspective.

Morgan, M. (1977). *The Total Woman - How to Make Your Marriage Come Alive*. Pocket Books.
A marriage self-help book for women.

Norman, J. (1974). *Imaginative Sex*, Daw Books
A book for male dominant, female submissive couples on using imagination to improve relationships, and scene suggestions.

Panzer, R.A. (1997). *Condom Nation: Blind Faith, Bad Science*. Center for Educational Media
A book on sex education in America and how "safe sex" can be an oxymoron.

Peace, M. (1997). *The Excellent Wife*. Focus Publishing

Biblical principles for becoming a woman and wife of excellence.

Penner, C., & Penner, J. (1982). *The Gift of Sex: A Guide To Sexual Fulfillment*. Word Books

A book on sexuality from a Christian perspective.

Robinson, J. & Love, P. (2012). *Hot Monogamy: Essential Steps to More Passionate, Intimate Lovemaking*. CreateSpace

A book detailing how the best sex is to be had in a monogamous relationship.

Robinson, M.N. (1959). *The Power of Sexual Surrender: A Psychiatrist Looks at Women's Central Problem and Shows How She May Overcome it through the Power of Surrender*. Doubleday

A work by a psychologist and physician who treated female frigidity and revealed the influence of female surrender.

Solomon. (ca. 900 BC). *The Song of Solomon* (a book in the Bible)

A poetic treatment of a romantic and sexual relationship from the Bible.

VanAuken, S. (1992). *A Severe Mercy*, Harper

The beautiful story of one couple's deep unbreakable love, how they find God and how their relationship with Him overcame all. As one reviewer put it, "This book makes everything else on romance seem shabby." After the death of his wife Davy, VanAuken never remarried and went on alone with God until his death in 1996.

Van de Velde, T. (1980). *Ideal Marriage*, Greenwood Publishing

One of the early American books on sex in marriage.

Varrin, C. (2001). *Erotic Surrender: The Sensual Joys of Female Submission*. Citadel Press

Techniques for women to improve and enjoy sex with their men.

Vatsayama. (ca. 300 AD). *The Kama Sutra*

The classic work on sexuality from India.

Wheat, E. & Wheat, G. (1977). *Intended for Pleasure*. Revell

A book on sexuality from the Christian perspective.

Whitehead, B.D. (1998). *The Divorce Culture: Rethinking Our Commitments to Marriage and Family*. Vintage

A book exposing the societal evil of divorce and the need to retain commitments.

Whitehead, B.D. (2003). *Why There Are No Good Men Left: The Romantic Plight of the New Single Woman*. Crown

An exploration of the romantic problems that feminism has generated.

- Wilson, P.B. (1997). *Liberated Through Submission*. Harvest House
The positive benefits of submission, and the way in which husbands and wives are to submit to each other.

Parenting and Education

- Beausay, W. (1994). *Boys! Shaping Ordinary Boys into Extraordinary Men*. Thomas Nelson
A book exploring how to train boys to be effective leaders and to cherish girls.
- Brimelow, P. (2003). *The Worm in the Apple: How Teacher's Unions are Destroying American Education*. Harper Collins
A book exposing the negative effects of the NEA and NFT.
- Eberstadt, M. (2004). *Home- Alone America: The Hidden Toll of Day Care, Behavior Drugs, and Other Parent Substitutes*. Sentinel Publishing
A book detailing the problems of missing parents.
- Grossman, M. (2009). *You're Teaching My Child What? A Physician Exposes the Lies of Sex Education and How They Harm Your Child*. Regneery
An expose of sex education in public schools.
- Holt, J. (1964). *How Children Learn, and How Children Fail*. Dell
The classic works on the factors influencing learning.
- Shaw, R. (2003). *The Epidemic: The Rot of American Culture, Absentee and Permissive Parenting, and the Resultant plague of Joyless, Selfish Children*. Regan Books
An expose of poor and non-existent parenting.
- Wexler, R. (1990). *Wounded Innocents: The Real Victims of the War Against Child Abuse*. Prometheus Books
A book about the impact of child abuse and neglect.

Psychology, Sociology, and Philosophy

- Adams, J.E. (1970). *Competent to Counsel: An Introduction to Nouthetic Counseling*. Zondervan
One of the classic books on Christian counseling.
- Adams, J.E. (1973). *The Christian Counselor's Manual*, Baker Book House
One of the classic books on Christian counseling.

- Bloom, A. (1987). *The Closing of the American Mind: How Higher Education Has Failed Democracy and Impoverished the Souls of Today's Students*. Simon & Schuster
A powerful statement on the negative impacts of higher education.
- Collins, G.R. (1977). *The Rebuilding of Psychology: An Integration of Psychology and Christianity*. Tyndale House
A book exploring the history of psychology and how it needs to be transformed.
- Farias, M. & Wikholm, C. (2015). *The Buddha Pill: Can Meditation Change You?* Watkins
A book explores the positives and negatives of meditation – what it can and cannot achieve.
- Goldberg, S. (1991). *When Wish Replaces Thought: Why So Much of What You Believe is False*. Prometheus Books
A book exploring the propaganda of our times.
- Kiersey, D. (1998). *Please Understand Me II: Temperament, Character, Intelligence*. Prometheus Books
An excellent resource for determining and understanding personality type.
- Kohn, A. (1993). *Punished by Rewards: The Trouble with Gold Stars, Incentive Plans, A's, Praise, and Other Bribes*. Houghton Mifflin
A book exposing psychological problems with our societal lack of discipline and empty rewards.
- McMillen, S.I. & Stern, D.E. (2008). *None of These Diseases: The Bible's Health Secrets for the 21st Century*. Revell
A book detailing the many health benefits of following biblical principles.
- Moore, R. & Gillette, D. (1992). *The Warrior Within: Accessing the Knight in the Male Psyche*. Avon Publishing.
An exploration into male and masculine psychology.
- Tiger, L. (1998). *Men in Groups*. Marion Boyars
One of the best sociological studies analyzing the male in action.
- Trueman, C.R. (2020). *The Rise and Triumph of the Modern Self: Cultural Amnesia, Expressive Individualism, and the Road to the Sexual Revolution*, Crossway
A powerful and must-read summary of the trends in America that had led to the culture of identity politics, socialism, social justice and transsexualism.

Theology

The Bible
Start here.

- Amorth, G., & Stimamiglio, S. (2016). *An Exorcist Explains the Demonic*. Sophia Press
A book about exorcism and the reality of demons.
- Chambers, O. (1963). *My Utmost for His Highest*. Barbour & Company
A daily series of reflections on devoting one's life to God.
- Keller, T. (2016). *Prayer: Experiencing Awe and Intimacy with God*. Penguin
A book about prayer and developing intimacy with God through prayer.
- Kreeft, P. (1995). *Angels and Demons: What Do We Know About Them?* Ignatius Press
A book about both angels and demons.
- Lewis, C.S. (1940). *The Problem of Pain*. Macmillan
A book on understanding the problem of evil – how God can be good and evil exist in the world.
- Martin, M. (1992). *Hostage to the Devil*. Harper
A powerful book on the reality of demon oppression and possession – how it occurs, what happens, and how it can possibly be cured.
- Moody, R. (2015). *Life After Life*. Harper
The classic work on near-death experiences.
- Sarchie, R., & Cool, L.C. (2001). *Deliver Us from Evil*. St Martin's Griffin
A book about exorcism and the reality of demons.

Fiction Books

- Andersen, H.C. (1953). *Fairy Tales*, Flensted
The classic stories by the most popular fairy tale writer of all time
- Clavell, J. *Shogun*, Dell, 1976
An engrossing novel of ancient Japan that explores and exposes the thought processes of traditional Japanese society.
- Donne, J. Joyce, J., Marvel, A., Herrick, R. and others, *Love and Sex Poetry*.
O my America! My new-found land. My Kingdom, safest when with one man manned.
- Dostoevsky, F. (1990) *The Brothers Karamazov*. Translated by Pevear, R., et al Picador
The classic novel of the struggle of good and evil and understanding God.
- Golding, W. (1954) *The Lord of the Flies*, Faber & Faber
The classic novel about youth and the darkness that can exist in people's hearts.

Hull, E. (1996). *The Sheik*, Buccaneer Books

A very popular book in its time that explored the sheik/captured maiden fantasy. The book became the foundation for Rudolf Valentino's screen success, and thousands of women were enamored by his depiction of the dark and dangerous male, who took delight in capturing and loving women. It was not known at the time of publication that the author of the book was a woman, and it caused something of a stir when it leaked out. The fantasies of men and women tend to be similar, save for the difference in perspective.

Huxley, A. (1958). *Brave New World*

A penetrating novel about a future society in which the reproductive aspects of sexuality have been eliminated and people are grown in bottles. The government assumes all parental functions, controls all aspects of the population, and breeds people with the desired level of intelligence.

Lewis, C.S. (1938-1945). *The Space Trilogy (Out of the Silent Planet, Perelandra, and That Hideous Strength)*. Macmillan

A popular science fiction fantasy work that also treats male/female roles.

Lewis, C.S. (1942). *The Screwtape Letters*. Macmillan

A fictional and satirical series of letters from a senior devil to a junior devil instructing him on how to tempt people.

Lewis, C.S. (1945). *The Great Divorce*. Macmillan

A powerful novel on the possibility of people in hell entering heaven.

Lewis, C.S. (1946). *The Narnia Chronicles*. Macmillan

A popular children's fantasy series.

Longfellow, H.W. (2000). *The Song of Hiawatha*. Everyman

The classic poem of Native Americas.

Orwell, G. (1950). *1984*. Penguin Books

One of the most powerful novels ever written, which describes the disastrous potential result of unchecked government power.

Puzo, M. (1969). *The Godfather*. Signet

The powerful and absorbing story of the Mafia.

Puzo, M. (1984). *The Sicilian*. Signet

An extension of Puzo's *Godfather* novel to explore the history and culture of Sicily.

Reage, P. (1989). *The Story of O*. Ballantine Books

The classic book of S&M. The book contains some dark S&M themes of group sex, pain, and death.

Tolkien, J.R.R. (1956). *The Lord of the Rings (The Fellowship of the Ring, The Two Towers, and The Return of the King)*. Ballantine
Along with *The Hobbit* and *The Silmarillion*, these are the most powerful and compelling works of fantasy ever written.

By the Author

Unholy Grail – The Story of Judas Iscariot and Mary Magdalene. Xulon Press, 2007.

Unholy Grail – The Heir of Judas Iscariot and Mary Magdalene. CreateSpace, 2011.

Accuracy of the Bible and Questioning God.

https://www.academia.edu/42748548/Accuracy_of_the_Bible_and_Questioning_God

Beyond the Blue. https://www.academia.edu/42260978/Beyond_the_Blue

Commentary on the Song of Solomon.

https://www.academia.edu/42179283/Commentary_on_the_Song_of_Solomon

Criticism of the Church, https://www.academia.edu/42210577/Criticism_of_the_Church

Darwinian Emperor is Naked, The.

https://www.academia.edu/42232462/The_Darwinian_Emperor_is_Naked

Economics and the Bible.

https://www.academia.edu/50585615/Economics_and_the_Bible

Face of God, The. https://www.academia.edu/95092545/The_Face_of_God

Feminist Theology. https://www.academia.edu/42299163/Feminist_Theology

Gender and the Bible. https://www.academia.edu/113541703/Gender_and_the_Bible

Meaning and Significance of the Holy Grail, The.

https://www.academia.edu/42253641/The_Meaning_and_Significance_of_the_Holy_Grail

My Spiritual Journey. https://www.academia.edu/44865056/My_Spiritual_Journey

Redemption of Eroticism, The.

https://www.academia.edu/42186012/The_Redemption_of_Eroticism

Religion and the Corruption of Eroticism.

https://www.academia.edu/42169250/Religion_and_the_Corruption_of_Eroticism

Star Gospel, The. https://www.academia.edu/42296729/The_Star_Gospel

True Conspiracy, The. https://www.academia.edu/42309829/The_True_Conspiracy

True Holy Grail, The. https://www.academia.edu/42243805/The_True_Holy_Grail

Other articles on www.richardsorensen.com, www.unholygrail.net/blog,
www.academia.edu and/or www.researchgate.net

References

- Acar, F. P., & Sümer, H. C. (2018). Another test of gender differences in assignments to precarious leadership positions: Examining the moderating role of ambivalent sexism. *Applied Psychology*, 67 (63), pp. 498–522. <https://doi.org/doi:10.1111/apps.12142>
- Acevedo, D. (2023). *Tracking Cancel Culture in Higher Education*.
<https://www.nas.org/blogs/article/tracking-cancel-culture-in-higher-education>
- Adams, J. (1970). *Competent to Counsel: An Introduction to Nouthetic Counseling*. Zondervan.
- Adams, K. A. (2021). The Trump Death Cult. 48(44), Spring, pp. 256-276.
- Adler, F. (1975). *Sisters in Crime: The Rise of the New Female Criminal*. McGraw Hill.
- Ainsworth, C. (2015). Sex redefined. *Nature*, 518(7539), 288-291.
<https://doi.org/10.1038/518288a>
- Allen, D. M. (2012). *Why Psychotherapy Efficacy Studies Are Nearly Impossible*.
<https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/blog/matter-personality/201212/why-psychotherapy-efficacy-studies-are-nearly-impossible>
- Allen, L. S., & Gorski, R. A. (1991). Sexual dimorphism of the anterior commissure and massa intermedia of the human brain. *Journal of Complete Neurology*, 312(1), 97-104.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/cne.903120108>
- Allen, L. S., & Gorski, R. A. (1992). Sexual Orientation and the Size of the Anterior Commissure in the Human Brain.
- Allen, L. S., Hines, M., Shryne, J. E., & Gorski, R. A. (1992). Two Sexually Dimorphic Cell Groups in the Human Brain. *Journal of Neuroscience*, 9(2), pp. 497-506.
- Ambrosch, G. (2019). *Beware of the Trojan Horse: A Critique of Social Justice*.
<https://areomagazine.com/2019/06/19/beware-of-the-trojan-horse-a-critique-of-social-justice/>
- AmerBibleSoc. (2020). *Research: 3 ways the Bible helps those who use it*.
<https://www.ncfgiving.com/stories/research-3-ways-the-bible-helps-those-who-use-it/>
- AmericanAdoptions. (2023). *4 Reasons for Choosing Adoption over Abortion [How Adoption Changes Lives]*. <https://www.americanadoptions.com/pregnant/reasons-for-adoption-instead-of-abortion>
- Amorth, F. G. (2016). *An Exorcist Explains the Demonic*. Sophia Press.
- Andersen, H. C. (1953). *Fairy Tales*. Flensted.
- Anderson, K. J. (2015). *Modern Misogyny: Anti-Feminism in a Post-Feminist Era*. Oxford University Press. <https://www.drugs.com/sfx/mifepristone-side-effects.html>
- Anderson, L. A., & al, e. (2023). *Mifepristone Side Effects*.
<https://www.drugs.com/sfx/mifepristone-side-effects.html>
- Anonymous. (1939). *Alcoholics Anonymous*. Works Publishing and the Anonymous Press.
- Aragão, C. (2023). *Gender pay gap in U.S. hasn't changed much in two decades*.
<https://www.pewresearch.org/short-reads/2023/03/01/gender-pay-gap-facts>
- Archie, A. (2023). *Stanford president resigns after fallout from falsified data in his research*.
<https://www.npr.org/2023/07/19/1188828810/stanford-university-president-resigns>
- Arnold, J. (2022). *Virginia Parents: Complicit School Board Members 'All Need to Resign Now'*.
<https://www.dailysignal.com/2022/12/15/virginia-parents-complicit-school-board-members-all-need-to-resign-now>

- Arora, R. (2020). *The fallacy of white privilege — and how it's corroding society*.
<https://nypost.com/2020/07/11/the-fallacy-of-white-privilege-and-how-its-corroding-society>
- Asher, J. (2013). *Are homosexual families dysfunctional?*
<https://www.catholicsun.org/2013/03/26/are-homosexual-families-dysfunctional/>
- Augustine, J. (2024). *Jordan B. Peterson's Interview of Aaron Smith-Levin*.
<https://scientologymoneyproject.com/2024/01/11/jordan-b-petersons-interview-of-aaron-smith-levin/>
- Baba, T., Endo, T., Honnma, H., Kitajima, Y., Hayashi, T., Ikeda, H., Masumori, N., Kamiya, H., Moriwaka, O., & Saito, T. (2007). Association between Polycystic Ovary Syndrome and Female-to-Male Transsexuality. *Human Reproduction*, 22(24), pp. 1011-1016.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/humrep/de1474>
- Baglioi, M. (2010). From Book Censorship to Academic Peer Review. *Emergences: Journal for the Study of Media & Composite Cultures*, Vol. 12, pp. 11-45
<https://doi.org/10.1080/1045722022000003435>
- Bagus, P., Daumann, F., & Follert, F. (2023). Microaggressions, cancel culture, safe spaces, and academic freedom: A private property rights argumentation. *Business Ethics*.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/beer.12626>
- Bai, Z. (2021). Does frequent prayer help reduce alcohol use? Heterogeneity in religious contexts and drinking styles. *Mental health, Religion & Culture*, Vol. 24, No. 22, pp. 151–163.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/13674676.2020.1826915>
- Bailey, A., Lambert, R., & LaFrance, M. (2020). Implicit Reactions to Women in High Power Body Postures: Less Wonderful But Still Weaker. *Journal of Nonverbal Behavior*, 4, pp. 329–350. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10919-019-00327-w>
- Bakos, S. C. (1995). *Kink: The Hidden Sex Lives of Americans*. St. Martin's Press.
- Balčiauskas, M. (2019). *Women Demand Equal Pay For U.S. Female Soccer Team, Men Try To List The Reasons Why They Shouldn't In Response*.
https://www.boredpanda.com/women-us-female-soccer-team-equal-pay-men-respond/?utm_source=duckduckgo&utm_medium=referral&utm_campaign=organic
- Baron, T., & Dierckxsens, G. (2022). Two dilemmas for medical ethics in the treatment of gender dysphoria in youth. *Journal of Medical Ethics*, 48(9), 603-607.
<https://doi.org/10.1136/medethics-2021-107260>
- Baucham, V. T. (2022). *Fault Lines: The Social Justice Movement and Evangelicalism's Looming Catastrophe*. Salem Books.
- Bayne, H. B., Harness, L., Kane, B., & Warfield, M. (2020). Christian Counselors and Affirmative Counseling of Lesbian and Gay Clients. *American Counseling Association*, 99(91), pp. 60–71.
- Beauvoir, S. D. (1949). *The Second Sex*.
- Beblo, M., & Görges, L. (2018). On the nature of nurture. The malleability of gender differences in work preferences. *Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization*, 151, pp. 119–141.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jebo.2018.05.002>
- Bee, H. (2015). *Useless Psychotherapy?* <https://huibee.com/2015/05/useless-psychotherapy/>
- Behe, M. J. (2006). *Darwin's Black Box – The Biochemical Challenge to Evolution*. Simon & Schuster.
- Behe, M. J. (2007). *The Edge of Evolution: The Search for the Limits of Darwinism*. Free Press.
- Beinart, P. (2019). The Global Backlash Against Women. *Atlantic*, 323(321), pp. 311-315.

- Bem, D. J. (1996). Exotic Becomes Erotic: A Developmental Theory of Sexual Orientation. *Psychological Review*, 103(102), pp. 320–335. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.103.2.320>
- Benbow, C. P., & Stanley, J. C. (1980). Sex differences in mathematical ability: fact or artifact? *Science*, 210(4475), 1262-1264. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.7434028>
- Benbow, C. P., & Stanley, J. C. (1983). Sex differences in mathematical reasoning ability: more facts. *Science*, 222(4627), 1029-1031. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.6648516>
- Benbow, C. P., & Stanley, J. C. (1984). Biological correlates of high mathematical reasoning ability. *Progress in Brain Research*, 61, 469-490. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0079-6123\(08\)64455-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0079-6123(08)64455-6)
- Benjamin, K. (2021). *The Untold Truth of Karl Marx*. <https://www.grunge.com/648011/the-untold-truth-of-karl-marx/>
- Berg, I. (1963). Change of Assigned Sex at Puberty. *Lancet*, December, pp. 1216-1218.
- Berier, C. (2020). *Butches and Studs, in Their Own Words*. <https://www.nytimes.com/video/t-magazine/100000007075532/butches-and-studs-in-their-own-words.html>
- Bernard, J. (1982). *The Future of Marriage*. Yale University Press.
- Best, P. (2022). *Las Vegas high schooler charged with battery after video of horrific classroom beating goes viral*. <https://www.foxnews.com/us/las-vegas-high-schooler-charged-with-battery-after-video-of-horrific-beating-goes-viral>
- Bever, L. (2019). *There's no one 'gay gene,' but genetics are linked to same-sex behavior, new study says*. <https://www.washingtonpost.com/health/2019/08/29/theres-no-gay-gene-genetics-are-linked-same-sex-behavior-new-study-says/>
- Bjorkqvist, K. (2018). Gender differences in aggression. *Current Opinion in Psychology*, 19, 39-42. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.copsyc.2017.03.030>
- Bloom, A. (1987). *The Closing of the American Mind: How Higher Education Has Failed Democracy and Impoverished the Souls of Today's Students*. Simon & Schuster.
- Bolar, K. (2020). *She Wrote Fake News for Cosmopolitan and Now Regrets Misleading Women on Feminism*. <https://www.dailysignal.com/2020/05/26/she-wrote-fake-news-for-cosmopolitan-and-now-regrets-misleading-women-on-feminism/>
- Bonaventura, M. (1996). *Why Can't a Woman Be More Like a Man? A Woman's Guide to Revitalizing Her Natural Sex Drive*. Summit Publishing Group.
- Book, J. (2020). *Why So Much Science is Wrong, False, Puffed, or Misleading*. <https://www.aier.org/article/why-so-much-science-is-wrong-false-puffed-or-misleading/>
- Boone, A. P., Gong, X., & Hegarty, M. (2018). Sex differences in navigation strategy and efficiency. *Memory and Cognition*, 46(6), 909-922. <https://doi.org/10.3758/s13421-018-0811-y>
- Borysenko, K. (2020). *The Dark Side Of #MeToo: What Happens When Men Are Falsely Accused*. <https://www.forbes.com/sites/karlynborysenko/2020/02/12/the-dark-side-of-metoo-what-happens-when-men-are-falsely-accused/?sh=6c47e1a4864d>
- Bossuyt, S., & Kenhove, P. V. (2015). Assertiveness Bias in Gender Ethics Research: Why Women Deserve the Benefit of the Doubt. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 150, pp. 727–739. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-016-3026-9>
- Boteach, S. (1999). *Kosher Sex*. Doubleday.
- Bradford, W. (2019). *"No Exit" by Jean-Paul Sartre Summary of Characters and Themes*. <https://www.thoughtco.com/no-exit-overview-2713437>

- Bramblett, J. R., & Darling, C. A. (1997). Sexual contacts: experiences, thoughts, and fantasies of adult male survivors of child sexual abuse. *Journal of Sex and Marital Therapy*, 23(4), 305-316. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00926239708403934>
- Brandts, J., El Baroudi, S., Huber, S. J., & Rott, C. (2021). Gender differences in private and public goal setting. *Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization*, 192, pp. 222–247. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jebo.2021.09.012>
- Bränström, R., & Pachankis, J. E. (2020). Reduction in Mental Health Treatment Utilization among Transgender Individuals after Gender-Affirming Surgeries: A Total Population Study. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 177(178), pp. 727-134. <https://doi.org/10.1176/appi.ajp.2019.19010080>
- Bregman, H. R., Malik, N. M., Page, M. J., Makynen, E., & Lindahl, K. M. (2013). Identity profiles in lesbian, gay, and bisexual youth: the role of family influences. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 42(3), 417-430. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-012-9798-z>
- Brewer, J. (2023). *Fatherlessness and its effects on American society*. <https://americafirstpolicy.com/latest/issue-brief-fatherlessness-and-its-effects-on-american-society>
- Brimelow, P. (2004). *The Worm in the Apple: How the Teacher Unions Are Destroying American Education*. Harper.
- Brough, A. R., Wilkie, J., Ma, J., Isaac, M. S., & Gal, D. (2016). Is Eco-Friendly Unmanly? The Green-Feminine Stereotype and Its Effect on Sustainable Consumption. *Journal of Consumer Research*, Vol. 43(44), pp. 567–582. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jcr/ucw044>
- Brown, D. G. (1963). Homosexuality and Family Dynamics. *Bulletin of the Menninger Clinic*, 27, 227-232. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/14048831>
- Brown, L. (2023). *Pro-Life Doctors Raise Concerns About Abortion-Pill Complications Amid Push for Permanent Removal of Restrictions*. <https://www.ncregister.com/news/pro-life-doctors-raise-concerns-about-abortion-pill-complications-amid-push-for-permanent-removal-of-restrictions>
- Brunskell-Evans, H. (2019). The Medico-Legal ‘Making’ of the Transgendered Child. *Medical Law Review*, Vol. 27, No. 24, pp. 640–657. <https://doi.org/10.1093/medlaw/fwz013>
- Burg, A. (1966). Visual Acuity as Measured by Dynamic and Static Tests: A Comparative Evaluation. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 50, pp. 460-466. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0023982>
- Burleigh, B. (2020). *My Trans tragedy: 'Everything that I read told me that I had to transition*. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=2yDrzH_-lA0
- Bushnell, H. (2021). *NCAA reveals budget, revenue gulfs between men's and women's basketball tournaments*. <https://sports.yahoo.com/ncaa-revenue-budget-march-madness-mens-womens-basketball-tournaments-202859329.html>
- Buss, D. M. (2018). Sexual and Emotional Infidelity: Evolved Gender Differences in Jealousy Prove Robust and Replicable. Perspectives on Psychological Science. *Perspectives in Psychological Science*, Vol. 13(12), pp. 155–160. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691617698225>
- Butler, J. (2004). *Undoing Gender*. Routledge.
- Byne, W., & Parsons, B. (1993). Human Sexual Orientation: The Biologic Theories Reappraised. *Archives of General Psychiatry*. *Archives of General Psychiatry*, 50(53), pp. 228-239. <https://doi.org/10.1001/archpsyc.1993.01820150078009>
- Cahill, T. (1995). *How the Irish Saved Civilization*. Doubleday.

- Carmichael, C. (2021). *The Other Side of #MeToo*.
<https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/blog/the-high-functioning-hotspot/202108/the-other-side-metoo>
- Carnell, E. (1995). *Elders Just As Intolerant of Women's Rights As Groups and People She Criticizes*.
- Chambers, O. (1963). *My Utmost for His Highest*. Barbour & Company.
- Chapman, G. (1992). *The Five Love Languages*. Northfield Publishing.
- Chen, M. (2018). Does Marrying Well Count More Than Career? Personal Achievement, Marriage, and Happiness of Married Women in Urban China. *Chinese Sociological Review*, 50(53): 240–274. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21620555.2018.1435265>
- Chen, Y., Kim, E. S., & VanderWeele, T. J. (2020). Religious-service attendance and subsequent health and well-being throughout adulthood: evidence from three prospective cohorts. *International Journal of Epidemiology*, Vol. 49, No. 46, pp. 2030–2040.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/ije/dyaa120>
- Cherfas, J., & Gribbin, J. (1984). *The Redundant Male*. Pantheon.
- Cholerisa, E., Galeab, L. A., S., Farida, & Frick, K. M. (2018). Sex differences in the brain: Implications for behavioral and biomedical research. *Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews*, 85, Feb, pp. 126-145. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neubiorev.2017.07.005>
- Christenson, J. (2023a). *Nearly 6,000 US public schools hide child's gender status from parents* New York Post. <https://nypost.com/2023/03/08/us-public-schools-conceal-childs-gender-status-from-parents/>
- Christenson, J. (2023b). *Planned Parenthood took \$1.8B in taxpayer money in 3 years— with \$90M from COVID loans*. <https://nypost.com/2023/12/12/news/planned-parenthood-took-1-8b-in-taxpayer-money-with-90m-from-covid-loans-feds/>
- ClevelandClinic. (2022). *Intersex*. <https://my.clevelandclinic.org/health/articles/16324-intersex>
- Clinton, H. R. (1973). Children Under the Law. *Harvard Educational Review*, p. 493.
- Cloud, J. (1999). Slowing Down a Quick Fix. *Time*, December 13, p. 73.
- Cobb, M. (2020). *The Idea of the Brain: The Past and Future of Neuroscience*. Basic Books.
- Colapinto, J. (2006). *As Nature Made Him: The Boy That Was Raised as a Girl*. Harper.
- Coleman, E., & al, e. (2012). Standards of Care for the Health of Transsexual, Transgender, and Gender-Nonconforming People, Version 7. *International Journal of Transgenderism*, 13(4), pp. 165-232. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15532739.2011.700873>
- Conlon, R. A., Barroso, C., & Ganley, C. M. (2022). Young children's career aspirations: Gender differences, STEM ambitions, and expected skill use. *Career Development Quarterly*, 71, pp. 15–29. <https://doi.org/10.1002/cdq.12312>
- Connor, D. S., Hunter, L., Jang, J., & Uhl, J. H. (2023). Family, community, and the rural social mobility advantage. *Research in Social Stratification and Mobility*, Vol 87.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rssm.2023.100844>
- Coppedge, D. F. (2021). *Psychotherapy Is Useless*. <https://crev.info/2021/08/psychotherapy-is-useless/>
- Cornish, M. A., & Wade, N. G. (2015). A therapeutic model of self-forgiveness with intervention strategies for counselors. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, 93(91), 96-104.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6676.2015.00185.x>
- Cox, J. W., & al, e. (2024). *More than 360,000 students have experienced gun violence at school since Columbine. There have been 394 school shootings since 1999, according to Post data*. <https://www.washingtonpost.com/education/interactive/school-shootings-database/>

- Cross, S. (2021). *Karl Marx: The Great, Big, Fat, Smelly Douche*.
<https://americanpigeon.org/karl-marx-the-great-big-fat-smelly-douche/>
- Cuadrao, I., Garcia-Ael, C., & Molero, F. (2015). Gender-typing of leadership: Evaluations of real and ideal managers. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology*, 56, pp. 236–244.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/sjop.12187>
- Dafaure, M. (2022). Meme, Trolls and the manosphe: mapping the manifold expressions of anitfeminsm and misogyny online. *European Journal of English Studies*, 26(22), pp. 236–254. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13825577.2022.2091299>
- Dahl, J., Vescio, T., & Weaver, K. (2015). How Threats to Masculinity Sequentially Cause Public Discomfort, Anger, and Ideological Dominance Over Women. *Social Psychology*, 46(44), pp. 242–254. <https://doi.org/10.1027/1864-9335/a000248>
- Daly, M. (1990). *Gyn/Ecology: The Metaethics of Radical Feminism*. Beacon Press.
- Damon, W. (1995). *Greater Expectations: Overcoming the Culture of Indulgence in America's Homes and Schools*. Free Press.
- Darwin, C. (1859). *On the Origin of Species*.
- Davis, P. (2013). *Women & Happiness: Is It Still Declining?*
<https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/blog/pressure-proof/201303/women-happiness-is-it-still-declining>
- Davis, P. G. (1998). *Goddess Unmasked: The Rise of Neopagan Feminist Spirituality*. Spence Publishing.
- DeBoise, S. (2020). Music and misogyny: a content analysis of misogynistic, antifeminist forums. *Popular Music*, 39(33/34) pp. 459–481.
- DelPriore, D. J., Proffitt Leyva, R., Ellis, B. J., & Hill, S. E. (2018). The effects of paternal disengagement on women's perceptions of male mating intent. *J Pers Soc Psychol*, 114(2), 286–302. <https://doi.org/10.1037/pspi0000113>
- DeLuca, K. (2022). 'You can tell he's mentally ill,' says UPenn swimmer after Lia Thomas Good Morning America interview. <https://www.washingtonexaminer.com/opinion/you-can-tell-hes-mentally-ill-says-upenn-swimmer-after-lia-thomas-good-morning-america-interview>
- Desmond, M. (2023). *Poverty, by America*. Crown Publishers.
- Dhejne, C., Lichtenstein, P., Boman, M., Johansson, A. L., Langstrom, N., & Landen, M. (2011). Long-term follow-up of transsexual persons undergoing sex reassignment surgery: cohort study in Sweden. *Plos One*, 6(2), e16885. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0016885>
- DiAngelo, R. (2011). White Fragility. *International Journal of Critical Pedagogy*, 3(3), pp. 54–70.
- DiDonato, T. E. (2021). *Are Couples That Live Together Before Marriage More Likely to Divorce?* <https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/blog/meet-catch-and-keep/202101/are-couples-that-live-together-before-marriage-more-likely-to>
- Dittmann, R. W., Kappes, M. E., & Kappes, M. H. (1992). Sexual behavior in adolescent and adult females with congenital adrenal hyperplasia. *Psychoneuroendocrinology*, 17(2-3), 153–170. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0306-4530\(92\)90054-b](https://doi.org/10.1016/0306-4530(92)90054-b)
- Doherty, W. J., & al, e. (2002). *Why Marriage Matters: Twenty-One Conclusions from the Social Sciences*. <https://instituteforamericanvalues.org/catalog/pdfs/WhyMarriageMatters1.pdf>
- Dostoevsky, F. (1990). *The Brothers Karamazov* (R. Pevear & e. al, Trans.). Pingatore.
- Dowthwaite-Walsh, L. (2023). *The Paradox of Progress: Why More Freedom Isn't Making Women Happier*. <https://neurosciencenews.com/women-happiness-psychology-23862/>

- Doyle, K. (2021). *42 States Where Private School Costs Less Than Public School*.
<https://www.gobankingrates.com/saving-money/education/private-school-cost-vs-public-school/>
- Doyle, L. (2001). *The Surrendered Wife: A Practical Guide to Finding Intimacy, Passion, and Peace with a Man*. Fireside Books.
- Dubuc, B. (2014). *The brain from top to bottom*. <https://thebrain.mcgill.ca/>
- Dunn, A. (2018). *Partisans are divided over the fairness of the U.S. economy – and why people are rich or poor*. <http://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2018/10/04/partisans-are-divided-over-the-fairness-of-the-u-s-economy-and-why-people-are-rich-or-poor/>
- Dutton, D. G., & Convo, K. (2006). Transforming a Flawed Policy: A Call to Review Psychology and Science in Domestic Violence Research and Practice. *Journal of Aggressive and Violent Behavior*, Vol. 11, Issue 15, pp. 457-483.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2006.01.007>
- Dworkin, A. (1987). *Intercourse*. The Free Press.
- Earls, A. (2019). *Americans Vastly Overestimate LGBT Population*.
<https://research.lifeway.com/2019/07/08/americans-vastly-overestimate-lgbt-population/>
- Ebeling, R. (2017). *Karl Marx Was a Pretty Bad Person*.
<https://intellectuالتakeout.org/2017/02/karl-marx-was-a-pretty-bad-person/>
- Eberstadt, M. (2004). *Home-Alone America – The Hidden Toll of Day Care, Behavioral Drugs, and Other Parental Substitutes*. Sentinel Publishing.
- Eckert, A. J. (2021). *Conclusions Not So NICE: A Critical Analysis of the NICE Evidence Review of Puberty Blockers for Children and Adolescents with Gender Dysphoria*.
<https://sciencebasedmedicine.org/a-critical-look-at-the-nice-review/>
- Elchert, D. M., & Gaasedelen, O. J. (2016). Morality and adult attachment style as predictors of psychotherapy process and outcome expectations. *Counseling & Values*, 61(61), pp. 80-96.
- Ellis, H. (1894). *Man and Woman*, 8th edition rev. William Heinemann (Medical Books), 1934.
- Ennis, D. (2022). *Goodbye, Lia Thomas? New NCAA Trans Student-Athlete Policy Is ‘Effective Immediately’*. <https://www.forbes.com/sites/dawnstaceyennis/2022/01/20/goodbye-lia-thomas-new-ncaa-trans-student-athlete-policy-is-effective-immediately/?sh=6232006a34db>
- Erlangsen, A., Jacobsen, A. L., Ranning, A., Delamare, A. L., Nordentoft, M., & Frisch, M. (2023). Transgender Identity and Suicide Attempts and Mortality in Denmark. *JAMA*, 329(24), 2145-2153. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2023.8627>
- Evans, C., Brown, D., & Davis, J. (2022). Professional counseling from a Christian worldview. *Journal of Spirituality in Mental Health*, Vol. 24, No. 23, pp. 309–326.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/19349637.2021.1885004>
- Everton, S. F., & Schroder, R. (2019). Plagues, Pagans, and Christians: Differential Survival, Social Networks, and the Rise of Christianity. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 58(54), pp. 775–789.
- Exposito-Campos, P., Salaberria, K., Perez-Fernandez, J. I., & Gomez-Gil, E. (2023). Gender detransition: A critical review of the literature. *Actas Esp Psiquiatr*, 51(3), 98-118.
<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/37489555>
- Eysenck, H. (1985). *Decline and Fall of the Freudian Empire*. Viking Press.
- Eysenck, H. J. (1952). The effects of psychotherapy: an evaluation. *J Consult Psychol*, 16(5), 319-324. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0063633>

- Fahmy, D. (2018). *Christian women in the U.S. are more religious than their male counterparts*. <https://www.pewresearch.org/short-reads/2018/04/06/christian-women-in-the-u-s-are-more-religious-than-their-male-counterparts/>
- Faludi, S. (1991). *Backlash: The Undeclared War Against American Women*. Random House.
- FamilyResearchCouncil. (2004). *What Causes Homosexuality?* <https://downloads.frc.org/EF/EF08L41.pdf>
- Farthing, M. (2023). *Woke California Just Went After Its Toy Stores – Plans to Fine Them Big Bucks for Breaking 1 Sick Rule*. <https://pjnewsletter.com/woke-california-toy-stores/>
- Farthing, M. (2024). *Top Hospital Just Went Crazy “Woke” – You Won’t Believe Why They Want to Refuse Care*. https://pjnewsletter.com/top-hospital-just-went-crazy/?utm_medium=email&utm_source=actengage
- Fausto-Sterling, A. (2021). A Dynamic Systems Framework for Gender/Sex Development: From Sensory Input in Infancy to Subjective Certainty in Toddlerhood. *Front Hum Neurosci*, 15, 613789. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fnhum.2021.613789>
- Feilden, T. (2017). *Most scientists 'can't replicate studies by their peers'*. <https://www.bbc.com/news/science-environment-39054778>
- Feinberg, L. (1992). *Transgender Liberation: A Movement Whose Time Has Come*. World View Forum.
- Felluga, D. F. (2015). *Critical Theory: The Key Concepts*. Oxfordshire Press.
- Fernandez, R., Guillaumon, A., Cortes-Cortes, J., Gomez-Gil, E., Jacome, A., Esteva, I., Almaraz, M., Mora, M., Aranda, G., & Pasaro, E. (2018). Molecular basis of Gender Dysphoria: androgen and estrogen receptor interaction. *Psychoneuroendocrinology*, 98, 161-167. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psyneuen.2018.07.032>
- Fincham, F. D., & May, R. W. (2021). Generalized gratitude and prayers of gratitude in marriage. *Journal of Positive Psychology*, Vol. 16, No. 12, pp. 282–287. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17439760.2020.1716053>
- Firestone, S. (1970). *Dialectic of Sex: The Case for Feminist Revolution*. Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
- Fischbach, A., Lichtenthaler, P. W., & Horstmann, N. (2015). Leadership and Gender Stereotyping of Emotions Think Manager – Think Male. *Journal of Personnel Psychology*, Vol. 14(13):153–162. <https://doi.org/10.1027/1866-5888/a000136>
- Fitzsimons, T. (2020). *Lesbians more accepted than gay men around the world, study finds*. <https://www.nbcnews.com/feature/nbc-out/lesbians-more-accepted-gay-men-around-world-study-finds-n1118121>
- Fog, K. (2018). Feminist Censorship: The Lace Curtain, Journal of Information Ethics. *Journal of Information Ethics*, Vol. 27 Issue 21, pp. 95-119.
- Foley, R. (2023). *Practicing Christians give more to charity than non-Christians: study*. <https://www.christianpost.com/news/practicing-christians-give-more-to-charity-than-non-christians.html>
- Foley, R. (2024). *Abortion was the leading cause of death worldwide in 2023*. <https://www.christianpost.com/news/abortion-was-the-top-cause-of-death-worldwide-in-2023.html>
- Foucault, M. (1976). *The History of Sexuality, Volume 1*. Éditions Gallimard.
- Francis, B., Mills, M., & Lupton, R. (2016). Towards social justice in education: contradictions and dilemmas. *Journal of Education Policy*, 32(34), pp. 414-431. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02680939.2016.1276218>

- Frank, H. (2023). *What is the “rural advantage”? New study considers why boys raised in rural poverty economically outperform their urban peers as adults.*
<https://wng.org/roundups/what-is-the-rural-advantage-1701721323>
- Freidman, R. C., & Downey, J. (1993). Neurobiology and Sexual Orientation: Current Relationships. *Journal of Neuropsychiatry and Clinical Neuroscience*, Vol. 5, pp. 131-153. <https://doi.org/10.1176/jnp.5.2.131>
- Freud, S. (1961). *Future of an Illusion* (J. Strachey, Trans.). Norton.
- Friedan, B. (1984). *The Feminine Mystique*. Dell.
- Fujiwara, Y., Miyazaki, W., Koibuchi, N., & Katoh, T. (2018). The Effects of Low-Dose Bisphenol A and Bisphenol F on Neural Differentiation of a Fetal Brain-Derived Neural Progenitor Cell Line. *Front Endocrinol (Lausanne)*, 9, 24.
<https://doi.org/10.3389/fendo.2018.00024>
- Furlong, Y. (2021). Autism and Gender Identity. chap. 3 in Autism Spectrum Disorder-Profile. *IntechOpen*. <https://doi.org/10.5772/intechopen.97517>
- Furstenburg, F. (1998). *How We Unintentionally Injure the Poor - As quoted by Michael Bauman in Dangerous Samaritans.*
- Gallick, S. (2021). *The Causes of Social Pathology.* <https://stevegallik.org/the-causes-of-social-pathology/>
- Galvin, G. (2019). *Study: C-Section Tied to Higher Risk of Autism.*
<https://www.usnews.com/news/health-news/articles/2019-08-28/c-section-tied-to-higher-risk-of-autism-adhd>
- Garai, J. E., & Scheinfeld, A. (1968). Sex differences in mental and behavioral traits. *Generic Psychology Monographs*, 77(72), pp. 169-299.
- Gartner, H. (2023). *Howard Gardner's 9 Types of Intelligence.* <https://practicalpie.com/9-types-of-intelligence/>
- Gauffin, F., Norgren, S., & Savendahl, L. (2021). *Guideline Regarding Hormonal Treatment of Minors with Gender Dysphoria at Tema Barn-Astrid Lindgren Children's Hospital (ALB).*
<https://segm.org/sites/default/files/Karolinska%20Guideline%20K2021-4144%20April%202021%20%28English%2C%20unofficial%20translation%29.pdf>
- Gaulin, S. J., & Fitzgerald, R. W. (1986). Sex Differences in Spatial Ability: An Evolutionary Hypothesis and Test. *The American Naturalist*, 127(121), pp. 174-188.
- Gilder, G. (1986). *Men and Marriage (revised and expanded edition of Sexual Suicide)*. Pelican.
- Gilman, C. P. (1966). *Women and Economics: A Study of the Economic Relations Between Men and Women as a Factor in Social Evolution*. Harper & Row.
- Glasser, W. (1965). *Reality Therapy: A New Approach to Psychiatry*. Harper & Row.
- Glick, P., & al, e. (2000). Beyond Prejudice as Simple Antipathy: Hostile and Benevolent Sexism Across Cultures. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 79, No. 75, pp. 763-775.
- Gloom. (2014). *15 Common Causes Of Suicide: Why Do People Kill Themselves?*
<https://mentalhealthdaily.com/2014/07/23/15-common-causes-of-suicide-why-do-people-kill-themselves/>
- Godwin, W. (1793). *An Enquiry concerning Political Justice, and its Influence on General Virtue and Happiness (2 volumes)*. G. G. J. and J. Robinson.
- Godwin, W. (1798). *Memoirs of the Author of a Vindication of the Rights of Woman*.
- Goldberg, S. (1973). *The Inevitability of Patriarchy*. Morrow.

- Goldberg, S. (1991). *When Wish Replaces Thought – Why So Much of What You Believe is False*. Prometheus Books.
- Goldberg, S. (1993). *Why Men Rule – A Theory of Male Dominance*. Open Court.
- Gorelik, G. (2021). Domains of Female Choice in Human Evolution. *Evolutionary Behavioral Sciences*, 17(12), pp. 187–208. <https://doi.org/10.1037/ebs0000276>
- Gorski, R. A. (1991). Sexual Differentiation of the Endocrine Brain and its Control. *Brain Endocrinology*, Vol. 1, pp. 80-83.
- Gorski, R. A. (1996). Gonadal Hormones and the Organization of Brain Structure and Function. *The Lifespan of Individuals, Behavioral, Neurobiological, and Psychosocial Perspectives*, pp. 317-321.
- Gould, J. (2005). Becoming good: The role of spiritual practice. *Philosophical Practice: Journal of the American Philosophical Practitioners Association*, 1(3), pp. 135-147. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17428170600595846>
- Gould, S. J. (1978). Women's Brains. *New Scientist*, pp. 364-366.
- Goy, R. W., & McEwen, B. S. (1980). *Sexual Differentiation in the Brain*. MIT Press.
- Graaf, N. M., Carmichael, P., Steensma, T. D., & Zucker, K. J. (2018). Evidence for a Change in the Sex Ratio of Children Referred for Gender Dysphoria: Data From the Gender Identity Development Service in London (2000-2017). *Journal of Sexual Medicine*, 15(10), 1381-1383. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsxm.2018.08.002>
- Graglia, F. C. (1998). *Domestic Tranquility: A Brief Against Feminism*. Spense Publishing.
- Graiver, I. (2022). Training the mind: The ascetic path to self-transformation in late antique Christian monasticism. *Journal of Spirituality in Mental Health*, Vol. 24, No. 23, pp. 251–269. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19349637.2021.1894528>
- Grant, G. (1988). *Grand Illusions: The Legacy of Planned Parenthood*. Wolgemuth & Hyatt Publishers.
- Grant, G. (1995). *Killer Angel*. <https://famguardian.org/Subjects/Life/Abortion/KillerAngel.pdf>
- Gray, M. (1979). *Margaret Sanger: A Biography of the Champion of Birth Control*. Richard Marek Publishers.
- Gray, S., Pamer, J., & Jacob, J. (2023). *After Death*. <https://www.angel.com/movies/after-death>
- Greer, G. (1970). *The Female Eunuch*. Harper.
- Grossman, M. (2009). *You're Teaching My Child What? A Physician Exposes the Lies of Sex Education and How They Harm Your Child*. Regnery.
- Gumpel, T. P., Wiesenthal, V., & Soderberg, P. (2015). Narcissism, Perceived Social Status, and Social Cognition and Their Influence on Aggression. *Behavioral Disorders*, 40(42), pp. 138-156.
- GutmacherInstitute. (1993). Statement. *The New York Times*, April 1, p. A1.
- Guy-Evans, O. (2023). *What Is White Matter In The Brain*. <https://www.simplypsychology.org/what-is-white-matter-in-the-brain.html>
- Hadj-Moussa, M., Agarwal, S., Ohl, D. A., & Kuzon, W. M. (2019). Masculinizing Genital Gender Confirmation Surgery. *Sexual Medicine Reviews*, 7(1), 141-155. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sxmr.2018.06.004>
- Hadj-Moussa, M., Ohl, D. A., & Kuzon, W. M. (2017). Feminizing Genital Gender-Confirmation Surgery. *Sexual Medicine Reviews*, 6(3), pp. 457-468. <https://doi.org/10.1016/1.sxmr.2017.11.005>

- Hadj-Moussa, M., Ohl, D. A., & Kuzon, W. M. (2018). Evaluation and Treatment of Gender Dysphoria to Prepare for Gender Confirmation Surgery. *Sexual Medicine Reviews*, 6(4), 607-617. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sxmr.2018.03.006>
- Hakim, C. (1996). *Key Issues in Women's Work: Female Heterogeneity and the Polarization of Women's Employment*. Athlone Press.
- Hakim, C. (2007). Dancing with the Devil? Essentialism and other feminist heresies. *The British Journal of Sociology*, 58(1), 123-132; discussion 133-124. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-4446.2007.00142.x>
- Hall, J. A., & Kimura, D. (1995). Sexual orientation and performance on sexually dimorphic motor tasks. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 24(4), 395-407. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01541855>
- Hallowell, B. (2022). *Do Christians Really Donate More? Bible's Stunning Impact on Charitable Giving Revealed in Fascinating New Study*. <https://www.faithwire.com/2022/11/30/do-christians-really-donate-more-bibles-stunning-impact-on-charitable-giving-revealed-in-fascinating-new-study/>
- Halpern, D. F. (2011). *Sex differences in cognitive abilities (4rd ed.)*. Taylor & Francis Group.
- Hamer, D., & Copeland, P. (1996). *The Science of Desire: The Search for the Gay Gene and the Biology of Behavior*. Simon & Schuster.
- Hamer, D. H., Hu, S., Magnuson, V. L., Hu, N., & M., P. A. (1993). A Linkage Between DNA Markers on the X Chromosome and Male Sex Orientation. *Science*, Vol 261, pp. 321-227. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.8332896>
- Hammond, M. D., Overall, N. C., & Cross, E. J. (2016). Internalizing Sexism Within Close Relationships: Perceptions of Intimate Partners' Benevolent Sexism Promote Women's Endorsement of Benevolent Sexism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Feb, 110(112), pp. 214-238. <https://doi.org/10.1037/pspi0000043>
- Hancock, G. (1989). *Lords of Poverty: The Power, Prestige, and Corruption of the International Aid Business*. Atlantic Monthly Press.
- Harmon-Jones, E., & Winkielman, P. (2014). *Social neuroscience: Integrating biological and psychological explanations of social behavior*. Guilford Publications.
- Harris, L. J. (1978). *Sex Differences in Spatial Ability: Possible Environmental, Genetic, and Neurological Factors: Asymmetrical Function of the Brain*. Cambridge University Press.
- Harris, L. J. (1981). *Sex-Related Variations in Spatial Skills. Spatial Representation and Behavior Across the Life Span*. Academic Press.
- Hatch, T. (2023). *Slavery, and the Bible*. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=OSG2RACsubQ&pp=ygURdGltIGhhdGNoIHNSYXZlcnk%3D>
- Hawley, P. H., & Hensley, W. A. (2009). Social dominance and forceful submission fantasies: feminine pathology or power? *Journal of Sex Research*, 46(6), 568-585. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00224490902878985>
- Hegarty, M. (2017). Ability and sex differences in spatial thinking: What does the mental rotation test really measure? *Psychonomic Society*, pp. 1212-1219. <https://doi.org/10.3758/s13423-017-1347-z>
- Heilbrun, C. G. (1988). *Writing A Woman's Life*. W.W. Norton.
- Herbert, W. (2014). *Why Psychotherapy Appears to Work Even When it Doesn't*. <https://www.psychologicalscience.org/news/were-only-human/why-psychotherapy-appears-to-work-even-when-it-doesnt.html>

- Herek, G. M. (1991). Stigma, Prejudice, and Violence Against Lesbians and Gay Men. Homosexuality Research Implications for Public Policy. *Sage Publications*, p. 62. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781483325422.n5>
- Herron, R., & Bell, K. (2023). *Gender Detranistioning: Ritchie Herron and Keira Bell share their stories*. https://youtu.be/3_EEWmUY-k0
- Hevesi, B. (2021). *The lab leak, the missing scientists, the cover-up: Piecing together 'What Really Happened in Wuhan'*. <https://www.skynews.com.au/world-news/global-affairs/the-lab-leak-the-missing-scientists-the-coverup-piecing-together-what-really-happened-in-wuhan/news-story/122d7cab3d2db39103d75085edb85195>
- Hoffman, M. T. (2020). Christianity and Psychoanalysis: Orienting View and Augmenting Modality. *Psychoanalytic Inquiry*, Vol. 40, No. 46, pp. 395–407. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07351690.2020.1782141>
- Holmberg, D., Thibault, T. M., & Pringle, J. D. (2016). Gender differences in romantic relationship memories: who remembers? Who cares? *Memory*, Vol. 26, No. 26, pp. 816–830. https://www.theepochtimes.com/the-masculinity-message-in-the-lord-of-the-rings_4949399.html?src_src=ref_share&src_cmp=br-cc
- Holmquist, A. (2023). *The Masculinity Message in "The Lord of the Rings"*. https://www.theepochtimes.com/the-masculinity-message-in-the-lord-of-the-rings_4949399.html?src_src=ref_share&src_cmp=br-cc
- Holvoet, L., Huys, W., Coppens, V., Seeuws, J., Goethals, K., & Morrens, M. (2017). Fifty Shades of Belgian Gray: The Prevalence of BDSM-Related Fantasies and Activities in the General Population. *Journal of Sexual Medicine*, 14(9), 1152–1159. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsxm.2017.07.003>
- Honeycutt, N., & Jussim, L. (2020). A Model of Political Bias in Social Science Research. *Psychological Inquiry*, Vol. 31, Issue 31, pp. 73–85.
- Hooper, A. (1994). *Anne Hooper's Kama Sutra*. Carroll & Brown.
- Hope, J. (2007). The great ADHD myth. *Daily Mail*, March 9.
- Hughes, L. D., & al, e. (2021). 'These Laws Will Be Devastating:' Provider Perspectives on Legislation Banning Gender-Affirming Care for Transgender Adolescents. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 69, no. 66 (December 61, 2021): pp. 2976–2082. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jadohealth.2021.08.020>
- Hunter, A., & Hunter, C. (2010). *Opines on Therapy and Counseling*. <http://christiehunter.com/index.htm>
- Huntington, C., Stanley, S. M., Doss, B. D., & Rhoades, G. K. (2022). Happy, Healthy, and Wedded? How the Transition to Marriage Affects Mental and Physical Health. *Journal of Family Psychology*, Vol. 36, No. 34, pp. 608–617. <https://doi.org/10.1037/fam0000913>
- Hutt, C. (1975). Gender Differences: Their Ontogeny and Significance. pp. 73–121.
- Hutt, C. (1976). Biological Bases of Psychological Sex Differences. European Society for Pediatric Endocrinology,
- Hutton, R., & Parris, M. (2015). *Would They Lie to You?: How to Spin Friends and Manipulate People*. Elliott & Thompson.
- Huxley, A. (1958). *Brave New World*.
- Inci, A. C., Narayanan, M. P., & Seyhun, H. N. (2017). Gender Differences in Executives' Access to Information. *Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis*, Vol. 52, No. 53, June, pp. 991–1016.

- Indremo, M., White, R., Frisell, T., Cnattingius, S., Skalkidou, A., Isaksson, J., & Papadopoulos, F. C. (2021). Validity of the Gender Dysphoria diagnosis and incidence trends in Sweden: a nationwide register study. *Scientific Reports*, 11(1), 16168. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-021-95421-9>
- Ingallhalikara, M., & al, e. (2013). Sex differences in the structural connectome of the human brain. *PNAS*, Vol. 111, No. 112, pp. 823–828. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1316909110>
- Iqbal, N. (2015). *Femvertising: how brands are selling #empowerment to women*. <https://www.theguardian.com/lifeandstyle/2015/oct/12/femvertising-branded-feminism>
- Iscoc, L., & Welch, D. (1992). Mother Care: A Career Option For Now. *Hogg Foundation for Mental Health*, pp. 7,10.
- Jackson, E. F., & Bussey, K. (2020). Under Pressure: Differentiating Adolescents' Expectations Regarding Stereotypic Masculine and Feminine Behavior. *Sex Roles*, pp. 303–314. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-019-01113-0>
- Jacobs, T. (2017). *There Aren't As Many Gay People As You Think*. <https://psmag.com/social-justice/there-arent-as-many-gay-people-as-you-think>
- Jaffe-Hoffman, M. (2023). *Dr. Phil slams Ivy Leagues: Are universities becoming 'woke hotbeds?'*. <https://www.msn.com/en-nz/news/other/dr-phil-slams-ivy-leagues-are-universities-becoming-woke-hotbeds/ar-AA1lhDla>
- Jaffe, C. A. (1994). *Second Income May Not Be So Indispensable*.
- James, S. (2020). *Margaret Sanger: Sex as Salvation*. <https://www.christian.org.uk/features/margaret-sanger-sex-as-salvation/>
- Jaslow, R. (2012). *Kids of gay parents fare worse, study finds, but research draws fire from experts*. <https://www.cbsnews.com/news/kids-of-gay-parents-fare-worse-study-finds-but-draws-fire-from-experts/>
- Jay, M. E. (2018). *Sigmund Freud, Austrian psychoanalyst*. <https://www.britannica.com/biography/Sigmund-Freud>
- Jelsma, T. (2022). An Attempt to Understand the Biology of Gender and Gender Dysphoria: A Christian Approach. *Perspectives on Science and Christian Faith*, 74(73), pp. 130-148. <https://doi.org/10.56315/PSCF9-22Jelsma>
- Johnson, R. (2013). *Spirituality in counseling and psychotherapy: An integrative approach that empowers clients*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Johnson, W., Carothers, A., & Deary, I. J. (2008). Sex Differences in Variability in General Intelligence: A New Look at the Old Question. *Association for Psychological Science*, Vol. 3, No. 6, pp. 518-531. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-6924.2008.00096.x>
- Johnston, J. (2018). *Kids Need a Mom and a Dad – That's What the Research Shows*. <https://dailycitizen.focusonthefamily.com/kids-need-a-mom-and-a-dad-thats-what-the-research-shows/>
- Jong, E. (1993). Opinions to the Editor. *The New York Times*, February 10, p. A15.
- Jorgensen, S. (2023). Transition Regret and Detransition: Meanings and Uncertainties. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 52(5), 2173-2184. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10508-023-02626-2>
- Jozifkova, E. (2018). Sexual Arousal by Dominance and Submissiveness in the General Population: How Many, How Strongly, and Why? *Deviant Behavior*, pp. 1229–1236.
- Kanin, E. J. (1994). False rape allegations. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 23(1), 81-92. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01541619>
- Karlen, A. (1971). *Sexuality and Homosexuality*. Norton.

- Karlen, A. (1978). Homosexuality: The Scene and its Students in Henslin, J. & Sagarin. In *The Sociology of Sex* (pp. 247). Schocken Books.
- Karrington, B. (2022). Defining Desistance: Exploring Desistance in Transgender and Gender Expansive Youth Through Systematic Literature Review. *Transgender Health*, 7(3), pp. 189-212. <https://doi.org/10.1089/trgh.2020.0129>
- Kaufmann, E. (2021). *We Have the Data to Prove It: Universities Are Discriminating Against Conservatives*. <https://www.newsweek.com/we-have-data-prove-it-universities-are-hostile-conservatives-opinion-1573551>
- Keller, T. (2016). *Prayer: Experiencing Awe and Intimacy with God*. Penguin.
- Kelly, J. (2008). *Whatever happened to... Robert E. Bauman?* <https://www.baltimoresun.com/news/bs-xpm-2008-04-05-0804050215-story.html>
- Planned Parenthood of Southeastern Pennsylvania v. Casey, (U.S. Supreme Court 1992). <https://www.law.cornell.edu/supremecourt/text/505/833>
- Kerlin, S. (2021). *My 25 Years of Academic Research into Prenatal Diethylstilbestrol (DES) Influences on Gender and Sexual Development in Men and Women, 1995 to 2020*. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/352465694_My_25_Years_of_Academic_Research_Into_Prenatal_Diethylstilbestrol_DES_Influences_on_Gender_and_Sexual_Development_in_Men_and_Women_1995_to_2020
- Kersten, K. (2016). *Transgender Conformity*. <https://www.firstthings.com/article/2016/12/transgender-conformity>
- Kesslen, B. (2021). A Rapid-Onset Gender Theory - Research suggesting a transgender contagion arrived at just the right moment to be taken up by social media and a new wave of anti-trans political effort. MIT Technology Review,
- Ketter, S. (2015). *The 'Wage Gap' Myth That Won't Die - You have to ignore many variables to think women are paid less than men, but California is happy to try*. <https://www.wsj.com/articles/the-wage-gap-myth-that-wont-die-1443654408>
- Kim, C. (2023). *White House bans three guests after topless video at Pride party*. <https://www.bbc.com/news/world-us-canada-65898998>
- Kim, J. H., & Scialli, A. R. (2011). Thalidomide: the tragedy of birth defects and the effective treatment of disease. *Toxicology Science*, 122(1), 1-6. <https://doi.org/10.1093/toxsci/kfr088>
- Kimura, D., & al, e. (1998). Lesbians and the Inner Ear Source. *The Economist*, March, pp. 124-125.
- King, M. L. (1963). *I Have a Dream Speech*. <http://www.let.rug.nl/usa/documents/1951-/martin-luther-kings-i-have-a-dream-speech-august-28-1963.php>
- King, V., Wickrama, K., & Beach, S. (2022). Religiosity and Joint Activities of Husbands and Wives in Enduring Marriages. *Psychology of Religion and Spirituality*, Vol. 14, No. 11, 97-107. <https://doi.org/10.1037/rel0000370>
- Kinsey, A. (1948). *Sexual Behavior in the Human Male*.
- Kling, J., Holmqvist Gattario, K., & Frisen, A. (2017). Swedish women's perceptions of and conformity to feminine norms. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology*, 58(3), 238-248. <https://doi.org/10.1111/sjop.12361>
- Kobie, N. (2019). *The complicated truth about China's social credit system*. <https://www.wired.co.uk/article/china-social-credit-system-explained>

- Kocet, M. M., & Herlihy, B. J. (2014). Addressing value-based conflicts within the counseling relationship: A decision-making model. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, 92(92), pp. 180-186. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6676.2014.00146.x>
- Koertge, N. (1995). How Feminism is Now Alienating Women from Science. *Skeptical Inquirer*, March/April, pp. 42-43.
- Kozłowska, K., & al, e. (2021). Australian Children and Adolescents with Gender Dysphoria: Clinical Presentations and Challenges Experienced by a Multidisciplinary Team and Gender Service. *Human Systems*, No. 1, pp. 70-95. <https://doi.org/10.1177/26344041211010777>
- Kreeft, P. (1995). *Angels and Demons: What Do We Know About Them?* Ignatius Press.
- Kuhn, A., & Wolter, S. (2022). Things versus People: Gender Differences in Vocational Interests and in Occupational Preferences. *Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization*, 203, pp. 210–234. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jebo.2022.09.003>
- Kuhn, T. (1962). *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. University of Chicago Press.
- LaBarbera, R., & Hetzel, J. (2015). Christian Educators' Use of Prayer to Cope with Stress. *Journal of Religious Health*, 55, pp. 1433–1448. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10943-015-0118-2>
- Lafsky, M. (2009). *Is It Possible to Systematically Turn Gay People Straight?* <https://www.discovermagazine.com/mind/is-it-possible-to-systematically-turn-gay-people-straight>
- LaHaye, B. (1998). *The Act of Marriage: The Beauty of Sexual Love*. Zondervan.
- Lai, G. J., Tan, K., Tan, M., Cheong, G., Cheng, C., & Mathew, M. (2023). Dyadic Positive and Negative Religious Coping Among Older Singaporean Couples and Marital Satisfaction. *Journal of Family Psychology*, Vol. 37, No. 32, pp. 268–274. <https://doi.org/10.1037/fam0001025>
- Lambert, J. (2019). No 'gay gene': Massive study homes in on genetic basis of human sexuality. <https://www.nature.com/articles/d41586-019-02585-6>
- Langer, E. (2017). Norma McCorvey, Jane Roe of Roe v. Wade decision legalizing abortion nationwide, dies at 69. https://www.washingtonpost.com/national/norma-mccorvey-jane-roe-of-roe-v-wade-decision-legalizing-abortion-dies-at-69/2017/02/18/24b83108-396e-11e6-8f7c-d4c723a2becb_story.html
- Lankov, A. (2015). *The Real North Korea: Life and Politics in the Failed Stalinist Utopia*. Oxford University Press.
- Lasch, C. (1977). *Haven in a Heartless World: The Family Besieged*. Basic Books.
- Lavin, N. (2023). Rhode Islanders are worried about democracy. What they blame depends on their political party. <https://rhodeislandcurrent.com/2023/11/13/rhode-islanders-are-worried-about-democracy-who-and-what-they-blame-depends-on-their-political-party/?emci=ea86a77f-a881-ee11-8925-00224832e811&emdi=27eda3c9-1382-ee11-8925-00224832e811&ceid=148306>
- Lee, A. (2020). *What is China's social credit system and why is it controversial?* <https://www.scmp.com/economy/china-economy/article/3096090/what-chinas-social-credit-system-and-why-it-controversial>
- Lee, C. J., & al, e. (2015). Bias in Peer Review. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology*, Vol. 82 Issue 85, pp. 1272-1283. <https://doi.org/10.1002/asi.22784>

- Lee, J., Hearon, B. A., & Otto, M. W. (2017). Combined Treatment With CBT and Psychopharmacology. *Science of Cognitive Behavioral Therapy*, pp. 131-153. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-803457-6.00006-4>
- Leef, G. (2023). *A Book to Remind Us of the Evils of Socialism*. <https://www.aier.org/article/a-book-to-remind-us-of-the-evils-of-socialism/>
- Leopold, T. (2018). Gender Differences in the Consequences of Divorce: A Study of Multiple Outcomes. *Demography*, 55(3), 769-797. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13524-018-0667-6>
- Leschied, A. W., & Anne, C. (2004). *Female Adolescent Aggression: A Review of the Literature and the Correlates of Aggression*. <https://www.publicsafety.gc.ca/cnt/rsrscs/pblctns/fml-adlscnt-aggrssn/index-en.aspx>
- LeVay, S. (1991). A Difference in Hypothalamic Structure Between Heterosexual and Homosexual Men. *Science*, August, 253(5023), pp. 1034-5037. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1887219>
- LeVay, S., & Hamer, D. H. (1994). Evidence for a biological influence in male homosexuality. *Scientific American*, 270(5), 44-49. <https://doi.org/10.1038/scientificamerican0594-44>
- Lewis, C. S. (1941). *The Weight of Glory*. <https://www.wheelersburg.net/Downloads/Lewis%20Glory.pdf>
- Lewis, C. S. (1965). *That Hideous Strength*. The Macmillan Company, (originally published in 1946 and the third book in Lewis' Space Trilogy).
- Lightfoot-Klein, H. (1989). Prisoners of Ritual. In *Domestic Tranquility* (pp. 84-86). The Haworth Press.
- Lipman, J. (2015). *Let's Expose the Gender Pay Gap*. <https://www.nytimes.com/2015/08/13/opinion/lets-expose-the-gender-pay-gap.html>
- Lips, H. M. (2013). Acknowledging Discrimination as a Key to the Gender Pay Gap. *Sex Roles*, 68, pp. 223–230. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-012-0245-0>
- Lips, K. A. (2016). *Don't Buy Into The Gender Pay Gap Myth*. <https://www.forbes.com/sites/karinagness/2016/04/12/dont-buy-into-the-gender-pay-gap-myth>
- Littman, L. (2018). Parent reports of adolescents and young adults perceived to show signs of a rapid onset of gender dysphoria. *Plos One*. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0202330>
- Littman, L. (2021). Individuals Treated for Gender Dysphoria with Medical and/or Surgical Transition Who Subsequently Detransitioned: A Survey of 100 Detransitioners. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 50(8), 3353-3369. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10508-021-02163-w>
- Liu, C. (2018). A Theory of Sex Difference in Changes in Marital Sexual Satisfaction. *Evolutionary Behavioral Sciences*, 12(14), pp. 381–393. <https://doi.org/10.1037/ebs0000120>
- Llosa, M. V. (2012). *Notes on the Death of Culture: Essays on Spectacle and Society* (J. King, Trans.). Picadore.
- Lloyd, C., & Waller, R. M. (2020). Demon? Disorder? Or none of the above? A survey of the attitudes and experiences of evangelical Christians with mental distress. *Mental health, Religion & Culture*, Vol. 23, No. 28, pp. 679–690. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13674676.2019.1675148>
- Lucas, T., & al, e. (2004). Marital satisfaction in four cultures as a function of homogamy, male dominance and female attractiveness. *Sexualities, Evolution & Gender*, 6.2–3 August–December, pp. 97–130. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14616660412331327518>

- Ludwikowski, W., & al, e. (2018). Explaining Gender Differences in Interests: The Roles of Instrumentality and Expressiveness. *Journal of Career Assessment*, Vol. 26(22), pp. 240-257.
- Mahfouda, S., Moore, J. K., Siafarikas, A., Zepf, F. D., & Lin, A. (2017). Puberty suppression in transgender children and adolescents. *The Lancet Diabetes and Endocrinology*, 5(10), 816-826. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S2213-8587\(17\)30099-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2213-8587(17)30099-2)
- Mailer, N. (1971). *Prisoner of Sex*. Primus.
- Malone, J., & Elder, L. (2020). *Uncle Tom II: An American Odyssey*.
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=OCwNeVhwTGc>
- Malone, W. (2023). *Study of 1,655 Cases Supports the "Rapid-Onset Gender Dysphoria" Hypothesis*. <https://segm.org/study-of-1655-cases-lends-support-to-ROGD>
- Maltz, W. (1998). *In the Garden of Desire: The Intimate World of Women's Sexual Fantasies*. Broadway Books.
- Marcuse, H. (1965). *Repressive Tolerance - A Critique of Pure Tolerance*. Beacon.
- Marek, S., & al, e. (2022). Reproducible Brain-Wide Association Studies Require Thousands of Individuals. *Nature*, 603, pp. 654-660. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-022-04492-9>
- Martin, M. (1992). *Hostage to the Devil*. Harper.
- Marx, K., & Engels, F. (1848). *Das Kapital, The Communist Manifesto, and other writings*.
- Matthews, J. (1992). *Feminist Censorship*. <https://fee.org/articles/feminist-censorship/>
- May, R. W., Cooper, A. N., & Fincham, F. D. (2020). Prayer in Marriage to Improve Wellness: Relationship Quality and Cardiovascular Functioning. *J Relig Health*, 59(6), 2990-3003. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10943-019-00829-3>
- McCarthy, J. (2019). *Americans Still Greatly Overestimate U.S. Gay Population*. <https://news.gallup.com/poll/259571/americans-greatly-overestimate-gay-population.aspx>
- McCarthy, M. M. (2020). A new view of sexual differentiation of mammalian brain. *J Comp Physiol A Neuroethol Sens Neural Behav Physiol*, 206(3), 369-378. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00359-019-01376-8>
- McCorvey, N., & Thomas, G. (1998). *Won By Love: Norma McCorvey, Jane Roe of Roe v Wade*. Thomas Nelson. and Roe v. McCorvey, Prager Leadership U.
- McDermott, R. C., Naylor, P. D., McKelvey, D., & Kantra, L. (2017). College Men's and Women's Masculine Gender Role Strain and Dating Violence Acceptance Attitudes: Testing Sex as a Moderator. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, Vol. 18, No. 12, pp. 99–111. <https://doi.org/10.1037/men0000044>
- McGrath, R. E. (2019). A Brief History of Psychopharmacology in the Context of Psychology and Psychiatry. *APA handbook of psychopharmacology*, pp.. 3–16. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0000133-001>
- McGuinness, D. (1985). *What Children Don't Learn*. Basic Books.
- McHenry, S. E. (2022). "Gay Is Good": History of Homosexuality in the DSM and Modern Psychiatry. *Psychiatry Online*. <https://doi.org/10.1176/appi.ajp-rj.2022.180103>
- McIntosh, P. (1989). *White privilege: unpacking the invisible knapsack*. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/community.30714426>
- McKusick, L., Horstman, W., & Coates, T. J. (1985). AIDS and sexual behavior reported by gay men in San Francisco. *Am J Public Health*, 75(5), 493-496. <https://doi.org/10.2105/ajph.75.5.493>

- McLanahan, S., Tach, L., & Schneider, D. (2013). The Causal Effects of Father Absence. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 39, 399-427. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-soc-071312-145704>
- Mead, M. (1949). *Male and Female: A Study of the Sexes in a Changing World*. Morrow.
- Mendelson, W. (2022). *Influencer Oli London explains why he detransitioned back to male, blasts 'hypocritical' haters*. <https://www.foxnews.com/entertainment/influencer-oli-london-explains-why-detransitioned-male-blasts-hypocritical-haters>
- Meneau, V. (2020). Coding sexual violence as love – choreographed heteronormative gender performances in Latin American competitive dancing. *Journal of Gender Studies*, Vol. 29, No. 28, pp. 962–980. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09589236.2020.1823824>
- Mercola, J. (2023). *Is Your Gallbladder Causing Digestive Issues?* . https://articles.mercola.com/sites/articles/archive/2023/11/13/gallbladder-digestive-issues.aspx?ui=4d1afcbf5b4a62b114af3d35c3e76460f89794c4d59b0a3a15daf3ec44b5fbc&sd=20231015&cid_source=dnl&cid_medium=email&cid_content=art1HL&cid=20231113&foDate=false&m
- Mikulak, A. (2021). *Researchers find disparities in suicide risk among lesbian, gay, and bisexual adults*. <https://www.nih.gov/news-events/news-releases/researchers-find-disparities-suicide-risk-among-lesbian-gay-bisexual-adults>
- Miller, C. C. (2017). *The Gender Pay Gap Is Largely Because of Motherhood*. <https://www.nytimes.com/2017/05/13/upshot/the-gender-pay-gap-is-largely-because-of-motherhood.html>
- Millet, K. (1969). *Sexual Politics*. Doubleday.
- Millet, K. (1970). Comments. *Barnard Alumnae*, Spring, 1970.
- Mitchell, P. (2017). *What's the definition of feminism? 12 talks that explain it to you*. <https://blog.ted.com/whats-the-definition-of-feminism-12-talks-that-explain-it-to-you/>
- Moir, A., & Jessel, D. (1991). *Brain Sex – The Real Difference Between Men and Women*. Dell.
- Moir, A., & Moir, B. (1999). *Why Men Don't Iron – The Fascinating and Unalterable Differences Between Men and Women*. Citadel Press.
- Moody, R. (2015). *Life After Life*. Harper.
- Moore, M., & Brunsell-Evans, H. (2019). *Inventing Transgender Children and Young People*. <https://www.cambridgescholars.com/resources/pdfs/978-1-5275-3638-8-sample.pdf>
- Moser, C. (2016). Defining Sexual Orientation. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 45(3), 505-508. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10508-015-0625-y>
- MotherTeresa. (1994). *Mother Teresa's National Prayer Breakfast Message*. <https://www.crossroadsinitiative.com/media/articles/mother-teresas-national-prayer-breakfast-message/>
- Moulton-Tetlock, E. E., Ahn, J. N., Haines, E. L., & Mason, M. F. (2018). Women's Work: Remembering Communal Goals. *Motivation Science*, 5(2), pp. 157–178. <https://doi.org/10.1037/mot0000109>
- Mueser, K. T., & Gingerich, S. (2006). *The Complete Family Guide to Schizophrenia*. Guilford Press.
- Muravchik, J. M. (2002). *Heaven on Earth: The Rise and Fall of Socialism*. Encounter Books.
- Neate, R. (2018). *Generation wealth: how the modern world fell in love with money*. <https://www.theguardian.com/global/2018/jul/08/generation-wealth-how-the-modern-world-fell-in-love-with-money>

- Nemko, M. (2016). *Is Psychotherapy Worth It?* .
<https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/blog/how-do-life/201603/is-psychotherapy-worth-it>
- Netchaeva, E., Sheppard, L. D., & Balushkina, T. (2022). A meta-analytic review of the gender difference in leadership aspirations. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 137 103744.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2022.103744>
- Newman, A. (2020). *The Sordid History and Deadly Consequences of 'Sex Ed' at School*.
<https://illinoisfamily.org/education/the-sordid-history-and-deadly-consequences-of-sex-ed-at-school/>
- Newport, F. (2015). *Americans Greatly Overestimate Percent Gay, Lesbian in U.S.*
<https://news.gallup.com/poll/183383/americans-greatly-overestimate-percent-gay-lesbian.aspx>
- Nightingale, E. (1956). *The Strangest Secret*. <https://ia801400.us.archive.org/24/items/e.-nightingale/E.%20Nightingale%20%21.pdf>
- Nikel, D. (2022). *World Happiness Report: Are The Nordic Countries Really So Happy?*
<https://www.forbes.com/sites/davidnikel/2022/03/19/world-happiness-report-are-the-nordic-countries-really-so-happy/?sh=87a2b765d1c4>
- Nindl, B. C., Scoville, C. R., Sheehan, K. M., Leone, C. D., & Mello, R. P. (2002). Gender differences in regional body composition and somatotrophic influences of IGF-I and leptin. *Journal of Applied Physiology*, 92(4), 1611-1618.
<https://doi.org/10.1152/japplphysiol.00892.2001>
- Nissley, L. (2019). *An Amazing Secret to Marriage Success*.
<https://www.encompasscc.org/blog/an-amazing-secret-to-marriage-success#:~:text=A%201997%20Gallup%20Poll%20done,is%201%20out%20of%201%2C152>
- Norman, J. (1974). *Imaginative Sex*. Daw Books.
- Norris, P. (2020). *Closed Minds? Is a 'Cancel Culture' Stifling Academic Freedom and Intellectual Debate in Political Science?* <https://www.encompasscc.org/blog/an-amazing-secret-to-marriage-success#:~:text=A%201997%20Gallup%20Poll%20done,is%201%20out%20of%201%2C152>.
- North, A. (2018). *Why women are worried about #MeToo*.
<https://www.vox.com/2018/4/5/17157240/me-too-movement-sexual-harassment-aziz-ansari-accusation>
- O'Connor, P. J., & Brown, C. M. (2016). Sex-linked personality traits and stress: Emotional skills protect feminine women from stress but not feminine men. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 99, pp. 28–32. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2016.04.075>
- O'Neill, B. (2015). *New Feminism's War on Women*. <https://www.cis.org.au/wp-content/uploads/2015/03/31-2-oneill-brendan.pdf>
- O'Reilly-Treiter, M., & al, e. (2020). Having a Baby: Impact on Married and Cohabiting Parents' Relationships. *Family Process*, Vol. 60, No. 62, pp. 477–492.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/famp.12567>
- Oxenhandler, N. (1999). Room to Grow. *The Reader's Digest*, December.
- Paglia, C. (1991). *Sexual Personae: Art and Decadence from Nefertiti to Emily Dickinson*. Vintage.

- Panreck, H. (2022). *Stacey Abrams suggests having an abortion as solution to inflation: 'Economic realities of having a child.* <https://www.foxnews.com/media/stacey-abrams-suggests-having-abortion-solution-inflation-economic-realities-having-child>
- Panzer, R. A. (1997). *Condom Nation: Blind Faith, Bad Science*. Center for Educational Media.
- Parker, S. (2009). *Inner cities a snapshot of America's future* Perspectives,
- Parris, M. (2008). *As an atheist, I truly believe Africa needs God.* <https://virtueonline.org/atheist-i-truly-believe-africa-needs-god-matthew-parris>
- Patchin, J. W. (2019). *School Bullying Rates Increase by 35% from 2016 to 2019.* <https://cyberbullying.org/school-bullying-rates-increase-by-35-from-2016-to-2019>
- Patel, S., & al, e. (1995). Personality and Emotional Correlates if Self-Reported Anti-Gay Behaviors. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 10(13), pp. 354-366. <https://doi.org/10.1177/088626095010003008>
- PatriotPost. (2018). *PC Police Suppress Another Scientific Study.* <https://patriotsnews.com/pc-police-suppress-another-scientific-study-the-patriot-post/>
- Pease, H. (2011). *The Pilgrim's Failed Socialist Experiment.* <http://libertyunderfire.org/2011/11/1430/>
- Pederson, J. (2022). *The Monster Behind Gender Theory, and the Atrocious Lie He Based It On.* <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=0Zw1EdRKoel>
- Pederson, J. (2023). *Stop the Butchers - Detransition: The Wounds That Won't Heal – Interview with Chloe Cole.* <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=6O3MzPeomqs>
- Pederson, J., & Grossman, M. (2023). *Parental Trauma in a World of Gender Insanity.* https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Su2Z4_iQH4
- Perry, M. (2021). *Women Earned the Majority of Doctoral Degrees in 2020 for the 12th Straight Year and Outnumber Men in Grad School 148 to 100.* <https://www.aei.org/carpe-diem/women-earned-the-majority-of-doctoral-degrees-in-2020-for-the-12th-straight-year-and-outnumber-men-in-grad-school-148-to-100/>
- Peteet, J. R. (2017). What is the clinician's role in the patient's moral and spiritual life? A kierkegaardian contribution. *Spirituality in Clinical Practice*, 4(3), pp. 205-208.
- Petherick, A. (2016). *Gains in women's rights haven't made women happier. Why is that?* <https://www.theguardian.com/lifeandstyle/2016/may/18/womens-rights-happiness-wellbeing-gender-gap>
- Phillips, A. (2023). *How Many Mass Shootings Have Been Carried Out by Transgender People?* <https://www.newsweek.com/mass-shootings-transgender-perpetrators-1790854>
- Petrokovski, S. G., M. (2017). *Researchers identify 6,500 genes that are expressed differently in men and women.* <https://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2017/05/170504104342.htm>
- Pillard, R. C., & Bailey, J.M. (1998). Human sexual orientation has a heritable component. *Human Biology*, April, 70(72), pp. 347-365.
- Pokorski, R. (2013). *Margaret Sanger Papers Project.* <https://sangerpapers.wordpress.com/2013/10/25/the-origins-of-the-woman-rebel/>
- Poulter, B. (2023). *UPenn Board Of Trustees Holds Emergency Meeting Following Disastrous Hearing Featuring School's President.* <https://dailycaller.com/2023/12/07/upenn-board-of-trustees-holds-emergency-meeting-following-disastrous-hearing-featuring-schools-president/>
- Prager, D. (2018). *A Middle-Aged Career Woman on the Lies of Feminism She Learned Too Late.* <https://www.dailysignal.com/2018/11/27/a-middle-aged-career-woman-on-the-lies-of-feminism-she-learned-too-late/>

- Prager, D. (2023). *Why are more Americans than ever committing suicide?*
<https://www.bizpacreview.com/2023/08/15/dennis-prager-why-are-more-americans-than-ever-committing-suicide-1386860/>
- Prescott, S. (2021). *Six states have now passed LGBTQ+ inclusive curriculum legislation—each with a different definition of ‘inclusion’*. New America.
<https://www.newamerica.org/education-policy/edcentral/six-states-have-now-passed-lgbtq-inclusive-curriculum-legislationeach-with-a-different-definition-of-inclusion/>
- Prestigiacomio, A. (2023a). ‘Bigger, Stronger, Faster!’: U.S. Soccer Legend Carli Lloyd Says, Yes, Women’s Team Lost To 15-Year-Old Boys. <https://www.dailywire.com/news/bigger-stronger-faster-u-s-soccer-legend-carli-lloyd-says-yes-womens-team-lost-to-15-year-old-boys>
- Prestigiacomio, A. (2023b). ‘It Was Like A Science Class’: Grown-Up ‘Trans Kid’ Details Horrors Of Trans Surgeries In Candace Owens Interview.
<https://www.dailywire.com/news/it-was-like-a-science-class-grown-up-trans-kid-details-horrors-of-trans-surgeries-in-candace-owens-interview>
- Puts, D. A., Welling, L., Burriss, R. P., & Dawood, K. (2012). Men's masculinity and attractiveness predict their female partners' reported orgasm frequency and timing. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, 33, pp. 31–39.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.evolhumbehav.2011.03.003>
- Rahman, K. (2023). *Video of Drag Marchers Chanting 'We're Coming For Your Children' Goes Viral*. Newsweek. <https://www.newsweek.com/video-drag-marchers-chanting-viral-1808870>
- Raiku, F. A. (2020). *Therapy is useless. Easiest scam in mental health*.
https://www.reddit.com/r/offmychest/comments/d5jkd1/therapy_is_useless_easiest_scam_in_mental_health
- Rainwater, L. Y., W.L. (1967). *The Moynihan Report and the Politics of Controversy*. MIT Press.
- Rantz, J. (2023). *WA laws now allow teen gender reassignment surgery without parental consent*.
<https://mynorthwest.com/3296653/rantz-washington-laws-permit-teen-gender-reassignment-surgery-parental-consent/>
- Ray, B. (1997). *Strengths of Their Own: Home Schoolers Across America*. National Home Education Research Institute.
- Reilly, D., Neumann, D. L., & Andrews, G. (2019). Gender differences in reading and writing achievement: Evidence from the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP). *American Psychologist*, 74(4), 445-458. <https://doi.org/10.1037/amp0000356>
- Reinisch, J. M. (1974). Fetal hormones, the brain, and human sex differences: a heuristic, integrative review of the recent literature. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 3(1), 51-90.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01541042>
- Reinisch, J. M. (1987). *Masculinity and Femininity, Kinsey Institute Series*. Oxford University Press.
- Remafedi, G. (1992). Deomography of Sexual Orientation in Adolescents. *Pediatrics*, 89(84), pp. 714-721. <https://doi.org/10.1542/peds.89.4.714>
- Renaud, C., & Byers, S. E. (2005). Relationship between sexual violence and positive and negative cognitions of sexual dominance. *Sex Roles*, 53(53-54), pp. 253-260.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-005-5683-5>
- Reuben, D. (1971). *Everything You Always Wanted to Know About Sex but Were Afraid to Ask*. Bantam Books.

- Ribar, D. (2015). *Why Marriage Matters for Child Wellbeing*. Princeton-Brookings.
https://futureofchildren.princeton.edu/sites/g/files/toruqf2411/files/media/marriage_and_child_wellbeing_revisited_25_2_full_journal.pdf
- Riley, N. S. (2020). *Why 60 years of feminism has not made women any happier*.
<https://nypost.com/2022/10/29/why-60-years-of-feminism-has-not-made-women-any-happier/>
- Ritchie, S. (2020). *Science Fictions: How Fraud, Bias, Negligence, and Hype Undermine the Search for Truth*. Metropolitan Books.
- Rivera, C. (1995). Violence Against Children at Crisis Level. *Austin American-Statesman*, April 26, p. A21.
- Rizza, J. (2009). Beyond Duluth: A Broad Spectrum of Treatment for a Broad Spectrum Domestic Violence. *Montana Law Review*.
- Robbins, B. G., Dechter, A., & Kornricha, S. (2022). Assessing the Deinstitutionalization of Marriage Thesis: An Experimental Test. *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 87(82), pp. 237–274. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00031224221080960>
- Robinson, J., & Love, P. (2012). *Hot Monogamy: Essential Steps to More Passionate, Intimate Lovemaking*. CreateSpace.
- Robinson, M. N. (1959). *he Power of Sexual Surrender: A Psychiatrist Looks at Women's Central Problem and Shows How She May Overcome it through the Power of Surrender*. Doubleday.
- Rodgers, G., & Semple, L. (1990). *Who Watches the Watchwomen? Feminists against Censorship*. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/1395106>
- Rogers, G. (2018). *How Testosterone Benefits Your Body*.
<https://www.healthline.com/health/benefits-testosterone>
- Rosen, H. (2013). *The Gender Wage Gap Lie*.
http://www.slate.com/articles/double_x/doublex/2013/08/gender_pay_gap_the_familiar_line_that_women_make_77_cents_to_every_man_s.html
- Roser, M., Appel, C., & Ritchie, H. (2013). *Human height*. <https://ourworldindata.org/human-height>
- Rosiak, L. (2023). *Nashville Shooter Decried 'Crackers' And 'White Privilege,' Leaked Manifesto Pages Reveal*. <https://www.dailywire.com/news/nashville-shooter-decried-crackers-and-white-privilege-leaked-manifesto-pages-reveal>
- Rosiak, L. (2024). *HHS Says It Has Only Two Pages Of Scientific Evidence Backing Its Support For "Gender-Affirming Care"*. Daily Signal. <https://www.dailywire.com/news/hhs-says-it-has-only-two-pages-of-scientific-evidence-backing-its-support-for-gender-affirming-care>
- Rothschild, N. (2021). *Young Dems more likely to despise the other party*.
<https://www.axios.com/2021/12/08/poll-political-polarization-students>
- Rouhandeh, A. J. (2020). *Big Pharma's Game of Control*. <https://prospect.org/coronavirus/big-pharmas-game-of-control-covid-drug-treatment/>
- RoyalCourt. (2020). *Neutral Citation Number: [2020] EWHC 3274 (Admin), "Bell-v-Tavistock Judgment.Pdf," case no. CO/60/2020*. <https://www.judiciary.uk/wp-content/uploads/2020/12/Bell-v-Tavistock-Judgment.pdf>
- Rudden, M. G. (2022). Misogyny and gender role straight-jackets: A psychoanalytic perspective. *Psychoanalytic Inquiry*, Vol 42(47), October, pp. 557-566.
- Rufo, C. F. (2023). Inside the Transgender Empire. *Imprimis*, September, Vol. 52, No. 59.

- Ruppin, U., & Pfafflin, F. (2015). Long-Term Follow-Up of Adults with Gender Identity Disorder. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 44(5), 1321-1329. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10508-014-0453-5>
- Rutherford, A., & Pettit, M. (2015). *Feminism and/in/as Psychology*. <https://www.apa.org/pubs/journals/special/5581805>
- Sadalla, E. K., Kenrick, D. T., & Vershure, B. (1987). Dominance and heterosexual attraction. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 52, No. 54, pp. 730-738.
- Sahakian, T. (2023). 'DINK' couples receive mixed responses after flaunting child-free lifestyle on TikTok. <https://www.foxnews.com/media/dink-couples-receive-mixed-responses-flaunting-child-free-lifestyle-tiktok>
- Sanchez, D. T., Fetterolf, J. C., & Rudman, L. A. (2012). Eroticizing inequality in the United States: the consequences and determinants of traditional gender role adherence in intimate relationships. *Journal of Sex Research*, 49(2-3), 168-183. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00224499.2011.653699>
- Sánchez, R. R. (2022). *How Can We Explain Rising Gender Dysphoria Among Girls?* <https://www.newsweek.com/how-can-we-explain-rising-gender-dysphoria-among-girls-opinion-1738260>
- Sanderson, D. (2024). *Parents who refuse children gender change face seven years in jail in Scotland*. <https://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/2024/01/09/parents-refuse-child-gender-change-jail-snp-conversion-ban/>
- Sandini, T. M., & al, e. (2023). *Repeated exposure to high-THC Cannabis smoke during gestation alters sex ratio, behavior, and amygdala gene expression of Sprague Dawley rat offspring*. <https://www.eneuro.org/content/early/2023/11/10/ENEURO.0100-23.2023>
- Sarchie, R., & Cool, L. C. (2001). *Deliver Us from Evil*. St Martin's Griffin.
- Sarre, R., & al, e. (2021). *Men are more likely to commit violent crimes. Why is this so and how do we change it?* <https://theconversation.com/men-are-more-likely-to-commit-violent-crimes-why-is-this-so-and-how-do-we-change-it-157331>
- SaturdayReview. (1975). *Sex, Society and the Female Dilemma – A Dialogue between Simone de Beauvoir and Betty Friedan*. <http://64.62.200.70/PERIODICAL/PDF/SaturdayRev-1975jun14/14-24/>
- Scales, A. (1990). Comments. *Yale Law School Review*.
- Schlott, R. (2024). *Elite colleges have turned into the cesspools of bigotry they once claimed to be fighting*. New York Post. <https://nypost.com/2024/02/08/opinion/colleges-have-a-double-standard-about-antisemitism/>
- Schwanberg, S. L. (1993). Attitudes Toward Gay Men and Lesbian Women: Instrumental Issues. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 26(21), pp. 99-136. https://doi.org/10.1300/J082v26n01_08
- Schwartz, B. (2016). *The Paradox of Choice: Why More is Less*. <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=VO6XEQIsCoM>
- Segal, L. (1995). *Feminism and the Family. Gender, Power, and Relationships*. Routledge.
- Seiler, L. (2023). *How Jesus Redeemed My Gender Confusion*. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=W4WxPhWdU60>
- Sensoy, O., & DiAngelo, R. (2017). *Is Everyone Really Equal?: An Introduction to Key Concepts in Social Justice Education*. Teachers College Press.
- Shaw, R. (2003). *The Epidemic – The Rot of American Culture, Absentee and Permissive Parenting, and the Resultant Plague of Joyless, Selfish Children*. Reagan Books.
- Shelley, P. B. (1971). *Poetical Works* (T. Hutchinson, Ed.). Oxford University Press.

- Shelton, M. (2016). *Male Bisexuality: Current Research Findings*.
<https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/blog/sex-life-the-american-male/201601/male-bisexuality-current-research-findings>
- Shi, Z. (2023). The Impact of Early Sexual Activities to Mental Health for Adolescents. *Proceedings of the 4th International Conference on Educational Innovation and Philosophical Inquiries*, 11(11), pp. 208-213. <https://doi.org/10.54254/2753-7048/11/20230742>
- Shlemon, A. (2012). *Can Homosexuals Change Their Orientation?* <https://www.str.org/w/can-homosexuals-change-their-orientation->
- Shrier, A. (2021). *Irreversible Damage: The Transgender Craze Seducing Our Daughters*. Regnery.
- Shvanyukova, P. (2022). We need to talk about gender: anti-feminist, anti-gender backlash all'italiana. *European Journal of English Studies*, 26(22), pp. 197-219.
- Siegelman, C. K., & al, e. (1991). Courtesy Stigma: the Social Implications of Associating with a Gay Person. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 131(131), p. 149.
- Siegelman, M. (1974). Parental background of male homosexuals and heterosexuals. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 3(1), 3-18. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01541038>
- Siler-Kohodr, T. M. (1978). Studies in human fetal endocrinology. *American Journal of Obstetrics and Gynecology*, 130, pp. 795-800.
- Silverstein, J. (2021). *Stanford student senator says 'White people need to be eradicated'*. <https://www.thecollegefix.com/stanford-student-senator-says-white-people-need-to-be-eradicated/>
- Simon, A. (2022). *The Tragic Real-Life Story of Greg Louganis*.
<https://www.grunge.com/463849/the-tragic-real-life-story-of-greg-louganis/>
- Singh, D., Bradley, S. J., & Zucker, K. J. (2021). A Follow-Up Study of Boys With Gender Identity Disorder. *Frontiers in Psychiatry*, 12, 632784.
<https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsy.2021.632784>
- Skinner, B. F. (1971). *Beyond Freedom and Dignity*.
- Skorska, M. N., Blanchard, R., VanderLaan, D. P., Zucker, K. J., & Bogaert, A. F. (2017). Gay Male Only-Children: Evidence for Low Birth Weight and High Maternal Miscarriage Rates. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 46(1), 205-215. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10508-016-0829-9>
- Smith, W. J. (2021). *Planned Parenthood Founder Margaret Sanger Boosted Racism by Embracing Racists*. <https://www.nationalreview.com/corner/planned-parenthood-founder-margaret-sanger-boosted-racism-by-embracing-racists/>
- Soh, D. (2020). *The End of Gender: Debunking the Myths about Sex and Identity in Our Society*. Threshold Editions.
- Sommers, C. H. (2012). *Who Stole Feminism? How Women Have Betrayed Women*. Simon & Schuster.
- Sorensen, R. B. (2009). *Accuracy of the Bible and Questioning God*.
https://www.academia.edu/42748548/Accuracy_of_the_Bible_and_Questioning_God
- Sorensen, R. B. (2010). *Criticism of the Church*.
https://www.academia.edu/42210577/Criticism_of_the_Church
- Sorensen, R. B. (2011). *Commentary on the Song of Solomon*.
https://www.academia.edu/42179283/Commentary_on_the_Song_of_Solomon

- Sorensen, R. B. (2012). *The True Conspiracy*.
https://www.academia.edu/42309829/The_True_Conspiracy
- Sorensen, R. B. (2020). *The Darwinian Emperor is Naked*.
https://www.academia.edu/42232462/The_Darwinian_Emperor_is_Naked
- Sorensen, R. B. (2024). *Gender and the Bible*.
https://www.academia.edu/113541703/Gender_and_the_Bible
- Sowell, T. (1995). *The Vision of the Anointed – Self-Congratulation as a Basis for Social Policy*. Basic Books.
- Sowell, T. (2011). *Economic Facts and Fallacies*. Basic Books.
- Squazzoni, F., & al, e. (2021). *Peer review and gender bias: A study on 145 scholarly journals*.
<https://www.science.org/doi/10.1126/sciadv.abd0299>
- Stacey, J. (1998). Dangerous Samaritans – How We Unintentionally Injure the Poor. *Imprimas*, As quoted by Michael Bauman.
- Staines, G. L., Pottick, K. J., & Fudge, D. A. (2021). The Effects of Wives' Employment on Husbands' Job and Life Satisfaction. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, Vol. 71, No. 71.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-6402.1985.tb0089>
- Standing, E. M. (1962). *Marie Montessori: Her Life and Work*. New American Library.
- Stanley, W. B. (2000). As Nature Made Him: The Boy Who Was Raised as a Girl. *Educational Studies*. Winter2000, Vol. 2031 Issue 2004, p. 2469.
- Stanton, E. C. (1868). *The Destructive Male*.
http://edchange.org/multicultural/speeches/stanton_destructive_male.html
- Stark, R. (2016). *Bearing False Witness: Debunking Centuries of Anti-Catholic History*. Templeton Press.
- Statista. (2023). *Number of violent crime victims in the United States from 2005 to 2022, by gender*. <https://www.statista.com/statistics/423245/us-violent-crime-victims-by-gender/>
- Steensma, T. D., Biemond, R., de Boer, F., & Cohen-Kettenis, P. T. (2011). Desisting and persisting gender dysphoria after childhood: a qualitative follow-up study. *Clinical Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 16(4), 499-516. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1359104510378303>
- Stefan, S., & al, e. (2018). Cognitive-behavioral therapy (CBT) for generalized anxiety disorder: Contrasting various CBT approaches in a randomized clinical trial. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 75, pp. 1188–1202. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jclp.22779>
- Steinbuch, Y. (2020). *Black Lives Matter co-founder describes herself as 'trained Marxist'*.
<https://nypost.com/2020/06/25/blm-co-founder-describes-herself-as-trained-marxist/>
- Steinbuch, Y. (2024). *Five trans players dominate women's college volleyball game, sparking outrage*. New York Post. <https://nypost.com/2024/02/07/news/video-allegedly-showing-five-trans-players-playing-in-womens-volleyball-game-sparks-outrage/>
- Stephenson, J. (1998). The Two-Parent Family Is Not the Best. *Imprimas*, quoted by Michael Bauman in *Dangerous Samaritans – How We Unintentionally Injure the Poor*.
- Stojmenovska, D. (2023). Gender Differences in Job Resources and Strains in Authority Positions. *Gender and Society*, Vol 37, No. 32, April, pp. 240–267.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/08912432231159334>
- Straus, M. A. (2007). Dominance and symmetry in partner violence by male and female university students in 32 nations. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 30, pp. 252–275.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2007.10.004>

- Strawn, B. D. (2022). Christian Spiritually Integrated Psychotherapy. *Spiritual Diversity in Psychotherapy: Engaging the Sacred in Clinical Practice*.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/0000276-007>
- Street, C., & Ward, K. W. (2019). Cognitive Bias in the Peer Review Process – Understanding a Source of Friction between Reviewers and Researchers. *CM SIGMIS Database*, 50(54), pp. 52-70.
- Strkalj, G., & Pather, N. (2021). Beyond the Sex Binary: Toward the Inclusive Anatomical Sciences Education. *Anatomical Sciences Education*, 14(4), 513-518.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/ase.2002>
- Stryker, S. (2006). *(De)Subjugating Knowledge: An Introduction to Transgender Studies: Transgender Studies Reader*. Routledge.
- StudentsForLife. (2023). *Post-Abortion Syndrome*. <https://www.prolifefuture.org/abortion-facts/post-abortion-syndrome/>
- Sullivan, B. (2019). *Stop calling it a choice: Biological factors drive homosexuality*.
<https://theconversation.com/stop-calling-it-a-choice-biological-factors-drive-homosexuality-122764>
- Sullivan, D. (2023). *Why People in "Blue Zones" Live Longer Than the Rest of the World*.
<https://www.healthline.com/nutrition/blue-zones>
- Swaab, D. F. (1995). Development of the human hypothalamus. *Neurochemical Research*, 20(5), 509-519. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01694533>
- Swaab, D. F., Gooren, L. J., & Hofman, M. A. (1995). Brain research, gender and sexual orientation. *Journal of Homosex*, 28(3-4), 283-301.
https://doi.org/10.1300/J082v28n03_07
- Szelewa, D. (2014). The Second Wave of Anti-Feminism? Post-crisis Maternalist Policies and the Attack on the Concept of Gender in Poland. *Gender Equal Opportunities Research*, 15(12) pp. 33-47. <https://doi.org/10.13060/12130028.2014.15.2.129>
- Tapson, M. (2018). *My Sister Kate: The Destructive Feminist Legacy of Kate Millett - A conversation with the feminist icon's sister*. <https://www.frontpagemag.com/my-sister-kate-destructive-feminist-legacy-kate-mark-tapson/>
- Thaler, M. (2021). Gender differences in motivated reasoning. *Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization*, 191, pp. 501-518. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jebo.2021.09.016>
- Thrift, E., & Sugarman, J. (2019). What Is Social Justice? Implications for Psychology. *Theoretical and Philosophical Psychology*, 39(31), pp. 31-17.
- Tiffany, K. (2019). *Why Gillette's toxic masculinity ad is annoying both sexists and feminists*.
<https://www.vox.com/the-goods/2019/1/15/18184072/gillette-toxic-masculinity-ad-super-bowl-feminism>
- Tiger, L. (1998). *Men In Groups*. Marion Boyars.
- Tinsley, C. H., Howell, T. M., & Amanatullah, E. T. (2014). Who should bring home the bacon? How deterministic views of gender constrain spousal wage preferences. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 126, pp. 137-148.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.obhdp.2014.09.003>
- Tipler, F. J. (1994). *The Physics of Immortality: Modern Cosmology, God, and the Resurrection from the Dead*. Doubleday.
- Tipler, F. J. (2007). *The Physics of Christianity*. Doubleday.
- Tomassi, R. (2013). *The Rational Male*. Counterflow Media.

- Torres, M. (2024). *Family flees US after teacher spurs, hides 10-year-old daughter's gender 'transition'*. New York Post. <https://nypost.com/2024/02/01/opinion/family-flees-us-after-teacher-spurs-hides-10-year-old-daughters-gender-transition/>
- Trueman, C. R. (2020). *The Rise and Triumph of the Modern Self: Cultural Amnesia, Expressive Individualism, and the Road to Sexual Revolution*. Crossway.
- Tsaousides, T. (2016). *The 3 Reasons Why Psychotherapy Fails*. <https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/blog/smashing-the-brainblocks/201603/the-3-reasons-why-psychotherapy-fails>
- Tseelon, E. (1995). The Little Mermaid: An icon of women's condition in patriarchy and the human condition of castration. *International Journal of Psychoanalysis*, Vol 76(75), October, pp. 1017-1020.
- Turley, E. L., King, Nigel, & Monro, S. (2018). 'You want to be swept up in it all': illuminating the erotic in BDSM. *Psychology and Sexuality*, Vol. 9, No. 2, 148–160. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19419899.2018.1448297>
- Udry, J. R., & Talbert, L.M. (1988). Sex Hormone Effects on Personality at Puberty. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Feb, 54(52), pp. 291-295. <https://doi.org/10.1037//0022-3514.54.2.291>
- Ulam, A. (1973). *Stalin: The Man and His Era*. Garzanti.
- UniverseInsideYou. (2020). *How Rockefeller Monopolized Medicine and Created Big Pharma*. <https://universe-inside-you.com/rockefeller-big-pharma/>
- UrbanInstitute. (1999). Families Who Left Welfare: Who are They and How are They Doing? *Family Policy*, as quoted by Amy Sherman, Changing the Face of Welfare - The Family Research Council, November – December, p. 3.
- Vall, B., Seikkula, J., Laitila, A., Holma, J., & Botella, L. (2014). Increasing responsibility, safety, and trust through a dialogical approach: A case study in couple therapy for psychological abusive behavior. *Journal of Family Psychotherapy*, pp. 299. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08975353.2014.977672>
- Vålsan, L. (2014). *Simone de Beauvoir: A Nazi, a Pedophile, and a Misogynist*. <https://avoicemen.com/featured/simone-de-beauvoir-a-nazi-a-pedophile-and-a-misogynist/>
- Van Bavel, J., & al, e. (2020). Breaking Groupthink: Why Scientific Identity and Norms Mitigate Ideological Epistemology. *Psychological Inquiry*, Vol. 31, No. 31, pp. 66–72. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1047840X.2020.1722599>
- Van de Velde, T. (1966). *Ideal Marriage*. Random House.
- Van Leerdam, T., Zajac, J. D., & Cheung, A. S. (2021). The Effect of Gender-Affirming Hormones on Gender Dysphoria, Quality of Life, and Psychological Functioning in Transgender Individuals: A Systematic Review. *Transgender Health*, 8(1), pp. 6-21. <https://doi.org/10.1089/trgh.2020.0094>
- Vandenbussche, E. (2022). Detransition-Related Needs and Support: A Cross-Sectional Online Survey. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 69(9), 1602-1620. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00918369.2021.1919479>
- Vigilante, R. (1992). Workingman's Blues? *National Review*, April, p. 47.
- Vincent, N. (2006). *Self-Made Man – One Woman's Year Disguised as a Man*. Penguin.
- Vlastos, G. (1981). *Platonic Studies*. <https://archive.org/details/platonicstudies0000vlas>
- Vrouenraets, L. J., Fredriks, A. M., Hannema, S. E., Cohen-Kettenis, P. T., & de Vries, M. C. (2015). Early Medical Treatment of Children and Adolescents With Gender Dysphoria:

- An Empirical Ethical Study. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 57(4), 367-373.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jadohealth.2015.04.004>
- Waggoner, M. D. (2012). *When the Court Took on Prayer and the Bible in Public Schools*.
<https://religionandpolitics.org/2012/06/25/when-the-court-took-on-prayer-the-bible-and-public-schools/>
- Waidzunus, T., & Ericksen, J. (2016). Book Review of *Fuckology: Critical Essays on John Money's Diagnostic Concepts*. *Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences*, Vol. 52(51), pp. 74–75. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jhbs.21753>
- Waitley, D. (1979). *The Psychology of Winning*. <https://deniswaitley.com>
- Waldis, L., Borter, N., & Rammsayer, T. H. (2020). On the Functional Relationships Among Sexual Orientation, Masculine and Feminine Gender Role Orientation, and Sociosexual Orientation in Young Heterosexual and Lesbian Women. *Journal of Sex Research*, Vol. 57, No. 58, pp. 1048–1058. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00224499.2020.1717413>
- Walia, R., Singla, M., Vaiphei, K., Kumar, S., & Bhansali, A. (2018). Disorders of sex development: a study of 194 cases. National Library of Medicine. *Endocrine Connections*, 7(2), pp. 364–371. <https://doi.org/10.1530/EC-18-0022>
- Wallien, M. S., & Cohen-Kettenis, P. T. (2008). Psychosexual outcome of gender-dysphoric children. *Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry*, 47(12), 1413-1423. <https://doi.org/10.1097/CHI.0b013e31818956b9>
- Walsh, A., & Jorgensen, C. (2020). *Criminology: The Essentials*. Sage Publications.
- Walsh, K. T. (2010). *The 1960s: Polarization, Cynicism, and the Youth Rebellion*.
<https://www.usnews.com/news/articles/2010/03/12/the-1960s-polarization-cynicism-and-the-youth-rebellionredirect>
- Ward, S. J., & King, L. A. (2018). Gender Differences in Emotion Explain Women's Lower Immoral Intentions and Harsher Moral Condemnation. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 44(5), 653-669. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167217744525>
- Waterman, A. S. (2013). The humanistic psychology-positive psychology divide: contrasts in philosophical foundations. *American Psychologist*, 68(3), 124-133.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/a0032168>
- Watson, J. (1930). *Behaviorism*.
- Wellman, J. D., & al, e. (2021). Masculinity Threat Increases Bias and Negative Emotions Toward Feminine Gay Men. *Psychology of Men & Masculinities*, Vol. 22, No. 24, pp. 787–799. <https://doi.org/10.1037/men0000349>
- Wells, M. (1999). Getting Real. *Brides*, December – January, p. 138.
- Wetzler, A. (2011). *New study confirms atrazine's effects across a range of species (including us)*. <https://www.nrdc.org/bio/andrew-wetzler/new-study-confirms-atrazines-effects-across-range-species-including-us>
- Whitaker, D. J., Haileyesus, T., Swahn, M., & Saltzman, L. S. (2007). Differences in Frequency of Violence and Reported Injury Between Relationships with Reciprocal and Non-Reciprocal Intimate Partner Violence. *American Journal of Public Health*, 97(95), pp. 941-947. <https://doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.2005.079020>
- Whitam, F. L. (1983). Culturally invariable properties of male homosexuality: tentative conclusions from cross-cultural research. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 12(3), 207-226.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01542072>
- White, B., & Angel, B. (2022). *The Truth about Trans Kids from Trans Adults*.
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=f8GtmWxKb08>

- Whitehead, B. D. (1994). The Failure of Sex Education. *The Atlantic Monthly*, October.
- Whiting, K. (2018). *Women were awarded more PhDs in the US than men last year.*
<https://www.weforum.org/agenda/2018/10/chart-of-the-day-more-women-than-men-earned-phds-in-the-us-last-year/>
- Wikholm, C. (2015). *Seven common myths about meditation.*
<https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2015/may/22/seven-myths-about-meditation>
- Wilcox, W. B. (2009). *The Evolution of Divorce.*
<https://nationalaffairs.com/publications/detail/the-evolution-of-divorce>
- Williams, A. (2020). 'White privilege' is the biggest white lie of all.
<https://thehill.com/opinion/civil-rights/511323-white-privilege-is-the-biggest-white-lie-of-all/>
- Winegard, B. M. (2019). Egalitarianism: A source of liberal bias. *Dissertation Abstracts International: Section B: The Sciences and Engineering*, Vol 80(82-B)(E).
- Witchel, S. F. (2017). *Disorders of Sex Development.*
- Witters, D. (2023). *U.S. Depression Rates Reach New Highs.*
<https://news.gallup.com/poll/505745/depression-rates-reach-new-highs.aspx>
- Wittig, M. (1992). Why Women Need the Goddess. *La Guerillieres - Womanspirit Rising*, p. 277.
- Wolf, N. (1990). *The Beauty Myth.* Chatto & Windus.
- Wolfe, A. (1998). *One Nation, After All : What Americans Really Think About God, Country, Family, Racism, Welfare, Immigration, Homosexuality, Work, The Right, The Left and Each Other.* Penguin.
- Wright, R. (1994). *The Moral Animal: Evolutionary Psychology and Everyday Life.* Pantheon.
- Wright, S. (2018). De-Pathologization of Consensual BDSM. *Journal of Sexual Medicine*, 15(5), 622-624. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsxm.2018.02.018>
- Wu, Y. C. (2021). *How neurons that wire together fire together.*
<https://medicalxpress.com/news/2021-12-neurons-wire.html>
- Yarhouse, M. A., & Sadusky, J. (2020). *Emerging Gender Identities: Understanding the Diverse Experiences of Today's Youth.* Brazos Press.
- Yen, J. (2010). Authorizing happiness: Rhetorical demarcation of science and society in historical narratives of positive psychology. *Journal of Theoretical and Philosophical Psychology*, Vol 30(32), pp. 67-78. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0019103>
- Yenor, S. (2017). *Sex, Gender, and the Origin of the Culture Wars: An Intellectual History.*
<https://www.heritage.org/gender/report/sex-gender-and-the-origin-the-culture-wars-intellectual-history>
- Zeigler, C. (2022). *6 truths and myths about Lia Thomas, trans athletes and women's swimming.*
<https://www.outsports.com/trans/2022/1/6/22867761/lia-thomas-penn-swimming-trans-truth-myth>
- Zhisui, L. (1994). *The Private Life of Chairman Mao.* Random House.
- Zinsmeister, K. (2019). *Less God, Less Giving? .*
<https://www.philanthropyroundtable.org/magazine/less-god-less-giving/>