

# This post deals with what people call sexual anarchy.

---

 [kentbrandenburg.com/2025/08/30/sexual-anarchy-in-the-united-states](https://kentbrandenburg.com/2025/08/30/sexual-anarchy-in-the-united-states)

Kent

August 30, 2025

## [Part One](#)

Maybe you've heard in recent days the new terminology, "sexual anarchy." I first heard someone use it with reference for the new male cheerleaders for National Football League teams. The two words together were the title of [a book by feminist professor at Princeton, Elaine Showalter](#). She says that "sexual anarchy" was first coined by George Gissing in his book of fiction, *Odd Women*, saying the following:

The novelist George Gissing remarked that the 1880s and 1890s were decades of sexual anarchy, when the notions of gender that governed sexual identity and behaviour were being constantly eroded. It was a time when the words "feminism" and "homosexuality" came into use, redefining accepted ideas of masculine and feminine, and a time when the "emancipated woman" was viewed as a threat to family stability.

## Throwing Off God's Sexual Order

---

Recently (2021) Charlie Kirk reused the words in an article he entitled, [On Sexual Anarchy](#), in which he wrote:

I didn't come up with the expression "sexual anarchy." Manhattan pastor and good personal friend David Engelhardt devoted a whole chapter on the subject in his upcoming book, [Good Kills](#), of which I've had the privilege of reading an advance copy. Here's how he describes it:

The hatred of structure. The motivation to consume for the pleasure of self. Sexual anarchy is the throwing off of God's sexual order. That order as dictated by Jesus is as follows: "Have you not read that from the beginning the Creator 'made them male and female,' and said, 'For this reason a man will leave his father and mother and be united to his wife, and the two will become one flesh'? So they are no longer two, but one flesh. Therefore, what God has joined together, let man not separate."

Engelhardt didn't come up with the language either, but he repurposes the words with a dictionary definition type use of them.

## Male Cheerleaders

---

The NY Post did three stories in the last couple of weeks on the Vikings male cheerleaders ([here](#), [here](#), and [here](#)). This inspired recent references to "sexual anarchy." A Roman Catholic apologist, Trent Horn, recorded [an entire podcast on it](#), featuring and explaining the repugnance, and even the philosophical idea of repugnance with sexual anarchy. He said at the beginning:

I want to focus today's episode on the deeper philosophical reason so many people are frankly repulsed by these particular male cheerleaders and how this instinct should guide our moral reasoning.

Will Cain, a commentator on Fox News, commented on the repulsion, [and said](#):

If we're really being honest, we're talking about male cheerleaders being female cheerleaders. That's what's happening with these men who are cheering on the Minnesota Vikings or the Philadelphia Eagles or these other franchises. They're not out there dressed like the Texas A&M "fighters" in their painter suits — wear white from neck to ankle. These are men dressed virtually as women, acting as women.

The NFL cheerleader happening brought this issue to some kind of tipping point. Perhaps drag queens and shows normally sequester themselves into their, albeit available, niche space. No one needs to go there. People know it's there, but it isn't so much in their faces. When someone watches the NFL, he feels forced to look at something that turns it into the unavoidable mainstream, like passing it on a street in town. It's mere existence doesn't mean it is acceptable. Including it with the NFL speaks of acceptability and a future for this activity.

### Who Is Talking

---

I don't hear much to anything anymore about such performances as these NFL cheerleaders. Individuals and outlets with larger audiences, representing a bigger segment of society, have spoken. They have reintroduced a biblical subject as if it exists and that people watching might consider or be considering.

Charlie Kirk used the words, "sexual anarchy." Will Cain's inside voice became his outside voice. In his instance, someone asked him to comment, because it had already become a topic for news commentary for the day. But what are we even talking about? Something is bothering someone, even to rise to the expression, "sexual anarchy."

### Recognition of Designed Distinctions

---

Cain said two things and people agreed. One, men joined female cheerleaders, dressed the same as them, like women. Two, these men acted like women, behaved like female cheerleaders would behave. By doing so, Cain pronounced such items existed as male and female garments and that there was distinct masculine and feminine behavior. To do this required of Cain objectivity or objective meaning to dress and behavior. Dress, as it relates to sexual distinction, is not relative, he needs admitted by even judging male cheerleader actions.

The male Vikings cheerleaders crossed over into wearing skirts and having the same type of long hair as the women. They moved with the same style of movements as the women. This wasn't meant as a joke. They were serious about what they were doing — as serious as a cheerleader for a football game could be.

## How New Is the Subject?

---

How new really is what Kirk and Cain and others now are addressing? We're talking about the appearances, what evangelicals today call and continue to call a non-essential and a tertiary issue. They say nothing about it and have said nothing about it. Almost no one wants to say anything — just stay quiet about it. Even conservative evangelicals would call it an issue only for fundamentalists or fundamental Baptists, said with a bit of disdain or mockery. Conservative evangelicals rarely stand on social or cultural issues today, mainly just one of them, and that is against same-sex marriage. Even with that, [they're barely against it](#).

Men wearing skirts didn't just happen. Looking at this as a historian, the cultural practice started with women wearing pants, tracing back to the late 19th century. That's the period called "sexual anarchy" by those who originated the terminology. If men do not have a male garment, do women have a female garment? Those being sincere and honest know how this issue worked. They know why women started wearing pants, or should we say, "the pants." Sexual anarchy relates to authority and even the Patriarchy. Pants as a male item, distinguished men and their authority in society.

## Rise In Talk Only

---

The kerfuffle over men in skirts associates with the a rise in talk, and I emphasize talk, about Christian nationalism. In fact, God calls the male wearing the female garment and the female wearing the male garment, both an abomination (Deuteronomy 22:5). This meant something through all of history until the twentieth century. The sexual anarchy began when this sexual confusion started and was clearly, plainly represented by women wearing pants. Men weren't wearing skirts yet, but it is the very same issue. People said the same thing then, when women started wearing pants, as Cain and Kirk are saying now.

Evangelicals mock the issue. That's why you see them saying nothing about the NFL cheerleaders. They have nothing to say. Nothing. Political or media figures are saying something, but zero religious or biblical figures. It can't mean anything to any of them, because if it does, then the other issue will appear as well. If men are wrong to wear skirts, the female item or garment, that could highlight what women wear, which degrades their sex more than ever.

## Gird Up Thy Loins

---

Like God said to Job — twice (Job 38:3, 40:3) — "Gird up now thy loins like a man." Men gird their loins. Women do not. Just the opposite is true too. Men don't wear the female garment. Neither do men who act like women inherit the kingdom of God (1 Corinthians 6:9-11). God said this to Job. Does that make it an essential or could Job have told God, "That's a tertiary issue, God, not one of my core doctrines"? This sentiment does not alter God with whom is no variableness nor shadow of turning.

These NFL male cheerleaders are wearing female items. Men have led cheers along with women for awhile. Even that seemed edgy for many. Many men, and rightly so, might say, "I would never do that, because the task itself associates with being a woman." What made this more serious was men with hair like women, wearing a skirt like the women, and acting like women. This is a non-essential for evangelicals, not something to break fellowship or cause separation. Will they have skirt wearing men joining their churches?

## **The Future**

---

How does all of what I'm writing here relate to the elimination of designed sexual distinctions? If we as a culture, or as churches, just get rid of all of them, so that everyone wears the same uniform, like on Star Trek, representing an "evolved" state, does that mean it doesn't mean anything any more? That kind of rebellion will not work with God. He won't allow it. That doesn't mean that He will immediately scorch the nation that will not follow His design, but on His timetable, often slower than us, that nation will not survive and will leave destroyed people in its wake.