

Social engineering and de-constructing America

If you had a shred of doubt before about the Democrats' desire to systematically de-construct our society and use social engineering to radically rebuild it, the recent House of Representative proposed rules of the new 117th Session covering 'gender nomenclature' (and other things) proffered by none other than the Speaker, San Fran Nancy Pelosi, will convince you of it.

Before we go to the overarching Democrat blueprint for re-arranging our society through the use of language, here is the section of the House Resolution that clearly reveals the Dems' latest attack on biology and family identities...

(3) In clause 8(c)(3) of rule XXIII, strike “father, mother, son, daughter, brother, sister, uncle, aunt, first cousin, nephew, niece, husband, wife, father-in-law, mother-in-law, son-in-law, daughter-in-law, brother-in-law, sister-in-law, stepfather, stepmother, stepson, stepdaughter, stepbrother, stepsister, half-brother, half-sister, grandson, or granddaughter” and insert “parent, child, sibling, parent’s sibling, first cousin, sibling’s child, spouse, parent-in-law, child-in-law, sibling-in-law, stepparent, stepchild, stepsibling, half-sibling, or grandchild.”

Basically, with this resolution, House leaders are telling their members that they must dismiss thousands of years of established familial identifiers, presumably because they represent historical attacks on the disenfranchised members of society AND the Representatives must adopt the *new* gender preferences that the Left perceives that take precedence over biology. The House rules are a continuation of the gender equality movement, and as such, the leaders feel can be justified, just as they have removed the word 'man' from words like *Chairman* and gender appellations like 'waiter and waitress' and 'actor and actress,' etc. Seeing little in the way of pushback to these changes from the Right they moved on to a 'free choice' platform of promoting individual gender selection. This is a situation in which people can freely decide their own gender and the pronouns that apply to it, irrespective of biological fact.

This is the ideology versus biology argument, and it was only natural for Left-wing social engineers in Congress to determine the next step which was the HR banning certain words from the official House vocabulary. To be fair to them (only I don't know why I am) the English language is always changing, and some of those changes reflect eliminating certain words to the *archaic* dust bin of the dictionary or to label them as 'insulting' or 'derogatory' and suggesting they either be dropped out of respect for certain groups OR substituted with more socially-acceptable less controversial ones. I get that. Few people would use the formerly widely-used word, 'Negro' to describe a person of black skin pigmentation and racial background, just as many people have adopted the use of the word 'gay' to describe a person who has chosen to practice homosexuality, for example. And on it goes.

The great social-engineering manipulators (many of whom were fascists) throughout the ages understood that whoever controls language controls society, and that's why there is so much attention paid to effecting change by 'word hegemony.' The fact is that each tribe of Man has a language of its own, complete with labels that describe its members and those of the world around them. Those labels change when tribes go to war and when pressure is placed on those controlling the political dialogue. Essentially, we're no different in the USA. However, this ideology vs. biology argument has reached ridiculous proportions, and if we do not put a stop to it now we will find ourselves deep into the world of Orwell's 'newspeak' where conversation will be self-censored and only exist to re-affirm our allegiance to our leaders. I'm not kidding about this.

This is worse than a slippery slope to surrendering the truth about biology. It is a form of linguistic social tyranny.

Want an example? Try to have a conversation with a gender rights activist and see how far you get by addressing them as Mr. or Mrs. or even Ms. and you'll soon see what I mean. Try to talk to committed language change agents like some representatives of the media like NPR that has a stated official policy of allowing its employees to choose from dozens of different pronouns to describe themselves. Even the phrase 'ladies and gentlemen' is under attack. How many times have you heard 'woke' politicians like Joe Biden use it? Answer: none. Instead, he uses the more benign and infinitely more politically-correct term, 'folks.'

But back to the language debate. If you agree with ideological social engineering and the elimination of any and all gender identifiers then you are probably a Democrat or certainly a Leftist. Should you reserve your right to address people based on their biological sex or regard family members based on their relationship to one another then you are probably a Republican or certainly a Conservative.

The politicization of gender is part and parcel of a longer term and I might say somewhat seemingly hypocritical plan by the Left to remove anything that makes us all different while at the same time calling attention to and highlighting all of the small differences! This fits in nicely with the Democrats' plan to use identity politicking to win the individual issue battles they choose to fight. When they determine some aspect of American society has outlived its usefulness or is in direct competition with one of their own stated ideological aims, they call up those special interest groups to man the barricades.

This kind of abusive and tyrannical politics has worked well for the Democrats with a variety of demographic groups like the many new *victim* groups, but it has failed to win over about half the country that has seen through its attempts to cloak their efforts under a 'togetherness/fairness' banner. Ironically, it was the 'community organizer-in-chief,' Barack Obama who expressed it best in a campaign stop in Virginia in 2008 when he said, "You can put lipstick on a pig, but it's still a pig." Though he wasn't speaking about the Dems' efforts to social engineer America, he did - perhaps unknowingly - reflect the wisdom of the ordinary American when it comes to the three-card Monty language game of the Left.

Stephan Helgesen is a retired career U.S. diplomat who lived and worked in 30 countries for 25 years during the Reagan, G.H.W. Bush, Clinton, and G.W. Bush Administrations. He is the author of ten books, four of which are on American politics and has written over 1,000 articles on politics, economics and social trends. He can be reached at: stephan@stephanhelgesen.com