

Morality Forum Update

Standing up for family values in society

Issue 75

Autumn 2019

“God Sets the Agenda not LGBT or Humanistic Political Parties” By John O’Neill

I attended the Annual Assembly of the Christian People’s Alliance on October 5th near Harlesden in NW LONDON. There were various inspiring speakers throughout the day covering different topics such as Abortion, SRE education in schools, Free Speech etc: *Truth is the most powerful weapon. Ephesians 6:10 Put on the armour of God. God can do incredible miracles when we are in line with his will. We have to be bold. God is in control through us. We need people to impose the kingdom on our knees and by our actions. Don’t be afraid to stand up for the truth. Stand up for God in all areas of life. “If God is with you...” Our values are divinely ordained. We have to work hard. Need to include people from other faiths. A party of truth and love. People need hope and good news. Never underestimate the influence you have on others. “I will bless anyone who blesses you and...” Everything is better when you do things God’s way – stats prove this. When God asks you to do something it sometimes doesn’t look to be sensible. Lack of direction across the whole nation. Ephesians 6:7, God is not mocked. Knife crime is a problem because this country has turned its back on God. Abomination of Abortion in our land. God sets the agenda not LGBT or humanistic political parties. The lies and vitriol and calumny that come against you when you stand for the truth. Abortion is child abuse and genocide, child sacrifice. Most women cry after their abortion. 800 babies aborted in UK every working day. 182,553 killed last year in UK. Highest rates since 1967. Where are the prophets calling this nation to account? Showing graphic pictures about abortion changes minds; we should not be afraid to do this. Prayerful: we must go deeper. Nothing is so influential as the power of the Holy Spirit. Have a passion and a desire to be Godly. Yield ourselves to God’s word. Get passionate about what God stands for. Is.*

(Continued on page 2)

GENERAL IMPORTANT NEWS

There is no single ‘gay gene’, scientists say

Scientists who conducted the largest ever genetic study into sexuality found no evidence of DNA material that was entirely responsible for homosexuality. They have ruled out the existence of a single so-called ‘gay gene’. Researchers obtained the genes of more than 470,000 people mainly taken from the UK Biobank genetic database and DNA testing website 23andME. Scientists combed database information for common genetic variations in people who had slept with someone of the same sex. But they could not find the genetic marker inherited from a mother through the X chromosome that started the theory of a ‘gay gene’. The study found only five genes with a significant link to being gay. Together, these explain 1% of someone’s sexuality, and thousands of further genes combined are needed to have a larger effect. A co-author of the study, Dr Benjamin Neale, a statistical geneticist from the Broad Institute in the US said: ‘This study disproves the notion that sexual behaviour is a choice. We also found that it’s effectively impossible to predict an individual’s sexual behaviour from their genome. Genetics is less than half of this story for sexual behaviour but it’s still a very important contributing factor.’ The study found an individual’s genes have less influence on their sexuality than their educational ability or height. Dr Neale further said that the study was ‘reassuring’ for those who fear that there might one day be attempts to edit DNA, and that, ‘The genetics are just too complicated and biology and the environment are involved.’ The study was published in the journal Science.

‘Pro-suicide advocates’, Dignity in Dying Scotland, have made fresh demands, calling for the widespread introduction of assisted suicide as they allege 11 Scots a week can expect a ‘bad death.’

(Continued on page 3)

Inside this issue:	
God Sets the Agenda not LGBT or Humanistic Political Parties	1
General Important News	1
Prague, Czech Republic - UPF held a Conference examining “Family & the media” and “Why We Need the Family”	2
Morality Forum Action	4
Appalling Decline of Standards of Good Taste and Decency at BBC	4
True Family Values	5
Letters and Emails Received	6
Marriage and divorce in the liberal imagination	6
The Anatomy of Cultural Marxism and Why it Always Leads to Aggression, Divisiveness, and a Decline in Social Well-Being	7
Morality Forum 43 Lancaster Gate London W2 3NA Tel: 020-77230721 www.moralityforum.org.uk Editor: John O’Neill Design and Technical Section: Frank Van Der Stok	

45:3. Be credible with God and he will do the rest. It is the fear of God that is the beginning of all wisdom. We have a mighty God. Be Godly. It's an honour to serve God. Love casts out fear. Faith will take you beyond your mind and emotions. We need humility and honesty not trying to make ourselves look good. We became compromisers. Many parents are livid about SRE lessons. Some schools already implementing 2020 legislation. UK is second in Europe for teenage pregnancies. STI's at epidemic levels. Adult themes to children. Criminally misleading children with transgender ideology. Reprehensible for those things to be endorsed by schools. Parents are primary educators of their children within their own religious and cultural beliefs. Grassroots operation needed to combat this. People are afraid of saying what is true. Human dignity comes from Gen. 1:27. Declaration of Human rights. Article 10 – Freedom of Expression. Eph. 4:15. 1Peter 3:14-17. We have a higher authority from which all truth comes. Should not be afraid to say things. Jesus died for speaking the truth. Our culture is based on rampant individualism. Matt 5: 11-12. Mark 8:38. Matt 5:9. If we want to stand for God, we have to stand for everything. David slayed the giant and the nation was transformed. More power in CPA than in the main parties. God's power can change the nation. We have had enough of evil triumphing. Evil triumphs when the Church is not in the right place. CPA stands for truth. Other parties' humanistic politics frightened of offending people. We will stand for holiness and righteousness. Take the shield of faith against the enemy. Have to grasp the power of prayer; without prayer we cannot win the battle. Standing for marriage and family. Family breakdown costs £50 billion. Respect for life from conception to death. In USA, in some states they cannot kill if there is a heartbeat. Only "horrific" are the pictures (of baby in womb) to those who want to kill the unborn child. One Labour Christian MP hid before voting against assisted dying because he would be persecuted by his colleagues. Help persecuted Christians. Care for the poor. Support people who leave prison. Reoffending 35%. For one year 62%. Make sure family values and morality are restored. Stand together. All of the speakers at this event were dedicated moral/family activists, and it is always very uplifting and inspiring to be in the company of such people. One of the speakers was Christian Hacking a member of the Centre For Bio-Ethical Reform UK. This pro-life organisation were in the national news recently because they are targeting Stella Creasy the Walthamstow MP who was instrumental, together with the former Speaker of the House of Commons, John Bercow, in forcing abortion (and same-sex marriage) onto Northern Ireland in a devious and blatant misuse of parliamentary procedures. Postcards and leaflets have been produced which show pictures of fetuses in the womb and also aborted fetuses. Such images have been proven to be very successful in getting many people to change their views to being pro-life instead of pro-abortion. CBR also have wording on the postcards which states: "Your MP is working hard to take away my human rights". This wording is next to the photo of the fetus in the womb. Also, people are asked to contact Stella Creasy and to ask her to, "Stop promoting human rights abuses of children in the womb." There is



parliamentary procedures. leaflets have been produced which show pictures of fetuses in the womb and also aborted fetuses. Such images have been proven to be very successful in getting many people to change their views to being pro-life instead of pro-abortion. CBR also have wording on the postcards which states: "Your MP is working hard to take away my human rights". This wording is next to the photo of the fetus in the womb. Also, people are asked to contact Stella Creasy and to ask her to, "Stop promoting human rights abuses of children in the womb." There is

also a web address: www.stopstella.com. Another inspiring speaker was Susan Mason. Susan has started a campaign *RSE SCHOOLGATE CAMPAIGN*. Leaflets are given to people outside school gates highlighting the dangers posed by the government's totalitarian policy for SRE lessons. Susan highlights issues such as *Sexualising Children, Taking An Interest In Pornography, Confusing Children etc*. Various action points are listed such as using parental human rights and linking up with other parents. Also, links to other relevant organisations are listed. To order Susan's leaflets: schoolgatecampaign@gmail.com The latest *Safe at School* bulletin is also now available. This contains also very important information concerning RSE lessons in schools: information@spuc.org.uk. May each one of us do our best in following the wonderful example of dedicated moral/family activists such as Susan Mason and organisations such as CBRUK etc. Truly, with such commitment Almighty God will surely step in and help us to protect our nation from the evils of amoral RSE lessons and abortion-on-demand etc.

Luke 10:19 "Behold, I give you power to tread on serpents and scorpions, and over all the power of the enemy; and nothing by any means will hurt you."

Prague, Czech Republic—UPF held a conference examining “Family and the Media” and “Why We Need the Family.”

The Czech UPF chapter organizes a special event every year on the occasion of International Day of Families. On May 30, 2019, together with the Civic Institute, UPF convened a half-day conference in the CEVRO Institute, a private university. In the first panel, “Family and the Media,” two well-known journalists described how the



Left to right: Dr. Juraj Lajda of UPF with speakers Jan Gregor and Matyáš Zrno

family and family values are depicted in the media. Jan Gregor, the vice president of the Alliance for the Family and a media expert, offered a detailed analysis of how the mainstream media have described the family and family values during the last several years, based on about 20 of the most important printed, electronic and private media. According to the research, the majority of articles on the family in the mainstream media are negative (about 60 percent); the rest are positive or neutral. The media often present the traditional family as a social issue. Statistically this is not true. In reality, traditional families are wealthier, more stable and better educated. This negative media picture destroys the ideal of a harmonized family and leads to doubts about marriage and redefinition of the family, the speaker concluded. Matyáš Zrno, editor in chief of Conservative Newspapers and also the Psychology Today monthly, spoke from his experience. He said that journalists usually stand politically apart from the majority of people. As an example, he said that in Germany 40 percent of journalists are for the Green Party, even though the reality among the population is around 20 percent. Concerning the family in the conservative media, he said that it is more important to write about the family positively—large families, etc.—than to focus on and criticize the negative aspects of the family. The second panel, “Why We Need the Family,” was opened by Dr. Juraj Lajda, the president of the Czech chapter of UPF. He intro-

(Continued on page 3)

(Continued from page 1: General Important News)

According to a new report produced by Dignity in Dying Scotland, 11 terminally ill Scots could "suffer intolerably" in their final weeks and months. As a result of these claims, the campaigning group has called for the legalisation of assisted suicide. Dignity in Dying Director, Ally Thompson, claimed that '11 Scots a week can expect a bad death.' SPUC Scotland, Director of Communications, Michael Robinson said: "Scaremongering is a tactic of assisted suicide advocates. Scotland like the rest of the UK should be continuing to pursue excellent health care for people at the end of their lives and must resist Dignity in Dying's dangerous agenda. Scaring people to support suicide is a desperate measure with dire consequences as we have seen around the world. Suicide leads to worse conditions for patients and creates momentum for widening the categories of those who are made to feel they should choose to die. We need to ensure we do not become one of the countries where the weak, sick and elderly feel they have a duty to die. Palliative care is the answer to concerns about suffering, yet assisted suicide undermines palliative care by proposing a cheap alternative which undermines human dignity." Director of SPUC's Patient's Network, Antonia Tully said: "Our current law protects every citizen, especially the elderly, sick and disabled. A change in law to legalise assisted suicide sends a lethal message; that the vulnerable are not worthy of life. The prospect of implementing a pro-suicide regime highlights that we have truly lost the meaning of what it is to care for one another." "It is disturbing that Nick Boles (MP) has upheld nations such as the United States and Canada as models of inspiration regarding assisted suicide. These countries have witnessed some of the most distressing consequences of medically assisted death. In Washington State, 56% of people who were killed by assisted suicide confirmed that their reason behind it was fear of being a burden on family, friends and caregivers. Similarly, a Canadian man only last month was killed by assisted suicide after authorities cut the funding to his in-home care. In the meantime, the nation of Canada itself allows citizens to apply for assisted suicide if they suffer from a mental illness." Ms Tully continued: "It is vital that we remain vigilant to the pressing issue of assisted suicide which is now, more than ever looming over Scotland and the rest of the UK. The slippery slope of assisted suicide is now on full display around the globe. It is crucial, for our collective protection that we resist its pressures to infiltrate the United Kingdom." *This article is published by permission of Society for the Protection of Unborn Children*

Pastor Slams Abortion, Calls Killing Babies a "Human Sacrifice to Demons" INTERNATIONAL MICAIAH BILGER JUL 29, 2019 | 5:23PM WELLINGTON, NEW ZEALAND

A New Zealand pastor slammed abortion as a "human sacrifice to demons" this week in reaction to legislation that would expand the killing of unborn babies in the country. "The killing of babies is condemned in the Bible and history tells us that only the most decadent and corrupt societies tolerated such evil; only the vilest defended and celebrated it as a virtue," Destiny Church Pastor Brian Tamaki told the New Zealand Herald. Abortions have been legal since 1977 in New Zealand. According to Right to Life New Zealand, more than 500,000 unborn babies have been aborted since then. Now, lawmakers are considering legislation to expand abortion by removing it from the criminal code. Tamaki did not hold back any condemnation of abortion as a horrific evil against God and unborn babies. "As a Christian, I know that demonic forces are behind the killing of our babies," he told the news outlet. "Abortion is

Satan's attempt to kill God in effigy by destroying the little ones created in God's image. We are not just dealing with a social or so-called health issue here, but with a demonic genocide." He said abortion is just a modern version of child sacrifice. "It is an act of child sacrifice to the post-modern radical left's demons of convenience, where they put social conventions and career wellbeing ahead of human life," Tamaki continued. "Abortion is none other than the savage pagan practises of baby sacrifice described in Ezekiel, Psalms and Jeremiah 19:5-6 – "where they built the high places of Baal to burn their children in the fire as offerings to Baal," the pastor said. Abortions can hurt women as well, he added, citing the high risk of mental health problems after an abortion. He criticized abortion activists for misleading women by using terms like "pro-choice," "women's health care" and "fetal tissue," rather than explaining what an abortion really is. Tamaki expressed sympathy for women and girls who feel pressured into aborting their unborn babies. "Thousands of New Zealand mothers, most who don't know better, are persuaded and aided by activists, the Government and certain so-called health practitioners annually to carry out premeditated murder on their unborn children," he told the news outlet. *This article is published by permission of Life News*

(Continued from page 2: Prague Czech Republic)

duced the family as the primary social environment for human beings. The problems of the family influence society, he said. All world religions support and honour the family and family values, he added. He introduced the vertical and horizontal structure of the family, as far as the relationships are concerned, and compared the family structure with the structure and order of the universe. The family's external structure needs internal content, which is the love that we can experience in the family. The four great realms of love and heart are the core, and each family should develop them, Dr. Lajda said. We need a new view of the family. In order to build up good families and prevent undesired results, we need to start in the home. Next the educational system should support the strengthening of healthy families, and the social policy of the state should create a good environment for families. Finally the culture, the arts and the media can contribute to establishing good families. The next speaker, Dr. Roman Joch, the director of the Civic Institute and a political scientist, said that the family has become a political question. Only a few years ago, nobody in the United States would have considered the family to be anything other than a man and a woman. According to Dr. Joch, democracy has three ideals: freedom, equality and authority. The best unit that corresponds to this political system is the family, because it demonstrates freedom (a man and a woman marry out of free will), equality (the husband and wife are equal to each other) and authority (children are equal among themselves but are expected to respect the parents' authority). A family that functions well is independent of the state and is the best prevention against dictatorship and totalitarianism, Dr. Joch said. Family breakdown strengthens the role of the state, because then people become more dependent on the state. That's why the state should give the family more autonomy, Dr. Joch concluded. The last speaker was H.E. Nina Nováková, a former member of parliament and chair of the Central European Inspiration. To love somebody unconditionally is very difficult, she said. Only the saints were able to love their enemies, but in the family it is possible, she said. In the family we love each other, even though somebody is ugly. The education of children is the right of the parents. Parents very often give up on the education of their own children and surrender this role to the state. School should teach the ideals. Today's battle for the family is the battle between good and evil, Mrs. Nováková said in conclusion. In the discussion that followed, many questions were raised concerning family policy and trends that endanger the family. Among the people in the audience were academicians, religious representatives and the general public.

Morality Forum Action

Dear Rosena, [Allin-Khan MP] I am writing to you regarding the Government's plans concerning Relationships Education and Sex Education in schools. The Society for The Protection of Unborn Children have stated: "The government is still refusing to listen regarding the right of parents to withdraw their children from any part of Relationships Education, despite more than 250,000 campaign postcards, dispatched from SPUC, to enable concerned people in England to call upon the Secretary of State to uphold this right. The Government's own consultation on this issue produced the following results: **31%** of respondents were parents and represented the largest group. **11%** of people who responded were grandparents, making **42%** of people who responded those with the greatest interest in the welfare of children. **58%** of those who responded **disagreed** (including 40% 'strongly') that the content of Relationships Education for primary schools is 'age appropriate'. **60% disagreed** (42% 'strongly') that the subject will help pupils at primary school. 'have positive relationships.' **64% disagreed** (50% 'strongly') that the content of Relationships and Sex Education for secondary schools is 'age appropriate'. **66% disagreed** (50% strongly) that the subject will help pupils at secondary school 'have positive relationships.' **58% disagreed** (41% strongly) that at secondary schools, taking the right of withdrawal for sex education away from the parent, and giving the decision to the head teacher, was, 'an appropriate and workable option'. Over **twice** as many respondents were **against** the teaching of LGBT issues as were in favour. In a recent article in the Daily Mail it was highlighted that parents in Warwickshire are warning that the new sex and relationships programme will cause the early sexualisation of their children, with one couple telling the Daily Mail that they have removed their sons from the lessons. Part of the lessons are encouraging the children to masturbate. Tory MP David Davies said: "I and many other parents would be furious at the completely inappropriate sexual matters being taught to children as young as six. These classes go way beyond the guidance the Government is producing and are effectively sexualising young children." An Anglican Vicar, Reverend Peter Hughes, the rector of St. Alban's church in Rotherham has made the following comments about sex and relationships education in schools. "Christian parents need to wake up to the danger posed by cultural Marxists directly targeting their children with LGBTI ideology." And that such programs were "state-sponsored child abuse...the LGBTI activists are imposing a sexual philosophy which at its heart is both anti-Christian and harmful...preparing [children] for early sexual experimentation." It is **completely unacceptable** for the Government to ignore the concerns and anxieties expressed by so many parents, grandparents, and other concerned people, about children attending our schools in relation to this matter. Freedom of religion and conscience is enshrined within the UN Declaration of Human Rights, and also, similar EU and UK Equality laws. To ignore the rights of the parents concerning freedom of religion and conscience, and to protect the innocence and purity of their children is clearly a form of totalitarianism. Please do all that you can to stop the Government from introducing these highly offensive and totally unacceptable Relationships Education and Sex Education programmes in our schools. Best regards! Bruno Klotz, 54, Greyswood Street, SW16 6QN

On June 21st and August 17th together with other members of the Harrow branch of SPUC, John O'Neill delivered abortion information leaflets door-to-door in the Harrow and Stanmore areas of NW London.

John O'Neill was one of the speakers at a Prayer Summit event

held at Dominion Faith Chapel Int. at East ham on June 8th.

Together with around 30 other people, John O'Neill took part in a peaceful protest outside Brent library NW London, regarding a Drag Queen story event targeting small children. The event was organised by Christian Voice. Leaflets were handed out and there were various speakers.

John O'Neill complained to the manager at his local Sainsburys store, and also to Sainsburys head office concerning Sainsburys support of LGBT Pride month. Other Morality forum supporters responded also.



By chance, John O'Neill met John McDonnell MP on the street in Hayes Middlesex on July 26th. During a five-minute conversation about different important issues, John highlighted to Mr McDonnell the importance of Almighty God being at the centre of our nation again. Mr McDonnell's response was positive, and he asked John to send him further information by email which John did.

Andy Johnson has been contacting religious leaders encouraging them to take a stand against the government's totalitarian SRE education plans.

Items from SPUC continue to be widely distributed, including *Safe at School* bulletins and *SPUC PRO-LIFE TODAY* newsletters. John O'Neill continues to speak in different churches about key moral, family issues, and also distributing items from SPUC.

Appalling Decline of Standards of Good Taste and Decency at BBC

Dear Mr Rainey [BBC Complaints] RE: My original complaint and your reply about Radio 4's 'The Puppet Master' by Gabriel gatehouse – containing foul language – 1:45 pm after the lunchtime news – an attempt to normalise foul language by not bleeping and obscuring it. Thank you for your letter of 11.4.19; as it was basically the BBC's permanent standard reply I don't think there is a limit to when I can refer back to it. I didn't feel the reply answered my request for a "credible explanation of why sex-swearing was not bleeped". Other programmes are bleeped, particularly on the World Service – Do R4 listeners not merit the same respect and attention as the rest of the world? You said the BBC's "special responsibility" only applies to child listeners. (Not to moral and social principles?). Also, that because society doesn't have one identical opinion on language, the BBC lets its editors judge what they broadcast. (Is this a sound idea? The BBC operates in an isolated 'bubble' overendowed with 'managers' and it has a rumour of a cocaine culture permanently lingering around it). You say the BBC can only sort out this problem of language by broadcasting the whole language range, so no listener feels left out. (There is no mention of BBC principles here either). You also appear to be saying if anyone complains, it's probably because they don't recognise that the BBC was "challenging the audience's expectations in surprising ways". I quote the BBC's mantra: "Some of the words that can cause some viewers concern have, whether we like it or not, become part of everyday language". People go to the toilet habitually, but you don't broadcast it, so why feel you have to broadcast everything verbal? It sounds like an agenda to introduce coarse, vulgar language everywhere. Are there no BBC staff in responsible posts who can visualise the future? COARSE, OFFENSIVE, WEAKNESS-DRIVEN LANGUAGE IN PUBLIC makes a clear sign within society that all boundaries are trashed and 'anything goes now' – which means life becomes degraded and desensitized. A desensitized society is a very dangerous place for the vulnerable – elderly people, disabled people, the very young, people who are different, foreigners – and animals (and it doesn't do the rest much good either). Toddlers picking up sex-swearing must be the delight of paedophiles, not to mention a green light to them. Has no-one at

(Continued on page 7)



TRUE FAMILY VALUES MINISTRY

The Parental Realm of Heart

A. The parental realm of heart.

3. *The parents act in the position of God, creating and educating their children.*

- Their love is as patient, enduring and compassionate as God's love.
- They invest totally in their children. They give and give and forget what they have given, and give again. They endure any difficulty without ceasing to give.
- They give entirely for the child's sake, centring on God. Parental love is selfless, generous. The more they can give to the children, the happier they are. Parents do not calculate their giving to the children. They do not ask for repayment later. Parents like to be taken advantage of by the children, who exploit their abilities to nurse, feed, embrace, play, teach, and support financially.
- Therefore, we must be people of absolute love in order to be true parents.
- Parents will sacrifice for the child, placing their child's value as greater than their own.
 - The mother who runs without thinking in front of an oncoming car to save her child who wanders onto the street.
 - The father who rushes back into a burning house to rescue his baby.
 - Parents who deny themselves in order to put their children through school.
 - No one criticizes such actions as irrational. Everyone respects parental love. It is a universal value.
- Their love is in the likeness of the love of God, the Father. The heart of a parent feels the child's pain, but disciplines for his own good. The parent should pray in tears all night for their child, not just punish. When the child becomes too old to receive physical punishment, the parent must ask the child to punish him for not being a good enough parent.

4. *The parents' goal is that their children become true men and women.*

- They want their children to be better than themselves - smarter, more attractive, more loving, more resourceful, more successful. Parents are never jealous of their child's surpassing them.
- Therefore we can understand that God wants us to be greater than Him. We can understand our value to God.
- The child has universal value.
- The child represents God's personal gift, and reflects God's own personality.
- The child represents the spouse's personal gift, and reflects the spouse's personality.

5. *The ideal for parents is true parental love.*

- A man with his mind and body united, centring on God's

will, is a true man. A woman with her mind and body united, centring on God's will, is a true woman.

- By the Blessing of God, a true man and true woman may be joined in marriage, to become true parents.
- The first man and woman, called Adam and Eve in the Bible, should have followed God's commandment and become a true man and true woman, true husband and true wife, and true parents.
- As true parents, their conjugal love would have been the dwelling place of God. Therefore, their children would have been the true children of God, and their lineage would have been the lineage of God.
- Because Adam and Eve fell, their love was not godly, and God could not participate in their family life. Their lineage was based upon false love. Their children were not true children of God, and their lineage was not God's lineage (John 8:44).
- The world is in need of true parents, who can create true conjugal love in which God can dwell. Through this love, true children and the true lineage of God can be created.
- God can be present in conjugal love based upon His Blessing of our marriage. Through His Blessing, we are connected to God's lineage.

6. *This world has not seen true parental love. Although few parents are cruel and uncaring, all are limited in their ability to love, because they themselves did not receive true love as children from their own parents.*

- If parental heart is not planted deep within the children, the gap between parents and children will expand.
- Primitive cultures have practiced infanticide; today there are millions of abortions a year, and increasing violent child abuse.
- Parents as defective models has led to the "generation gap."
- Children without good parents turn to crime, drugs, irresponsible sex, as they seek the affection they were deprived of in childhood.
- People ignorant of true love abuse defenceless nature, destroying the environment.
- A false model of authority arose. People in authority began oppressing those under them and lording it over the masses with tyranny and terror.

The Authority of True Love

A. The governing authority of true love.

1. *By passing through the four great realms of heart and embodying true love, we gain the nobility and authority of king and queen.*

- The achievement of true love, not power, is the highest purpose of life.
- Being a secular ruler is just a role, like any other job. It is a secondary purpose. But becoming a king of love is the primary purpose of life.
- This is true for everyone. In this primary arena of life, everyone is equal.
- We grow our love through completing the four great realms of heart as children, then as parents, and finally as grandparents.

(to be continued...from the book "True Family Values" by Wilson & Pak <http://www.hsabooks.com/books>)

Letters and Emails Received

Thank you very much for all your communication and your emails on Morality Forum. John, I admire your dedication and all your works and efforts in preserving moral ethics and values of biblical Christianity IN LOVING YOUR NEIGHBOUR and protecting children from any form of harms from the current society which has no respect, honour and reverence to God. Also, rights of moral people in the world. I pray Our Creator raises many John's like you pursuing the mighty battle you are engaged in. We need our voices to be heard in the Parliament and other authorities. In love of Christ, Jayanti

Dear John, Many thanks for this. [Summer Update] I liked the letter to President Trump! God bless you and your tireless work. Ian Kelly (Harrow SPUC)

Dear John, Thanks for the Update. Keep up the good work. Kind regards. Cllr. John D. Nottingham. (Dewsbury, W. Yorks.)

Thank you, Dear Pastor John. We appreciate your love and your commitment to the great commission and the work of the kingdom. God bless. Pastor Taiwo

Marriage and divorce in the liberal imagination - By Colin Hart

Marriage can be defined in a number of different ways. The online Oxford English Dictionary defines it as: 'the legally or formally recognized union of two people as partners in a personal relationship'. Lynne Featherstone, the former Equalities Minister defined it more romantically as 'a celebration of love [that] should be open to everyone'. Although such a definition doesn't seem to put any limit on the number of people involved, at least it is positive about marriage. However, according to Julie Bindel, founder of the feminist campaigning group Justice for Women: 'Marriage is an out-moded institution built on patriarchal inequality that has no place in modern society.' A summary of the Western legal definition was given by Lord Penzance in the case of Hyde v Hyde and Woodmansee over 150 years ago when he defined marriage as 'the voluntary union for life of one man and one woman, to the exclusion of all others'.

Lord Penzance's definition embodies four essential components: **It is a voluntary union.** Free consent is required. A forced marriage is not a true marriage. **It is a union for life.** Marriage is not entered into for a temporary period or a fixed term. Easy divorce laws have undermined this profoundly. **It is a union of one man and one woman.** Marriage is monogamous and unions between two men or two women do not constitute a true marriage. **It is a union to the exclusion of all others.** Marriage entails a commitment to faithfulness and sexual exclusivity. Easy divorce laws create a whole culture of serial monogamy and hollow out the definition of marriage. **Marriage in the liberal imagination:** A romantic view of marriage and a Marxist-feminist view of marriage have resulted in marriage being widely regarded as a plastic institution. **The romantic view:** Marriage has been dumbed down to a mere 'celebration of love'. The 'for life' aspect has been eroded. We are told: 'If your marriage doesn't live up to the romantic Hollywood ideal, surely it's your right – even your duty to yourself – to move on and seek fulfilment elsewhere? Your real soulmate is still out there, waiting to be found.' But the expectation of living in a perpetual bubble of romantic bliss will always result in dissatisfaction because it collides with reality. While we still insist that marriage is a voluntary union, requiring the consent of each party, the consent argument is now being turned on its head and deployed against life-long marriage. Holding a spouse to his or her vows is

now being likened to a forced marriage. So as soon as someone no longer wants to be married, it is argued that they should be allowed to leave it unilaterally on demand. Under the government's no-fault divorce plans, public policy is firmly on the side of the party that wants a divorce. There will be no opportunity for a spouse to contest it. If marriage becomes a relationship that can be terminated at any time by either party, it will be brittle, performance-based, and immature, without any protecting structure. This inevitably brings great insecurity for the parties. The only thing holding the marriage together will be the desire of both people at any given moment to be part of the marriage. As one author has said, unions based on romantic feelings and physical attraction 'are often the most tyrannical of bonds because they depend entirely upon the partners keeping emotionally all the time up to scratch'. When the romance wanes, or when the performance of a spouse drops below the optimum and there are better opportunities elsewhere, why stick with the marriage? Why not trade up for a new model? There's no restraint on selfishness. If your feelings are disappointed, then you can file for divorce. If marriage is merely a romantic relationship then each spouse knows that the other could up and leave without cause or warning. This is bound to affect what they put into the marriage. Why invest in the marriage if it could all be so easily ended? It naturally reduces commitment, undermining the marriage at its very core. **The Marxist-feminist view:** Both Marxists and feminists see marriage as the patriarchal exploitation of women. Early communist Russia aggressively promoted cohabitation and equated it with marriage. The 1918 Family Code 'severed the concept of marriage from that of the family'. Marriage was no longer to be a life-long commitment, so in came no-fault divorce. Alexander Goikhbarg, a key author of the 1918 Code, boasted: 'Marriage in Soviet legislation has ceased to be a prison... a union lifelong in principle, concluded for a whole lifetime, indissoluble.' The 1926 Family Code gave further rights to cohabitantes and speeded up divorce to just three days. Between 1926 and 1927 an already high divorce rate rose by nearly 70 per cent. Marriage was undermined using quick no-fault divorce. And it was more effective in doing so than the Communists ever dreamed. In fact, it was too effective. The ensuing destruction of family life began to destroy Russian society itself. Russia's leaders eventually had to do something. The deputy chairman of the Supreme Court said in 1936: 'It is necessary to put an end to the anarchist view of marriage and childbirth as an exclusively private affair.' **Three cardinal myths:** Back to today, the nature of marriage is not properly understood. And that means that divorce isn't understood either. Divorce is far more serious than society has been led to believe by our cultural elites. Opinion formers, the social policy intelligentsia, family lawyers and the media have been heavily influenced by wrong views of marriage. These elites propagate three cardinal myths. **Myth #1: You are better off after divorce.** The facts contradict this. Couples who persevere through periods of unhappiness in their marriage are likely to be glad they did so later. Research found that seven in ten parents who were unhappy at the time of the birth of their first child stayed together. Of these, around two-thirds were happy ten years later. **Myth #2: The law doesn't influence behaviour.** But the statistics show that major liberalisations of the law on divorce in England and Wales resulted in an increase in the number of divorces. In the space of a single decade successive changes to the process of divorce saw divorces rocket by two and a half times from 58,239 in 1970 to 148,301 in 1980. Over the same period, the divorce rate rose from 4.7 divorces per thousand of the married population to 12. **Myth #3:** The law can't be used to restrict divorce. A marriage is brought into being by solemn public declarations. In order to be married the couple have to intend to stay together for life, at least at

(Continued on page 8)

The Anatomy of Cultural Marxism and Why it Always Leads to Aggression, Divisiveness, and a Decline in Social Well-Being

By Stephen Stacey *(continued from last edition)*

Trans-theory and trans-rights law-making also can be placed under the banner of cultural Marxism. Again, this is done under the banner of compassion. Trans-activists make the claim that Mother Nature has, in Her lawbook, a special set of rights that apply to people who are confused about their sexual nature and that these special rights override the natural rights of everyone else in society. Thus, in passing any law or policy that is connected to trans-activism, then a range of much larger groups of individuals automatically lose their natural rights. And since natural rights are there to protect the wider society (that's what Mother Nature is all about), taking away so many natural rights from everyone else ultimately leads to much poorer social outcomes for many citizens. Thus, girls lose their natural right to be able to dress and undress without men, who say they are women, watching them. Fewer girls will go to the gym and many will become increasingly frightened of men in general. Thus, in athletics, women lose their natural right to just compete against other women with the same XX chromosomes, and many will give up on sports. And people are increasingly told that women can have penises and that men can have a period - thus taking away everyone's natural right to say what they know to be true. And gender-confused children are increasingly rushed off to have hormone replace therapies that will destroy their lives, all against their natural right of consent - consent which the Geneva Convention clearly states can only really be given by a mature, cognitive adult. And this happens even though research clearly shows that the vast majority of these children will grow out of their confusion as they go through puberty. In trans-rights law-making, these and many other groups of individuals have worse life outcomes. The damage done is far, far worse than the benefits accruing to a very, very, small group of individuals who struggle with gender identity disorder. These are psychologically challenged adults or temporarily confused children. This is what science shows us to be true. And it is the only way for us to save ourselves from harming so many other groups of people within the social fabric, all in the name of compassion. But still, those who see the damage and say something are called transphobic. And the law increasingly targets them as being nasty people. All these legal interventions are just part of the body of law-making that comes under the title of cultural Marxism. It is often called politically correct law-making because the politicians would like these laws to be true and helpful, but science proves them otherwise. The introduction of Islam into the social fabric of the West also has the same negative dynamics. Sharia law, which is embedded in Islam, automatically takes away natural rights from various groups of individuals, especially from women. Many of those who are against Sharia law becoming part of the social fabric of democratic nations see the harm that its introduction will do. They are not racist or Islamophobic. They just don't want their granddaughters living under a foreign set of laws, laws that will cause their granddaughters harm. They have every right to want to protect them. Several other laws also fall under this same dynamic. Conclusion: America today is in a very dangerous place. There are those who see the social damage that these laws have created or will create, and they are increasingly targeted by those who can't. Those who see the damage are increasingly banned from campuses. The media increasingly gives them no space to share their views. Social media increasingly shuts down those who worry about these Marxist laws, calling them haters or fake news. In the past - in China, the USSR, North Korea and more - this all turned very horrid. Millions were jailed or killed. The current level of aggression in the debates in the USA is toxic, with those who refuse to look at the present and future damage increasingly seeking to destroy the careers of those who see the damage. It could all turn very nasty. The challenge is that most of the media no longer want to look at both sides of the argument. They refuse to educate the public about why there are two very differ-

ent viewpoints. This would diffuse much of the tension. And the universities also increasingly teach the cultural Marxist worldview without looking at the harm that it will create. And the fear of being attacked for speaking what many know to be true keeps many professionals silent. The West is in a dangerous place. Though the cultural Marxist, social-progressives are preaching that the world is becoming a better, more-caring, more-tolerant place because of their efforts, ever-increasing levels of social decline are apparent in almost all sets of social data. Although many people are enjoying better lives than their parents ever had, a vast range of different groups of individuals are now experiencing far worse outcomes, directly because of these cultural Marxist laws. Homelessness, drug abuse, deaths from drug overdoses, rates of infertility, babies born addicted to drugs, obesity amongst mi-

(Continued on page 8)

(Continued from page 4: Decline of Standards of Decency BBC)

the BBC the ability and personal responsibility to consider this? (Public obscene language is an example of the few invading the personal space of the many and taking it over - bullying in other words, and there is no human right to bully.) When salesmen and postmen go to customers' houses and swear, and people making public speeches foul-mouth as a matter of course, you will be able to claim that foul, offensive, weakness-driven language is everyday language in Britain. Until then the BBC is just pushing its own agenda on this. The people I have recently heard publicly sex-swearing don't appear to be a cross-section of society - A woman leaving a supermarket yelling to her children - and anyone within earshot - that it was "xing hot in there"; a middle-aged man pulling a suitcase on wheels, leading his family along the pavement, shouting "out me xin' way" at passers-by; a young man in a very showy T-shirt talking much louder than his friends and frequently sex-swearing; a scruffy young man on a mobile phone rushing down the road and having a loud, uncontrolled sex-swearing row with his girlfriend. I appreciate that you want to give all of them the chance to hear language on the radio that is natural to them, but I doubt that they listen to Radio 4. Are you familiar with the generally accepted list of people who swear? Extreme attention-seekers (or in the case of the acting profession: publicity-seekers) Power-grubbers - who mistakenly think it makes them look powerful. People losing control of self or situation. People who are converting emotional or physical sexual problems into crude language. Those who have never learned to express themselves adequately. (There is a further group developing - a few of the people with dementia). Swearing always shows personal weaknesses and unsolved problems and you can often guess what the people's problem is. Finally, the BBC does not have a very good history of sound judgements behind it. E.g. Chartering a helicopter and broadcasting a police raid on Cliff Richard's home, then trying to put the film in for an award, when Cliff Richard had not even been charged with anything. Announcing on national TV news when a model was shot dead in the toilet by her athlete boyfriend in South Africa that "from the state of the body, Miss X had just been to the toilet". Outrageously intrusive and the public didn't want or need to know. The 2017 Red Nose Day show was a display of swearing and vulgarity - before 9pm - and not even funny. Radio 4 morning Woman's Hour in 2016 broadcast an erotic novel where about a dozen obscene words occurred within 15 minutes. These examples weren't all the incidents of course, but they are the ones which come easily to mind as really low points that have played a part so far in normalising bad behaviour and bad language in public - not to mention bringing into question how the BBC still gets a licence fee, considering there is a principle of 'public money for the public good'. I shall write separately about the recent radio broadcast of a so-called 'poetic fable' as morning 'Book of the Week' - Deaf Republic - which turned out to be a male sex fantasy with crude sexual language, and also the broadcasting from Glastonbury of Stormzy getting an audience to chant sex-swearing about Boris Johnson and politicians - but this needs separate letters. I know you are doing your prescribed job efficiently, so I plan to copy my letter to Broadcasting House as well. Yours sincerely, Jacqueline Deeks.

nors, suicide rates, children with ADHD, rates of single-parenting, - and much more - all are rising and linked to these politically-invented rights. And the national debts of almost every country in Western Europe and of the USA continue their onward spiral upwards as nations seek to pay for all the damage that these decaying laws create. We will all suffer the serious consequences. One wonders why people have let so many damaging laws be passed. One of the reasons is that almost all these laws were passed as a means to have compassion on adults, but they mainly involved taking natural rights away from children, from children who could not complain that they were going to have worse life outcomes as a result. The baby in the womb could not complain. The baby that is bought against its will cannot say anything, even if it is, on average, going to have a more difficult life. The children in the classroom who are taught sexual behaviours that might seriously hurt them - what could they say? They are told they are bigoted if they complain. So, in seeking to show themselves as compassionate to adults, the progressives show themselves to be incredibly hurtful to many different people who see the damage before it is too late. Let's sit down quietly at the table and sort these groups of children. And anyone with any sense should know that you cannot cause so much harm to so many children and build a better world tomorrow. Please progressives in the Democratic party, step back from the brink. We all saw how all these cultural Marxist laws were central to Hillary's 2016 presidential candidacy. In fact, in the last two years of Obama's presidency, it seemed to many that you only had your eyes set on LGBT and abortion rights. Many of you know exactly the kind of authoritarian future you intend to create. And now you know we know your hurtful plans. We do not have to go down the pathway of increasing levels of vitriol, authoritarianism, decay, and possibly mass murders - only to eventually remember that one cannot take away so many natural rights from citizens and expect to create social well-being. This is not a tolerant Nirvana you are creating. This is a future of deprivation and pain. The Russia communists were blinded by their erroneous beliefs that were also based on compassion. You don't have to be. Please listen to those who see the damage before it is too late. Let's sit down quietly at the table and sort this mess out. *"Did you really think we want those laws observed?" said Dr. Ferris. "We want them to be broken. You'd better get it straight that it's not a bunch of boy scouts you're up against... We're after power and we mean it... There's no way to rule innocent men. The only power any government has is the power to crack down on criminals. Well, when there aren't enough criminals one makes them. One declares so many things to be a crime that it becomes impossible for men to live without breaking laws. Who wants a nation of law-abiding citizens? What's there in that for anyone? But just pass the kind of laws that can neither be observed nor enforced or objectively interpreted - and you create a nation of law-breakers - and then you cash in on guilt. Now that's the system, Mr. Reardon, that's the game, and once you understand it, you'll be much easier to deal with."* - Ayn Rand, 'Atlas Shrugged' 1957
"And how we burned in the camps later, thinking: What would things have been like if every Security operative, when he went out at night to make an arrest, had been uncertain whether he would return alive and had to say good-bye to his family? Or if, during periods of mass arrests, as for example in Leningrad, when they arrested a quarter of the entire city, people had not simply sat there in their lairs, paling with terror at every bang of the downstairs door and at every step on the staircase, but had understood they had nothing left to lose and had boldly set up in the downstairs hall an ambush of half a dozen people with axes, hammers, pokers, or whatever else was at hand?... The Organs would very quickly have suffered a shortage of officers and transport and, notwithstanding all of Stalin's thirst, the cursed machine would have ground to a halt! If...if...We didn't love freedom enough. And even more - we had no awareness of the real situation... We purely and simply deserved everything that happened afterward." Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn - *The Gulag Archipelago*

the point of marriage. It's an institution, not merely a private relationship. **Why social liberals want to change the law:** We currently have a mixed fault and separation system of divorce. A divorce is granted on the ground of the irretrievable breakdown of marriage. This is proved by one of five facts: of fault (adultery, desertion or unreasonable behaviour) or of separation (two years with consent, or five years without consent). Under proposals contained in the Divorce, Dissolution and Separation Bill, the five facts will be replaced by automatic no-fault divorce after a waiting period of six months. The need for an allegation of fault or a period of separation will be swept away. It will become impossible to contest a divorce. The principal argument for the reform is that allegations of fault produce acrimony and generate unnecessary friction between divorcing spouses that sours the relationship going forward and affects future arrangements for any children. But the new system would create acrimony of its own. As one commentator has put it: 'marriage will become the one contract you can sign up to, invest all your life and love in, and then see it unilaterally broken, without even any acknowledgement that harm and wrong have been done. The anger and resentment created by this cannot simply be magicked away'. It is the fact of divorce that harms children, not the process. Over 20 years ago, The Exeter Family Study found that divorce does not usually reduce conflict for the children. In fact, the opposite is true: '...the experience of most children whose parents divorce is of increased conflict over an extended period, with the child involved to an extent that may not have been the case while the marriage lasted'. After divorce, children are often at the heart of disputes in a way they never were before. The government has stated that it is not anticipating that its proposals will lead to any increase in the divorce rate. However, it stands to reason that if something is made quicker and easier, it will inevitably become more common. This reality is borne out by the experience of countries that have instituted no-fault divorce. A 1998 study of the impact of no-fault divorce in the US concluded that it was responsible for 17 per cent of the rise in divorce rates between 1968 and 1988. A separate study in the same year confirmed that 'no-fault divorce laws are associated with higher divorce levels'. Similarly, in 2006 a study focusing on Europe said divorce law reform was responsible for about 20 percent of the increase in divorce rates in Europe between 1960 and 2002. **How should we respond? We must promote the true understanding of marriage.** Changing government policy and seeing a change in the legal establishment is a very tall order. Promoting marriage in our own families, churches and wider networks is much easier. We can teach our own children or grandchildren. Most young people want to marry - a poll published last year found that 78% of 14-17 year olds want to get married. Only 4% ruled it out. That's a good starting place. **We must fight the government's no-fault divorce reforms.** Divorce is at epidemic levels, but legislating for no-fault divorce will make things far worse. Many people take divorce far more seriously than our legal establishment and are not prepared to sign legal statements for divorce that are untrue. This, combined with the fact that many people don't know how easy it is to obtain a divorce is serving as a restraint on divorce rates. However, the government's proposals would take those restraints away. Formal no-fault will be far worse than the creeping no-fault we currently have. **We must support organisations like the Family Education Trust and the Coalition for Marriage.**

Colin Hart is director of the Christian Institute and chairman of the Coalition for Marriage. This article is published by permission of Family Education Trust