

The New Politics of Sex

Stephen Baskerville
Patrick Henry College

**Presented to the
Association for the Study of Religion, Economics, and Culture
Washington, D.C.**

April 13, 2013

NB: An earlier version of this paper was read at the Second International Congress on Science, Ethics, and Integrated Education, Sao Paulo, Brazil, 6-8 December 2012. I am grateful to the participants for their comments and suggestions.

With astonishing speed, the public agenda of the Western world has come to be dominated by [the politics of sex](#).¹ I am referring here to much more than the demand for same-sex marriage. My focus is something much larger, of which same-sex marriage is only one manifestation. This is what I call simply the sexual agenda. By this I do not mean the obvious sexualization of our culture, but again something less familiar but much larger: the emergence of a political ideology and public policy agenda based on sexuality and sexual power.

Elite opinion has been slow to comprehend this new form of political radicalism, both feminist and, to coin a term, homosexual-*ist*. But this may be changing. President Barack Obama's healthcare program has accelerated an emerging realization that growing sexual militancy – what Helen Alvare calls [“sexualityism”](#) – has now positioned itself on the vanguard of left-wing politics. “There has been a massive expansion of ‘sexual liberty’ on a nationwide scale,” she writes. “The federal government is seeking to expand sexualityism.” Gerard Bradley likewise [describes](#) it as the doctrine “that women will and should have lots more sexual intercourse than they have interest in conceiving children.”²

But there is much more to the new sexual politics than simply license. Its favorite terms are “power” and “empowerment,” indicating that what has emerged is a true political ideology that uses sexual leverage as a weapon to acquire political influence and satisfy the craving for political power. One sympathetic scholar-activist terms this “the ideology of the erotic.”³ Through this ideology, the old socialist battle cry of “social justice” – the principle that government officials should use the criminal justice system to punish those classified by their social and economic status as the “oppressors” of others – has been pushed into more extreme demands for what is now being called “erotic justice,” which appears to mean giving government functionaries the power to designate otherwise unimpeachable citizens as oppressors and

criminals according to their anatomy or the conduct of their private lives.⁴ This trend has already been institutionalized on a number of fronts, and some have reached public attention. Yet the most alarming have hardly been perceived, let alone contested.

Sexual agendas now pervade virtually all social and political institutions: schools, universities, charities, medicine, corporations, foundations, judiciaries, churches, governments, international organizations – all have become thoroughly saturated with the politics of sex, with hardly a word of objection, let alone opposition. Throughout the world, sex is now the polarity that – more than any other – determines our religious and increasingly our political alignments. “Most of the reasons” for differences between the Christianity of the affluent countries and the poor “involve disputes over gender and sexuality,” writes Philip Jenkins. “These have proved the defining issues that separate progressives and conservatives, ecclesiastical left and right.”⁵

[246] The same could be said of the secular political left and right.

The Obama administration’s healthcare program has focused public attention on the implications for religious freedom, and the new sexual politics indeed presents a major threat to freedom of religion. The new policies – which are far less about health than they are about sex – require employers to provide funding for abortion and contraception, even when these practices violate the consciences of the employers and their employees.

But these requirements are only the latest development in a trend which increasingly pits sexual liberty against religious liberty. In the Western democracies, almost all major threats to religious freedom now come from the expanding [sexual agenda](#).⁶ [street preachers have been arrested](#) for criticizing homosexuality; town clerks and registrars have lost their jobs for refusing to officiate same-sex marriages; bed-and-breakfast owners have been put out of business for “discrimination” against cohabiting homosexuals; Catholic adoption agencies have been closed

because they refuse to place children with same-sex couples; Christian firemen have been ordered to participate in “gay pride” parades and police to display symbols of “gay” liberation in police stations; homeschoolers have lost their children to school authorities pushing an increasingly sexualized curriculum;⁷ [directives](#) from the European Union would allow private citizens to be looted financially for expressing their religious and political convictions about sexual issues.⁸ “Christianity is...under pressure from a form of secularism, particularly in Europe,” according to the United Nations Economic and Social Council. “This form of prejudice against Christians or ideas based on religion, which exists both in Europe and in the United States, mainly concerns questions relating to sex, marriage, and the family, on which the Catholic, Muslim, and Orthodox churches have taken stands.”⁹ It is hardly too much to say that sexual freedom and religious freedom now stand eyeball-to-eyeball in a direct confrontation in which no compromise appears possible.

Advocates of sexual liberation themselves openly describe Christian and other religious beliefs as direct impediments to their freedom. “Cultural and religious values cannot be allowed to undermine the universality of women’s rights,” insists a UN committee. Another UN body makes clear its view that no middle ground is possible and that religious freedom is simply incompatible with sexual liberation. “In all countries, the most significant factors inhibiting women’s ability to participate in public life have been the cultural framework of values and religious beliefs,” it states. “True gender equality [does] not allow for varying interpretations of obligations under international legal norms depending on internal religious rules, traditions, and customs.”¹⁰

The aggressively ideological quality of the new sexual politics suggests a connection to another global ideology – also a major threat to religious freedom – which is also sexual in

nature: Islamism, or Islam as a radical political ideology. Islamist militancy is not usually thought of as a sexual ideology. Yet while it is obviously very different from feminism and homosexuality, it also bases its aspirations to political power on its claims to control the terms of sex, along with connected issues like the family and children. Apologists and polemicists generally ignore this complicating fact, but “the centrality of gender relations in the political ideology of Islam” is widely acknowledged by scholars,¹¹ however difficult they may have found it to make sense of it. “The issue of women is not marginal,” write Ian Buruma and Avishai Margalit; “it lies at the heart of Islamic [radicalism].”¹² Whatever may be the various sources of grievance and resentment fueling Islamist ideology, the responses largely distill down into Islamic sexual regulation. Muslim radicals understand that controlling sex and claiming sexual purity translate into political power. “The *hejab* has been identified by the [Iranian] regime as the very cornerstone of its revolution,” notes Haideh Moghissi. “It is described as basic to Islamic ideology and prescribed by God himself as a ‘duty’ for women.”¹³

But religious freedom is only the most recent and visible point of contention. The sexual agenda’s implications for freedom extend well beyond religious expression – though here as elsewhere religious freedom comprehends other freedoms. Following the experiences of its predecessors, the Sexual Revolution’s promise of a new age of freedom is already manifesting itself as something resembling a new form of tyranny and terror.

By far the most draconian punishments meted out by the new sexual gendarmes – and the most repressive government machinery ever created in the United States or most other Western democracies – is the unilateral and involuntary divorce *apparat*, government’s purpose-built mechanism for dismembering families, seizing control over the private lives of innocent people and their children, summarily confiscating property, and criminalizing the embodiments of the

hated “patriarchy”: fathers. This brainchild of the feminist bar associations¹⁴ was enacted throughout the Western world, mostly by stealth and misleading campaigns and with no public debate, beginning in 1969 at the height of the Sexual Revolution. It allows legally unimpeachable citizens – completely innocent of any legal infraction and sitting in their own homes minding their own business – to be summarily evicted from their homes, separated from their children, expropriated of everything they possess, and incarcerated without charge and without trial. Simply by filing for divorce, a discontented spouse acting without any legal grounds instantly places the lives of her entire family under government supervision: The father is summarily placed under the supervision of the penal apparatus, and the children become immediate wards of the courts and social service agencies – without anyone having committed any legally actionable offense. There are no formal charges, no indictments, no juries, no trials, no acquittals, and, no records whatever of the incarcerations.¹⁵

The most disturbing manifestations of this are also the least visible and almost entirely unchallenged. Since the inception of their revolution – and well beneath the media radar screen – sexual militants have been creating a vast panoply of new crimes and expanded redefinitions of existing crimes – all of them involving sex and sexual relations: “rape,” “sexual assault,” “sexual harassment,” “domestic violence,” “stalking,” “bullying,” “child abuse,” “sexual slavery,” “sex trafficking,” and more. These witch hunts bear almost no relation to what is suggested by the inflammatory language: “rape” that clearly includes consensual sex and in most instances is no more than that;¹⁶ domestic “violence” that involves no violence or physical contact or threat of it;¹⁷ “child abuse” that is routine parental discipline or homeschooling or concocted altogether to win advantages in divorce court;¹⁸ “bullying” that is so vague as to be meaningless or involves criticism of the homosexual political agenda or other differences of

belief and opinion; “stalking” that is involuntarily divorced fathers trying to see their own children; and much more.

In a rare example of a scholarly investigation, Marie Gottschalk attributes exploding prison populations not to conservative law-and-order programs but to feminist campaigns over rape and domestic violence. (She ignores the plethora of other but similar new gender crimes.) “The women’s movement became a vanguard of conservative law-and-order politics,” she writes. “Women’s organisations played a central role in the consolidation of this conservative victims’ rights movement that emerged in the 1970s.”¹⁹

These new and loosely-defined crimes have politicized law enforcement and criminal justice, rendered the law vague and subjective, by-passed and eroded due process protections for the accused, and criminalized and incarcerated vast numbers of men and some women who had no inkling that they were committing a crime.

Seldom are these quasi-crimes adjudicated by trials or juries in standard courts.²⁰ Instead guilt (but seldom innocence) is summarily pronounced by specialized judges or, increasingly, various pseudo-judges: “judges surrogate,” lawyers, social workers, school administrators, campus tribunals, and other petty bureaucrats, functionaries, and political operatives with a vested interest in accumulating offenders to administer. Accusers are identified as “victims” in officials documents, and the accused are publicly labeled not only by media but even by law enforcement officials themselves with terms that presume guilt – “perpetrators” “abusers,” “batterers,” “bullies,” “harassers,” “deadbeats,” “traffickers,” and more – even before they are tried (if they are tried). The distinction between crime and ordinary human conflict is blurred or eliminated by “the glorification of feeling,”²¹ with clear acts of criminal violence (for which existing criminal law has always provided) jumbled together with open-ended terms like “abuse”

and “exploitation” to suggest that anything that might fall under these vague but opprobrious terms is also a crime for which someone must be arrested. The crime is often defined subjectively, according to the judgement or “feelings” of the one claiming to be a “victim,” and guilt is determined not by the objective act of the accused but by the subjective state-of-mind of the accuser – not only whether she gave “consent” but whether she felt “fear” or simply “offense.”

Convictions and high conviction rates are presented as goals to be pursued for their own sake, regardless of the merits or evidence in particular cases.²² Proceedings are rigged in specialized quasi-courts with paid “victim advocates” (usually professional feminists and homosexuals) present to testify against defendants they do not know and about whose alleged guilt they have no first-hand knowledge, in order to ensure conviction and maximum punishment. Yet the accused are given no equivalent advocates and often no opportunity to speak on their own behalf. Throughout, the presumption of innocence has been inverted into a presumption of guilt, and knowingly false accusations are unpunished and even encouraged. Government campaigns claim to “raise awareness” of unnamed nonviolent malefactors said to be guilty of nebulous, newfangled crimes, many of which no one has ever heard of before and which no one really understands because no precise definition exists. Yet government statistics purporting to quantify the existence of these crimes are based not on verifiable convictions but on “reports” that are “confirmed” not by convictions in jury trials but by the decree of judges and sometimes simply by civil servants such as social workers. The statistics and reports are also based on definitions so vague that it is not clear what if anything is being reported. Some claimed “victims” are officially “certified” by civil servants without any judicial proceeding. For some alleged crimes, published government statistics and documentation on the resulting

incarcerations, which in the United States and other free societies are required by law, do not exist.²³

These propaganda campaigns generate public hysteria that renders fair trials impossible for those actually accused of these catch-all offenses. Accusations quickly become available as weapons to be used in personal and political vendettas. Flimsy accusations are taken seriously because they rationalize budgets of feminized and sexualized law-enforcement agencies by manufacturing [safe, nonviolent criminals](#) for female and homosexual policepersons to arrest.²⁴

Innocent men are quickly railroaded into prison because the alleged crimes and the accusations arising from them encounter almost no opposition. Few are willing to place themselves in a position of appearing to defend “sex crimes” or accused “sex offenders.” Government-funded and one-sided “awareness” campaigns that vilify groups *en masse* – “abusers,” “batterers,” “harassers,” “deadbeat dads,” “bullies,” “stalkers,” “traffickers” (all reminiscent of Communist campaigns against “counter-revolutionaries”) – reinforce the presumption of guilt and intimidate anyone who dares challenge the government line.

The result is a spiral of silence by journalists, scholars, and other presumed watchdogs. Far from questioning the accusations, gullible conservatives credulously hasten to add their voices to the radicals in condemning “crimes” of which they have little understanding. One need only observe the zeal with which conservative political operatives abandon traditional stigmas against quaint, old-fashioned concepts like adultery or fornication in favor of sexualized agitprop jargon, whose full implications they cannot possibly understand, when they opportunistically accuse President Bill Clinton of “sexual harassment” or Muslims of “homophobia.”

These new gender crimes have been created not despite the sexual freedom but as the inseparable corollary to it. For what is striking about the new crimes is that they operate

alongside and in concert with the new freedoms. What may be most the significant – and again, the least noticed – feature of the new gender crimes is how smoothly they combine sexual liberation with political repression.

Many people have observed the strange paradox of feminism’s promotion of licentious sex coupled with its “puritanical” intolerance, without understanding the dynamic that connects the two. “While women’s studies professors bang pots and blow whistles at anti-rape rallies,” observes Heather MacDonald, “in the dorm next door, freshman counselors and deans pass out tips for better orgasms and the use of sex toys.”²⁵

The crime usually begins as some new sexual freedom demanded in strident terms by feminists as necessary to liberate women from some form of “oppression” – though crucially, the new freedom is also enticing to men, especially young men with strong libidos and few responsibilities. This then degenerates into a corollary criminal accusation against (usually) the man who takes the bait by indulging in the new license:

- Free “love” and recreational sex in the evening turn into accusations of “rape” in the morning, even when it was entirely consensual.
- Demands for equal access to workplaces, universities, the military, and other previously male venues (accompanied with equally strident demands to engage there in female-only activities, such as pregnancy and breastfeeding) invite accusations of sexual “harassment” against the men when sexual relations inevitably develop and go sour, regardless of who initiates the relationship.
- Cohabitation and “no-fault” divorce are demanded to liberate women from “patriarchal” marriage but quickly generate accusations of male abandonment (even when the woman severs the relationship), as well as domestic “violence” and “child abuse,” in order to procure custody of children and the financial awards and assets that accompany them.
- Defiant declarations that women do not need men for financial support quickly give way to demands to arrest and incarcerate without trial men who do not provide women with adequate income in the form of alimony or child support.

- Assertions that women do not need men for protection soon produce hysterical outcries for intrusive police powers, innovative punishments, and expanded penal institutions to punish ever-proliferating and loosely-defined forms of “violence against women,” even when no physical contact or threat of it is involved.
- The proclaimed right to raise children outside wedlock and without fathers to protect and discipline them soon turns into demands to prosecute adolescents and even children for “bullying” one another and eventually for more serious matters.
- The demanded right to engage in homosexual acts and public sexual displays translates almost automatically into the power to arrest or otherwise stop the mouths of preachers, “bullies,” and anyone else who objects or ridicules or impinges on homosexuals’ “feelings”.
- Calls to legalize prostitution feed hysteria to find and prosecute unnamed “sex traffickers.”
- The right to breastfeed publicly without government restriction becomes the power to punish employers who try to impose limits in private workplaces and to punish private individuals who privately express discomfort.
- Demands for unisex bathing facilities in university residences lead to – well, any young man lacking the intelligence to detect the trap awaiting him there may not belong in a university in the first place.

Here once again, feminists have not eliminated a sexual “stereotype,” as they claim; they have merely politicized it – in this case that of the temptress, the seductress who lures men into a “honeytrap” by offers of sexual pleasure before springing a trap that today can mean decades in prison.

Here too, we also see the familiar pattern of how radical political movements create the very problems they then re-package as grievances, and which then serve to rationalize repression against their opponents.²⁶ “Utopians are actual multiplying the social problems they claim to be solving,” observes Bryce Christensen. “Gender-neutering utopians adroitly turn the social problem they cause into a justification for seizing yet more power.”²⁷ In each of these cases what is presented as the “right” of an individual to exercise a new sexual freedom without

restriction by the state quickly translates, by a sleight-of-hand that few detect or question, into a government power to punish – including arrest and incarceration – anyone who falls afoul of the new freedom. This is precisely the logic that transformed the French Revolution from proclaiming the Rights of Man to instigating the Reign of Terror. The fanatical Antoine de St. Just could have been speaking for the Sexual rather than the French Revolution when he announced, “No freedom for the enemies of freedom!”

This creeping criminalization of the population in turn reflects a still larger increase in government scope and power, also created and administered in the name of sexual liberation. Obamacare is only the latest venture in the ever-expansive modern welfare state – that vast and open-ended experiment in government growth whose existence is rationalized by the very problem it creates: the proliferation of single-mother homes. These fatherless communities are breeding grounds for crime, substance abuse, truancy, and virtually all social ills.

But further, the welfare state administers a plethora of its own specialized gendarmeries – a vast underworld of unaccountable quasi-police power that most people find too dreary to scrutinize until it reaches into their households: social work, child protection, child care, child and family counselling, child support enforcement, juvenile and family courts, forensic psychotherapy, eldercare, healthcare. These plainclothes gendarmes are largely ignored by conservative groups who describe themselves as “pro-family.” Yet these operatives are assuming ever-more intrusive control over the private lives of people with children.²⁸

But this is only the beginning. The social pathologies bred by welfare communities are the very problems that account for most domestic government spending, including budgets for law-enforcement and incarceration, education, health, and other “social services.” The welfare state is government’s self-expanding engine for creating problems for itself to solve. Its own

gargantuan expenditures are relatively minor compared to the multiplier effect on spending it necessitates. For it spends money to turn children into criminals, drug addicts, drop-outs, and rioters – precisely the problems that then rationalize more government programs, government powers, and government spending. This is why the [*Wall Street Journal*](#) and others have located the debt crisis entirely in the welfare state.²⁹ History's most affluent societies are voluntarily bankrupting themselves financially as well as morally by underwriting sexual decadence.

The Sexual Revolution has sabotaged the supply as well as the demand side of our solvency. The flood of women into the workforce drove down male wages, turning female employment from a luxury into a necessity.³⁰ It also reduced productivity, as less could be demanded of a workforce compromised by physical limitations, demands of childbearing and childrearing, and “lifestyle” choices promoted by feminists and available to women but not to men. Female employment and sexual liberation also sharply increased divorce and reduced birthrates throughout the industrial economies, further weakening their ability to provide for pensions, health, and other costs of their aging populations demanded by the burgeoning welfare constituency.

Welfare state functionaries comprise the sexualized New Class that constitutes the core and most loyal constituency of President Obama. This New Class is itself the product of the new sexualities and the new, extra-familial childrearing arrangements that its members now administer: single mothers and feminists, politicized homosexuals, children of divorce and others raised in institutions like day care, foster care, public housing, and public education. This new elite is not conscious of owing anything to previous generations or future ones. Education is seen as a matter of earning power, not transmitting knowledge or culture or values from one generation to the next. Their allegiance is not to family, church, community, or country but to

the ideological abstractions and bureaucratic machineries to which they owe their upbringing, education, livelihood, and advancement.

Members of the sexual New Class are or aspire to be on the public payroll: government workers, welfare recipients, grant recipients, government contractors, quangocrats, students from preschool to graduate school, inmates, and now even autoworkers, bankers, and the massive medical industry. As loyalties like family and church diminish, more become dependent on and obedient to the state.

To finance their benefits and livelihoods, this is the educated mob that must squeeze ever-more revenue out of ever-shrinking productive sectors – modern-day kulaks that can be vilified and then looted. Officials duly increase taxation, criminalize tax “evaders” who do not (or cannot) pay their “fair share” of their clients’ benefits and their own salaries, and devise innovative revenue schemes – [traffic fines](#),³¹ student loans,³² child support awards,³³ civil forfeiture – that are largely free of legislative control and inflict criminal penalties without criminal safeguards on those who cannot protect themselves from bureaucratic plunder. In the contest over the legality of the healthcare mandates, the Supreme Court’s collusion with the Obama administration to erase the distinction between taxes and fines will further facilitate government’s use of criminal law and the penal apparatus to feed its own insatiable appetite for revenue.

Europe is now financially and politically crippled because it cannot withstand the adolescent and feminist mobs demanding ever-more welfare – and to unions which no longer represent working men demanding their share of company profits but now serve mostly as auxiliaries to the increasingly female civil service bureaucracies who cater to welfare clients and

whose “bargaining” has degenerated into collusion with their employers to increase budgets and salaries at public expense.

Meanwhile, sexualization is undermining freedom on another front: military strength. Europe is now militarily almost useless. Previously the exception, Britain is disbanding prestigious regiments and dismantling essential weapons systems while its welfare state continues to expand and wreak havoc like the August 2011 [riots](#). According to [Max Hastings](#), “Britain’s entire Armed Forces are shrinking towards a point where, like Alice’s cat, soon only the smile will be left.”³⁴ The US military is not only being eviscerated by the infiltration of feminists and homosexuals into an institution most of them loathe; it is itself being transformed into a gargantuan welfare state, as benefits intended for families facilitate single motherhood, divorce courts see soldiers as sitting ducks for plunder, and budgets are consumed by childcare, abortion, and sexually transmitted diseases.

~~~

Throughout the world, virtually every item on the public agenda is now feminized and sexualized. Every issue, both domestic and foreign, is now cast in terms of its impact on women or “women and children”: health, taxation, welfare, immigration, development, war – all, we are told, involve some “special hardship” for women. “Women would suffer most from congressional budget cuts,” reports *The Hill*, where such headlines are routine.<sup>35</sup> (As satirized in *The Onion*: “World Ends – Women, Minorities Hardest Hit.”)

Even issues that seemingly have nothing to do with sex and “gender” are now being sexualized. Economic crises are addressed according to their allegedly special impact on women, though the vast majority of those left unemployed are men. War and foreign policy are transformed by debates about women and homosexuals in the military and evaluated for their

impact on women, though casualties are overwhelmingly heterosexual men. The environment is a women's issue, we are told, and so is climate change.

But in every case the alleged hardship exists, if it exists at all, only because women and children have been separated from, and set in opposition to, the families and men that traditionally protected and provided for them – a phenomenon created entirely by feminism itself. Solutions based on the roles of families, marriage, and men are never an option, and any such suggestion is quickly purged from the discussion, the unstated message being that families and men cannot be the solution because they are the problem. The only ideologically acceptable response is to devise new and expanded power for sexual activists, government functionaries, and police – power aimed directly at further weakening and marginalizing the families and men. Regardless of the specific policy chosen, it always expands – never contracts – government power.

When every source of fear is made a crime, when every claim of oppression is a claim to some new governmental or police power – the result is predictable: Everything oppresses women, because every grievance is “empowering.” Even problems and hardships created by feminists themselves and their homosexual and leftist allies oppress women and therefore empower them.

Feminists are shameless, for example, in posing as victims of the divorce revolution they themselves created and which is administered entirely by – or under pressure by – their operatives: “It is in families, writes Martha Nussbaum, “...that the cruelest discrimination against women takes place.”

[T]he patterns of family life limit their opportunities in many ways: by assigning them to unpaid work with low prestige; by denying them equal opportunities to outside jobs and education; by insisting they do most or all of the housework and child care even when

they are also earning wages. Especially troubling are ways that women may suffer from the altruism of marriage itself... [A] woman who accepts the traditional tasks of housekeeping and provides support for her husband's work is *not likely to be well prepared to look after herself and her family in the event (which is increasingly likely) of a divorce* or an accident that leaves her alone.<sup>36</sup>

In short, the alleged hardships and “cruelties” suffered by “women and children” are entirely a form of emotional blackmail created by radical ideology.

This answers the unasked question behind all this demand for “empowerment,” which is why is this power needed, who will wield it, and over whom will it be used? Power after all is the ability to control other people. By definition it is a limited-sum commodity; when some people acquire more power, those over whom they then exercise it have less. They also have less control over their own private lives, which are now controlled by the empowered.

Emotionally healthy people do not crave power to control other people and spend their lives devising ways to obtain more of it. But this is precisely how political ideologues spend all their time, and sexual ideologues now comprise an army of government busybodies at the forefront of this endeavor. The only possible targets over whom they will use this new power are the rest of us. Already we can see it being wielded against anyone who threatens or challenges or even questions the new sexual power: fathers and other heterosexual men, married couples, two-parent families, Christians, religious believers generally, conservatives, and so on from there.

All of this is so wildly successful and unstoppable because it exploits and politicizes the natural concern of every society to protect and provide for women. The one condition every civilized society demands of women in return for this protection and provision is sexual restraint: the restriction of sex and childbearing to married families. The mechanisms – which are almost entirely religious – by which societies attempt to encourage or if necessary impose this restraint vary significantly, and those variations make a huge difference in the economic prosperity and

political freedom of the society. Historically, Jewish and Christian societies have been by far the most successful, though Confucian societies have recently imitated their success. But this sexual restraint and its religious regimen are precisely what politicized Western women (and homosexuals) are now in open revolt against. What has changed is not that they are any less protected or provided for; on the contrary, they are the safest, least restrained, and most affluent people in history. But they have achieved levels of economic, political, and sexual freedom that allow them to demand “empowerment” without the restraint while still exploiting the privileges and limitations afforded to women, demanding to enjoy the privileges specific to both men and women without the responsibilities specific to either. Strikingly, this is equally true of homosexuals, who demand the privilege to alternate between male or female behavior as it suits their advantage, thereby exempting themselves from the restraints specific to either sex. Thus the paradox that the more powerful women and homosexuals become, the more frightened they are and the more rationalizations we hear to grant them the power to restrict and incarcerate heterosexual men under whatever pretext is available.

Sexual politics has fundamentally transformed the very nature and purpose of civil government. The most basic and traditional functions of the state – defense against external attack, control of borders, and punishment of criminals – have been significantly weakened or radically altered. State sovereignty today is being drastically diluted as states are increasingly unable to defend their populations and unwilling to enforce the integrity of their borders. In the global South, countries are beset by warlords, insurgencies, drug cartels, gangs and armies of violent (mostly fatherless) youth, while advanced nations transfer their sovereignty to supranational organizations like the European Union and the United Nations, which themselves advance strongly sexualized agendas.

At the same time that governments relinquish their traditional functions, they are increasingly taking on new ones that few in the past would have considered appropriate roles for the state: care of children and the aged, education, medical care. This open-ended project is now bankrupting wealthy Western societies, undermining traditional families, and creating growing constituencies with a vested interest in looting the declining productive sectors to finance their benefits.

It is tempting to point out that the traditional functions being surrendered by the state are masculine, whereas the new roles are feminine. Governments have forsaken their traditional public tasks as the men who conducted them have been politically marginalized, and they have taken on new tasks that were previously performed privately in the home by women because women now refuse to perform them. Here as elsewhere, gender roles are not eliminated but merely politicized. The face of the modern state (to the extent that it has not become “faceless” altogether) is less the male soldier or policeman and more the female social worker and bureaucrat.

And yet critically, the new feminized functionaries – the social workers and bureaucrats – are no less police than were the old male ones; they simply do not wear uniforms, and they are not restrained, as police are supposed to be, from the power to enter and control the private lives of citizens who are not criminals.

Correspondingly, the most basic internal function of any government – punishing criminals – has also been dramatically redefined. On the one hand, the criminal justice system has for well over a century been changing in ways that are advertised as being more humane and “caring,” with lighter sentences, alternatives to incarceration, and special procedures for youth and others deemed not fully responsible for their actions. Yet alongside this feminization of criminal justice and hardly noticed, as we see, have emerged the new sexual crimes defined by the new feminine functionaries.

But religion is the current target, because sexual radicals understand that religion is itself the most potent antidote to unrestrained “sexualityism.” “Religion is central to sexual regulation in almost all societies,” writes homosexualist scholar Dennis Altman. “Indeed, it may well be that the primary social function of religion is to control sexuality.”<sup>37</sup> This is simplistic in the extreme, but it does point to one very concrete avenue by which the erosion of faith is leading directly to social chaos and political tyranny. Our most salient political fault line now emerges as a confrontation between sexual freedom versus religious freedom – along with every other one.

It also indicates where believers are now facing the consequences of our own failures. By standing by in silence while the sexual revolutionaries plunder and incarcerate the innocent, we are now left alone and vulnerable as the militants turn on us – validating Martin Niemoeller’s famous lines about the Nazis.

So the killjoys turned out to be correct about the debilitating effects of license. Sexual indulgence has feminized us all, enervating our willingness to defend freedom and leaving us passively acquiescing in an authoritarian ideology with an unquenchable thirst for punishment. The licentiousness of every radical regime from the Bolsheviks to the Nazis shows where this leads. But we are the first civilization to elevate sexual decadence to the top of our political agenda.

*Stephen Baskerville is Professor of Government at Patrick Henry College and senior fellow at the Inter-American Institute. He is the author of [Taken Into Custody: The War Against Fathers, Marriage, and the Family](#) and is writing a book on sexual politics. He is grateful to the participants at the Second International Congress on Science, Ethics, and Integrated Education held in December 2012 in Sao Paulo, Brazil.*

## Addendum

It is the means as well as the ends of the new ideologies that have transformed our politics, replacing free and open government processes with the politics of stealth – the relentless “**salami tactics**” reminiscent of Bolshevik movements in Eastern Europe. “Instead of trying to convince the public and working through elected representatives, they often bypass the legislatures and work instead behind closed doors – which is to say through the courts and within the bureaucracies,” observe two scholars. “The revolution could be achieved quietly, in committee chambers, and without resistance.”<sup>38</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.rojaksite.com/newsweek-politics-of-sex/>

<sup>2</sup> Helen Alvare, “The White House and Sexualityism,” *Public Discourse*, 16 July 2012, <http://www.thepublicdiscourse.com/2012/07/5757/>; Gerard Bradley, “What’s Behind the HHS Mandate?” *Public Discourse*, 5 June 2012, <http://www.thepublicdiscourse.com/2012/06/5562/>.

<sup>3</sup> Richard G. Parker, *Bodies, Pleasures, and Passions: Sexual Culture in Contemporary Brazil* (Nashville, Vanderbilt University Press, 2009), 111.

<sup>4</sup> Sonia Corrêa, Rosalind Petchesky, and Richard Parker, *Sexuality, Health, and Human Rights* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2008), 4-5.

<sup>5</sup> Philip Jenkins, *The New Christendom: The Coming of Global Christianity* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 246.

<sup>6</sup> Stephen Baskerville, “The Sexual Agenda and Religious Freedom,” *International Journal for Religious Freedom*, vol. 4, no. 2 (2011).

<sup>7</sup> Mike Donnelly, “Religious Freedom in Education,” *International Journal for Religious Freedom*, vol. 4, no. 2 (2011).

<sup>8</sup> Paul Coleman and Roger Kiska, “The Proposed EU ‘Equal Treatment’ Directive,” *International Journal for Religious Freedom*, vol. 5, no. 1 (2012).

<sup>9</sup> Quoted in *Shadow Report, 2005-2010* (Vienna: Observatory on Intolerance and Discrimination Against Christians in Europe, 2010), 11 (<http://tinyurl.com/2wvteq5>).

<sup>10</sup> United Nations Division for the Advancement of Women, General Recommendations Made by the Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination Against Women. No. 19, 11th session (1992),

---

<http://www.un.org/womenwatch/daw/cedaw/recommendations/recomm.htm#recom19>; Report of the Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination Against Women. 13th sess., A/49/38 (New York: UN Women, 1994), 39.

<sup>11</sup> Parvin Paidar, *Women and the Political Process in Twentieth Century Iran*, 232, quoted in Masoud Kazemzadeh, *Islamic Fundamentalism, Feminism, and Gender Inequality in Iran Under Khomeini* (Lanham, Md.: University Press of America, 2002), 4.

<sup>12</sup> Ian Buruma and Avishai Margalit, *Occidentalism: The West in the Eyes of Its Enemies* (New York: Penguin, 2004). The Google Booksonline version of this book does not appear to have page numbers ([http://books.google.com/books?id=IQX2TNP4Z\\_MC&pg=PT72&lpg=PT72&dq=%E2%80%9CThe+issue+of+wo+men+is+not+marginal,%E2%80%9D+Ian+Buruma&source=bl&ots=5UtiPnXJHv&sig=pIq350bz-rZnq8V0P3\\_wt9f3g8M&hl=en&sa=X&ei=Av9nUdzNGIHD4AOqy4Eo&ved=0CDwQ6AEwAg](http://books.google.com/books?id=IQX2TNP4Z_MC&pg=PT72&lpg=PT72&dq=%E2%80%9CThe+issue+of+wo+men+is+not+marginal,%E2%80%9D+Ian+Buruma&source=bl&ots=5UtiPnXJHv&sig=pIq350bz-rZnq8V0P3_wt9f3g8M&hl=en&sa=X&ei=Av9nUdzNGIHD4AOqy4Eo&ved=0CDwQ6AEwAg)).

<sup>13</sup> Haideh Moghissi, ed., *Women and Islam* (London: Routledge, 2004), 77-78. I have argued this at greater length in “The Sexual Jihad: The Global Rise of Sexual and Religious Radicalism,” proceedings of the conference on Religion and Politics in the Globalization Era, Centre for Political Analysis, Babes-Bolyai University, Cluj-Napoca, Romania, 22-24 June 2012 (Cambridge University Press, forthcoming).

<sup>14</sup> Stephen Baskerville, *Taken Into Custody: The War Against Fathers, Marriage, and the Family* (Nashville: Cumberland House), ch. 5

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid.*, ch. 1. For only one shocking example, see Rebecca May and Marguerite Roulet, “A Look at Arrests of Low-Income Fathers for Child Support Nonpayment: Enforcement, Court and Program Practices,” Center for Family Policy and Practice (Madison, Wisconsin: January 2005; <http://www.cpr-mn.org/Documents/noncompliance.pdf>), 6, 9, 11, 41, 42, 43, 44.

<sup>16</sup> Stephen Baskerville, “Feminist Gulag: No Prosecution Necessary,” *The New American*, January 2010, and “Julian Assange’s Political Honeytrap,” *The American Conservative*, online edition, 25 February 2011.

<sup>17</sup> Baskerville, *Taken Into Custody*, ch. 4; David Heleniak, “The New Star Chamber,” *Rutgers Law Review*, vol. 57, no. 3 (Spring 2005).

<sup>18</sup> Baskerville, *Taken Into Custody*, ch. 4.

<sup>19</sup> Marie Gottschalk, *The Prison and the Gallows: The Politics of Mass Incarceration in America* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 115-116.

<sup>20</sup> “We mean [by the rule of law], in the first place, that no man is punishable or can be made to suffer in body or goods except for a distinct breach of law established in the ordinary legal manner *before the ordinary courts of the land*. A.V. Dicey, quoted in John Laughland, *A History of Political Trials* (Oxford: Peter Lang), 7 (emphasis added).

<sup>21</sup> Paul Nathanson and Katherine K. Young, *Legalizing Misandry: From Public Shame to Systemic Discrimination against Men* (Montreal: McGill-Queen’s University Press, 2006), 202-203.

<sup>22</sup> Christina Patterson, “It’s Miliband, Not Clarke, Who Should Be Ashamed,” *The Independent*, 19 May 2011.

<sup>23</sup> May & Roulet, *Look at Arrests*.

<sup>24</sup> “Wrong Arm of the Law,” leading column, *Daily Telegraph*, 31 July 2012 (<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/comment/telegraph-view/9432252/Wrong-arm-of-the-law.html>).

<sup>25</sup> Heather MacDonald, “The Campus Rape Myth,” *City Journal*, vol. 18, no. 1 (Winter 2008, [http://www.city-journal.org/2008/18\\_1\\_campus\\_rape.html](http://www.city-journal.org/2008/18_1_campus_rape.html)).

- 
- <sup>26</sup> Milovan Djilas, *The New Class* (New York, Praeger, 1958).
- <sup>27</sup> “The End of Gender Sanity in American Public Life,” *Modern Age*, vol. 49, no. 4 (Fall 2007), 412.
- <sup>28</sup> Stephen Baskerville, “From Welfare State to Police State,” *The Independent Review*, vol. 12, no. 3 (Winter 2008).
- <sup>29</sup> “Europe’s Entitlement Reckoning,” editorial, *Wall Street Journal*, 10 November 2011 (<http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052970204190704577026194205495230.html>); Tom G. Palmer (ed.), *After the Welfare State* (Ottawa, Illinois: Atlas Network, 2012).
- <sup>30</sup> Allan Carlson, “The Family and the Welfare State,” lecture delivered at the Atlas Economic Foundation International Workshop, Philadelphia, 1 May 1995, [http://profam.org/docs/acc/thc\\_acc\\_state.htm](http://profam.org/docs/acc/thc_acc_state.htm).
- <sup>31</sup> Philip Johnston, “Moting Fines are Just One-Way Traffic,” *Daily Telegraph*, 27 August 2012 (<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/uknews/law-and-order/9501876/Motoring-fines-are-just-one-way-traffic.html>).
- <sup>32</sup> Allan Carlson, “The Crushing Burden of Student Loans on Family Formation for Generation X,” lecture delivered at the Family Research Council, Washington, 4 Dec 2009, [http://www.profam.org/docs/acc/thc\\_acc.091204.crush.htm](http://www.profam.org/docs/acc/thc_acc.091204.crush.htm).
- <sup>33</sup> Baskerville, “From Welfare State to Police State.”
- <sup>34</sup> Max Hastings, “Army Cuts: Farewell to Our Warrior Nation,” *Daily Telegraph*, 9 November 2012.
- <sup>35</sup> 29 July 2011.
- <sup>36</sup> Martha Nussbaum, “Justice for Women,” *New York Review of Books*, 8 October 1992, 43 (emphasis added).
- <sup>37</sup> Altman, *Global Sex*. He adds: “...and gender in the interest of hegemonic masculinity.”
- <sup>38</sup> Paul Nathanson and Katherine K. Young, *Legalizing Misandry: From Public Shame to Systemic Discrimination against Men* (Montreal: McGill-Queen’s University Press), 402.