

Queer Theory: “Equality”, “inclusivity” and “diversity” explained

Dr Elisabeth Taylor

Hello,

My name is Elisabeth Taylor. My background is in historical research. I am a graduate of Sydney University, a Commonwealth scholar and have a PhD from Cambridge University in medieval history. I’m particularly interested in the history of ideas because what we believe to be true directs the moral compass of a society. Ideas are powerful shapers of history.

So, when I first came across Queer Theory in 2016 my natural inclination was to ask where these ideas had come from. I have spent hundreds of hours digging into that question and I hope that sharing my findings will help people understand our current cultural moment.

Queer Theory is now impelling very rapid cultural change – it is changing our laws, redirecting the education of children, the conduct of sport, medical ethics, parental rights, almost every aspect of public life is now touched by Queer Theory. If we understand the history of these ideas, we can form a clearer picture of where they would like to take us, if we let them.

In *the Art of War*, Sun Tzu explains the strategic importance of what he calls “the moral law”. An army that sincerely believes it fights on the side of righteousness is more steadfast and committed, and more likely to win. Most people want to act in accordance with their moral convictions and so, if you can persuade them that the high moral ground has shifted then, in general, people will shift with it.

In *The Gulag Archipelago*, Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn demonstrated how ideology can function to provide moral legitimacy, even for reprehensible regimes. He observed that the people carrying out the will of the state in Stalinist Russia – imprisoning, torturing and killing their fellow countrymen – did so willingly because they were persuaded their actions were righteous. He says:

“Ideology ... is what gives evildoing its long sought justification and gives the evildoer the necessary steadfastness and determination. That is the social theory which helps to make his acts seem good instead of bad in his own and others’ eyes, so that he won’t hear reproaches and curses but will receive praise and honors.”

The people Solzhenitsyn describes as “evil doers” are not different to the rest of us. They are just ordinary people who are operating according to the moral co-ordinates of a reprehensible ideology. As Voltaire is reputed to have said:

“Anyone who can make you believe absurdities can make you commit atrocities”.

So, before we co-operate with new ideological positions, it is important to scrutinize them very closely. Where do they come from? What kind of “social change” do they demand? What unintended consequences or undeclared agendas might be served by such of program of social change?

I think Queer Theory is particularly worthy of such scrutiny because it functions to provide moral justification for the combined political ambitions of both Marxists and a particularly radical element of the sexual rights movement. If we want to understand the full extent of the program of social change that is being sold to us in the name of “equity”, “diversity” and “inclusion”, we need some familiarity with both Marxist Critical Theory and with the ideas about human sexuality promoted by Dr Alfred Kinsey – father of the sexual revolution – because these combine to produce Queer Theory.

Before I begin, I would like to make it abundantly clear that I am not imputing anything other than noble motives to people who identify as LGBTIQ+ or to the large swathes of the population that support LGBTIQ+ rights or to academics who hold a positive view of Queer Theory because they think it promotes social justice. On the other hand, I do think Queer Theory is a dangerous social theory. The historical record shows that Marxist political regimes that promise freedom consistently deliver a high body count instead. For reasons that I will explain, I cannot see that it is logically consistent to denounce paedophilia as inherently harmful to children and still admire Kinsey’s philosophical propositions about the nature of human sexuality. Before we use Queer Theory as a template for social, political or legal reform, I think we should know a bit more about it.

I’ll begin with the Marxist bit first. Then I’ll explain the relevance of Kinsey. We also need to understand why gender identity is important and what happens when you reimagine the human person as s SOGI – a sexual orientation and gender identity - rather than as a body and a soul. Lastly, I’ll point to some examples of how Queer Theory is influencing Australian legal and policy reform to demonstrate how this works to advance what some activists are calling “the queer revolution”.

Marxism

So, Marxism first.

Most people are familiar with classical Marxist theory, which claims the root of all social inequality is economic, it blames capitalism for the oppression of the masses and proposes abolishing private property as the remedy for that oppression. By the 1960s, no one in the west was really buying that message anymore so Marxists pivoted from economics to

culture in search of new things to blame for social inequality. They developed Critical Theory, which turns classical economic Marxism into Cultural Marxism.

Cultural Marxism still calls for revolutionary social change. It posits that western culture is irretrievably tainted at its foundations by some form of oppressive cultural system and that equality can only be secured by burning the house down and building a new society on different foundations.

There are various types of Marxist Critical Theory operating in the current political conversation. Third wave feminism, for example, which sees sex or “gender” as the main axis of oppression and proposes to tear down “the patriarchy”. Then we have Critical Race Theory – which focusses on race as the principal axis of oppression and takes issue with “systemic racism”. And then we have Queer Theory - which sees sexuality as the main axis of oppression and takes issue with “heteronormativity”.

Heteronormativity is the system of cultural values that regards heterosexuality and gender congruence as normative for the majority of the population. So, the belief system that says babies born with male bodies are boys, and will grow into men; babies born with female bodies are girls and will grow into women; that most will experience heterosexual attraction during puberty in preparation for an adulthood where they pair up and have children of their own: that’s heteronormativity.

You might ask why we need a word for that – most people think that this is just normal, it is a function of natural law. Humans are mammals. Sexual reproduction depends on opposite-sex attraction and that depends on the ability to recognise male/female difference as significant. Babies do not survive without adults to assist them and who has a greater interest in offering that help than the two humans with the greatest genetic investment in that child? From this perspective, it is hardly surprising if important social institutions, like the nuclear family, give social expression to the practical imperatives of human reproduction and survival.

But, according to Queer Theory, heteronormativity is the product of a range of “false assumptions” and, because these assumptions create a system that oppresses the sexually diverse, it can and should be dismantled. Because heteronormativity centers heterosexual gender-congruent people as “normal”, it automatically marginalizes those with diverse sexual or gender identities, who are, by implication, “not normal” or less worthy.

This idea is central to the thesis advanced by Gayle Rubin, in her 1984 essay “Thinking Sex”, which is credited as one of the founding texts of Queer Theory. Rubin describes a hierarchical system of sexual value which positions married reproductive heterosexual couples at the top, followed by unmarried monogamous heterosexuals; stable, long-term gay and lesbian couples might be verging on respectability, but bar dykes and promiscuous

gay men are lower down in the hierarchy. At the very bottom, we have the most marginalized sexual interest groups: transsexuals, transvestites, fetishists, sadomasochists, sex workers, and “lowliest of all, those whose eroticism transgresses generational boundaries” – she’s talking about paedophiles.

These are the sexual minority groups that Queer Theory seeks to empower, and it does so by calling them to mount a collective objection to heteronormativity, to demand that all sexualities (that is to say, all forms of erotic self-expression) should be regarded as equal.

Another way Rubin explains this is to say that there is a “charmed circle of socially acceptable sexualities” which excludes all of those that are deemed abnormal, unhealthy or dangerous. This moral divide is maintained to stop anything hideous skittering over the line into mainstream society. If the sexual rabble, who currently exist on the margins, want to emulate the success of the gay rights movement, if they want to be dissociated from mental disorder and muscle their way into social respectability, then they need to eradicate that line. And they can do that more easily if they grow their economic and political power and work together.

As Rubin explains, the queer community is not a community at all – it is a collection of disparate sexual interest groups. The glue that gives these groups cohesion and forms the basis of **their common identity is their shared experience of being marginalized from mainstream sexual culture**. They are all different from each other but they are all queer – because they are different from the norm. If your oppression comes from being different from the norm, then it follows that your liberation can only be achieved by destroying those norms and establishing new ones. This is the aim of LGBTIQ+ activism – “social change”, which is code for the destruction of heteronormativity. Being “queer” is really a political identity – it is a collective declaration of war on “normal”.

The LGBTIQ+ acronym can be endlessly expanded because we’re not talking about “sexual orientation” anymore, or at least not in the way that most people understand this term. The queer revolution isn’t advocating that a fixed minority of the population with a settled pattern of same-sex attraction or opposite-gender identification should have greater inclusion in a social order where heterosexuality and gender congruence is still normal for most people. If you think about it, that idea doesn’t even make sense. In a heteronormative society sexual and gender minorities will always be marginalized, different from the norm. What Queer theorists propose is a new society where all sexuality is “queered”, so that queer becomes the new normal. That’s what they mean by “equity, diversity and inclusion” – they mean foundational social restructuring so that heteronormativity is replaced with “queer normativity”, where all sexual interests are regarded as normal and equal.

Do we really want to create a culture that esteems all erotic interests and behaviours equally? What about the sexual behaviours that are recognised as harmful to others? Let’s

think about paedophilia as an example. Do we really want to create a society where sex with children is legitimised and celebrated as a socially valuable behaviour? I think the vast majority of people, including many who identify as queer themselves, who would say “No”. Some LGBTQ+ activists think the movement is all about advocating for a fixed minority of the population who are born gay, lesbian and transgender. In other words, it seems that even they have not understood the radicals who are marching under the same rainbow flag. To understand the radicals, we need to turn to Kinsey.

Kinsey did not accept that humanity can be divided into discrete sexual categories labelled “heterosexual”, “homosexual” and “bisexual”. Unlike sexologists before him, Kinsey wasn’t interested in speculating about the causes of homosexuality. The question Kinsey posed for himself – the essential conundrum at the heart of human sexuality – was this: Why isn’t everyone open to every potentially satisfying sexual encounter of whatever type?

He thought sexual hedonism is a universal human possibility – I happen to agree with him about that. He also thought that comprehensively demolishing social and legal constraints on free sexual expression would be conducive to human flourishing. That’s where he and I disagree.

As one of the last great sexual taboos, paedophilia serves as a useful litmus test to separate the group that will I call “sexual radicals”, who advocate Kinsey’s ideas, from more politically centrist advocates for gay or lesbian rights, who simply want to live their lives without persecution in a society where the vast majority of the population are heterosexual and where the nuclear family is still the fundamental group unit of society.

You might wonder how anyone could ever advocate paedophilia as a positive social good. It turns out it’s not so difficult. All you need to do is exchange the truth for a lie in strategic places.

I’ll briefly talk through three of Kinsey’s key claims:

- 1) All sexual behaviours are natural and therefore normal
- 2) Sexual suppression is unhealthy
- 3) Children are sexual from birth

Kinsey

The first Kinsey proposition – that all sexual acts are normal – is achieved by reframing human sexuality. If you thought sex had something to do with reproduction or human intimacy, then Kinsey will tell you that is all unscientific nonsense.

Kinsey focusses just on what he calls the “sexual syndrome” – that is, the physiological changes in the body leading up to and including orgasm – and insists that this is all there is to sex. It has no inherent social or psychological significance. Any social or psychological

meaning we attach to sex is the product of culture – a later generation of philosophers would use the term “socially constructed”. Kinsey insists that if we were reasoning scientifically, we would realize that sexual response is just natural function of the body in response to stimulus, a bit like digestion is a function of the body in a response to food.

If that is true, then isn't it just bizarre to make moral judgements about what turns different people on? Kinsey reasoned that if we don't lock people up in prison because they have exotic tastes in food, then why should we lock people up in prison because they have unconventional sexual preferences?

His idea that all sexual behaviours are natural and therefore normal has important consequences. For him it means that all sexual behaviours are fine, whether heterosexual sex, homosexual sex, extra-marital sex, multiple partner sex, public sex, nymphomania, paedophilia, bestiality, incest, kink, BDSM ... name any fetish you fancy. You can't hold these views with Kinsey – that erotic interests are outside the purview of moral judgement, because they are just a natural function of the body – and then condemn people who like to have sex with goats or their sister.

Kinsey's is an “all or nothing” proposition. It is either true for all types of sexual behaviour, or it isn't true at all. So he is not suggesting we relax moral standards and draw the line between good and bad sexual behaviour in a slightly different place – he is saying that we cannot draw a line anywhere, because there is no such thing as bad sexual behaviour.

The second Kinsey proposition – that sexual suppression is unhealthy – draws on Freud's contention that humans are primarily sexual beings, and that regular sexual release is necessary for healthy psychological functioning. Kinsey reported from his research that a great many people whom psychologists would regard as psychopathic on account of their sexual interests and frequency of sexual activity are, in fact, well-adjusted individuals. At the same time, he found that people who suppress their sexual impulses are more likely to be neurotic. So he turns the tables on who is mad and who is not. See? Michel Foucault didn't get these ideas from nowhere.

We have an echo of this association between sexual suppression and mental illness in words like “homophobia”. I know most people think this just means someone who hates homosexuals but who “the homosexuals” are will differ depending on your belief system. Sexual radicals believe everyone has the capacity to be homosexual and “homophobia” refers to the irrational feelings of horror provoked in men – men who think of themselves as heterosexual –when they discover their capacity for homoerotic response. These feelings of horror might take the form of violence towards the homosexual man who provoked these erotic responses but the real problem is a culture that demands sexual suppression.

See how sexual suppression makes people neurotic, mentally unstable and potentially dangerous?

Once you understand this line of reasoning, it's obvious that anyone who rejects the truth claims of queer theory about gender and sexuality qualifies as a homophobe or a transphobe. When they are talking among themselves, activists are really clear about the fact that most of us are "LGBTIQ+ phobes" – even the people who are convinced they are not. All of those "progressives" who think that signing up as an LGBTIQ+ ally will put them on the right side of history are in for a bit of a nasty shock. According to Queer Theory, anyone who still believes that some – any! – moral constraints on sexual behaviour are legitimate is obviously suppressed and therefore "phobic". They will be joining the rest of us up against the wall if the revolutionaries ever get to take over.

Kinsey was particularly concerned that sexually suppressed people should never be allowed to damage children by imparting their crazy ideas about the importance of maintaining sexual boundaries. What children need, according to Kinsey, is someone who can help them make the most of their innate capacities for sexual response.

And here we come to point number three.

If humans are primarily sexual beings, as Freud said, then they must be sexual from birth. Until Kinsey came along, this was an open question. There was no way of answering experimentally whether infants are, in fact, capable of sexual response without violating some important ethical standards. But such ethics were no barrier to Kinsey, who (according to the official story at least) turned to paedophiles for information. They told him that of course children can reach orgasm!

Reading into the details of this for the first time made me want to throw up, so I'll spare you that discomfort and just summarise by saying that Kinsey lists a number of behaviours that any rational person would understand are symptoms of a child in extreme distress – tears, sobbing, fighting to get away, fainting – and he tells us that these are all symptoms of orgasm and the children "derive definite pleasure from the situation".

Whatever you want to call this, it's not "Science" but, incredibly, Kinsey's claim that children are capable of orgasm from birth continues unchallenged in modern sexology. I first heard it mentioned in an academic talk as though it was a completely uncontroversial proposition. The speaker said "Well, we know children are sexual from birth...". And I thought "Do we? What does that even mean?"

I was sufficiently intrigued to go looking for the origin of this remarkable claim and wound up reading these disgusting passages in Kinsey's work. Kinsey even admits that the symptoms of orgasm and the symptoms of extreme terror, electric shock, epileptic fit, are actually very similar and, in fact, one might flow into the other. So, that's the mind we are dealing with

when we are talking about Kinsey. He either tortured children himself and then said they enjoyed it, or else he transcribed second-hand reports and pretended these were his own observations. Either way, his claims about infant orgasm should be thrown out.

None of this contested, by the way. There is a very good documentary called “Secret History: Kinsey’s Paedophiles” on YouTube if you want more information about that.

I am sure that the academic who set me off on this quest is unaware of this particularly dark bit of history. I am sure she, and many others like her, have simply been taught to believe that infant sexuality is established fact and never thought to question the origins of this myth. Perhaps if they had read Kinsey for themselves, they would rethink their support for Queer Theory? On the other hand, questioning Queer Theory generally is a good way to kill off an otherwise promising academic career, so maybe they wouldn’t.

It’s obviously very convenient for Kinsey that he found children are capable of sexual response from birth because then that confirms his original contention that sex is nothing to do with reproduction and therefore the taboos that prohibit sexual activity before puberty – when reproductive capacities develop – are obsolete. More than that, since regular sexual release is necessary for healthy mental development, according to Kinsey, paedophiles are doing children a big favour. Certainly, paedophile apologists argue that the parents of the child so lucky as to attract the attentions of a paedophile should really be more grateful.

So there is a logic to what Kinsey says. I’m not saying it’s true. We could be here all day pointing out a host of philosophical errors, psychological tricks and outrageous lies. But there is internal consistency to his arguments.

The Achille’s heel of the whole intellectual artifice is trauma. All very well to sweep away the old-fashioned sexual moral code because all sex is now good and natural but if we are allowed to see that some types of sexual behaviour are inherently harmful to others, then suddenly the old moral constraints make sense again and Kinsey’s entire logic falls over.

So how, for example, does Kinsey deal with the widely held belief that sex with children is inherently harmful because it produces trauma? Kinsey answers this by saying that there is no rational basis for children to be “disturbed” by sexual contacts with adults. Any physical injuries (he mentions vaginal bleeding for example) are unlikely to result in permanent damage and the psychological impact is then explained away as the product of faulty “cultural conditioning” that has predisposed the child to believe that they have done something wrong or shameful. You see? It’s not the sex that is the problem, it’s the rules that say the sex is wrong – that’s the real problem.

This is how Kinsey explains it:

“Some of the more experienced students of juvenile problems [that is to say, his paedophile informants] have come to believe that the emotional reactions of the parents, police officers, and other adults who discover that the child has had such a contact may disturb the child more seriously than the sexual contacts themselves.”

So, if we believe Kinsey, who is responsible for traumatising the child? Well, it's the silly over-reacting parents, isn't it? It's the law, it's religious teaching, it's the moral standards that say sex with children is wrong. See how the heroes and villains have changed places? The moral compass has swung through 180 degrees, and now points south. Paedophiles are the good guys, and protective parents (however well-meaning they may be) are guilty of harming their child in terrible ways.

We find something very like the same logic repeated now in Queer Theory as the rationale for Equality, Diversity and Inclusion. Why are LGBTIQ+ people suffering? Well, to these theorists it's because humans are primarily sexual beings, and when some sexual behaviours are denigrated as shameful, well, that's what causes problems. If we don't want to admit that sex work is inherently harmful to prostituted women, then we better find a different explanatory mechanism for the clear indications that they suffer lower life outcomes than other women. If you don't acknowledge that sexual abuse produces trauma, then you can look at the LGBTIQ+ community – a population group that suffers significantly higher levels of sexual trauma, including child sexual abuse – and apparently not see that this might be a factor in contributing to lower life outcomes. Oh look, the real problem must be stigma, discrimination or heteronormativity and, if that is so, then the only way to solve the problems afflicting LGBTIQ+ people is to mainstream exotic sexual cultures, so that they are not made to feel different to other people.

I'm not remotely saying that stigma doesn't exist or that bullying isn't a contributing factor to LGBTIQ+ suffering. I am saying it's a failure of compassion when public policy treats LGBTIQ+ people as an homogenous identity group whose problems can be solved with a one-size fits all solution and then fails to grapple with the actual problems they are facing. They are among the people most harmed by policies that refuse to recognise the detrimental consequences of trauma and Queer Theory has to rigorously avoid acknowledging trauma, particularly sexual trauma, if it is going to maintain the illusion of intellectual credibility.

So, I hope this explains why, in my view, Queer Theory has the potential to be so dangerous. It refuses to acknowledge the detrimental consequences of sexual trauma and therefore denies victims the help they need. It creates the ideological justification for the complete collapse of moral boundaries that are necessary to protect the vulnerable from

sexual predation that causes trauma. It provides the justification for mischaracterising those who insist on maintaining these boundaries, including parents of young children, as irrational, “phobic” or prone to “moral panic”. Queer Theory demands that we think of the human person as primarily a sexual being and, accordingly, create a society in which sexual freedom must be the highest social priority.

Gender

These ideas have been incubating quietly in exotic sexual cultures and niche fields of academia for decades. The reason they are now emerging into mainstream public policy has to do with the pivot to focussing on gender. The history of gender ideology leads us back to the same coterie of sexual radicals that supported Kinsey and promulgated his ideas to the world. Men such as Magnus Hirschfeld, Harry Benjamin, John Money, for example - all supported sexual liberation, including paedophilia, and their life’s work demonstrates a settled fascination with affirming cross-sex identities, particularly in young boys.

The term “gender identity” was coined in 1964 by Robert J. Stoller, a psychiatry profession and popularized by Dr John Money who used this term describe an individual’s concept of their sexed self. He speculated that a person’s “gender identity” might vary independently of biological sex. From the 1970s, feminists began to use the word “gender” differently, to talk about social roles and stereotypes pertaining to women and men as separate biological categories. The concepts are related but distinct. What John Money was talking about relates very specifically to sexual-self concept, whether you feel “like a man” or “like a woman” in terms of your *sexual role*.

With the publication of her book, *Gender Trouble*, in 1990, Judith Butler proffered a slightly reconceived version of gender identity that is detached from the male/female binary, still related to sexual performance but fluid, so that it can change from moment to moment. Elevating the significance of gender identity to the exclusion of male/female sex differences can then provide the mechanism needed to decentre heterosexuality. In practical terms, the principle works this way: if you can’t tell who is a man and who is a woman, then you can’t distinguish between homosexual and heterosexual relationships and in the gender confusion that results, norms are blurred all sexuality is “queered”.

Butler’s ideas hijacked the feminist movement by persuading a new generation of Gender Studies graduates that the key to women’s liberation was to deny that “woman” is a biological category and to replace male/female distinctions in our culture and language with non-gendered concepts and words.

Identifying as non-binary now provides a low-commitment mechanism for joining the queer community. You can announce your political objection to heteronormativity without having to be sexually diverse – because now you just change your pronouns.

And, of course, encouraging trans and non-binary identities has opened huge new revenue streams for Big Pharma and other consumer markets. So, as well as personal and political motivations for promoting Queer Theory as the guiding principle for “social change”, we now have massive global commercial interests involved, busily funding lobby groups and changing education programs and rolling out Diversity and Inclusivity training schemes to saturate the whole population in Queer Theory.

The SOGI

At the heart of this massive program of social re-engineering you find a fundamentally different concept of the human person to the one that we inherited from the ancient Greeks. Instead of a body and a soul, children in schools are now being taught that the important constituent elements of individual identity are their sexual orientation and gender identity; their SOGI.

If “who you really are” – and activists use that phrase a lot – is all wrapped up in your SOGI, then your body is really irrelevant. You need a body to give expression to your SOGI – you need to be free to have the kind of sex you want, you need to be able to modify your body with hormones and surgery if necessary to give expression to the gender identity – but the information transfer just goes one way; nothing about your unaltered body tells us anything about “who you really are”.

That means that all the information written into the body – your biological sex but also your age, race, and genetic connection to your family – is effectively erased; it becomes irrelevant to “who you really are”.

- If SOGIs have no age, then we can’t distinguish between children and adults anymore. And if all SOGIs need to be able to express themselves sexually, well, you can see how that’s a message that paedophiles would welcome.
- If genetic inheritance is irrelevant to identity, then the rational basis for parental rights disappears. Everything that is important about “who you really are” is contained in your SOGI and none of that comes from your parents.

According to some activists, the main job of good parents is to help their children explore and celebrate their sexual orientation and gender identity. Parents who attempt to place constraints on that exploration, parents who resist the hormones and surgery, or parents who – heaven forbid! – try to impart their own beliefs about sexual morality to their children are guilty of oppressing the little SOGIs in their care. Marxism cannot conceive of benevolent power, and in the writings of some activists, parents who use their authority to protect their children from sexual predation are openly mischaracterized as “abusive” or “unsafe” for their children.

So you see how, in the process of changing the fundamental cultural norms that centre heterosexuality and gender congruence and reimagining the human person and a SOGI, you have removed the cultural template for the nuclear family and you've eliminated parental rights. Marxists have wanted to destroy the nuclear family for more than a century and the sexual revolution provides the ideological tools needed for that task.

You've also destabilised individual identity, severed children from the genetic connections that anchor them within families and people groups. You've even encouraged them to dissociate from their own bodies. We end up with a population of socially atomised individuals who are absolutely dependent upon the state for every form of support. Such a population is then easily controlled.

How many people would actually vote for a Marxist revolution and Kinsey's manifesto for sexual hedonism if it were advanced in the clear light of day? My guess is, not very many. On the other hand, a lot more people will co-operate if you tell them it is all about recognising human diversity and promoting "diversity", "equity" and "inclusion". Disguised in nice words, a radical social agenda can be advanced in plain sight without anyone realising what is happening. Anyone who does challenge it, can be denounced as a bigot - what kind of monster would argue against "equity", "diversity" and "inclusion"?

In concluding, I would summarise my concerns about the political consequences of Queer Theory this way:

- I believe freedom of thought, conscience and belief is essential to any free society;
- I believe families (by and large) are a good thing; I trust loving parents over government to look after children;
- I don't want to see Australia end up as a totalitarian state where the government has these extraordinary powers to intrude into private interactions between parents and their children, religious leaders and their congregations and between health professionals and their patients.
- I don't see how we can escape male/female difference and am absolutely convinced of the harm produced when we set ourselves at war with our own bodies;
- I believe child protection should be an absolute priority, and am concerned that the ideological co-ordinates of Queer Theory point in the opposite direction.

Unless we wise up to Queer Theory and unmask its true objectives, then we risk being taken for fools by political radicals. If the revolution were really so marvellous, if the masterminds of all this thought people would knowingly vote for it, then radical sexual rights activists would not need word-tricks and subterfuge to disguise it. They wouldn't have to stifle free speech to prevent people discussing it.

My hope is that this talk will help to give ordinary Australians a fair chance of understanding Queer Theory and its political consequences, so they can decide for themselves what sort of future they want for our country, for their children and grandchildren.

Thank you for listening.