

WTN U. Class Notes
Lesson 17

As we close out Marxism and Marxist philosophy, there are a couple of statements that can serve as sort of a "test" for when we're thinking like a Marxist and when we're thinking at a Christian.

1. When looking at a "problem" – the "what's wrong" are we placing the blame on something outside of ourselves on our circumstances or some aspect of our society?
2. If so, then we need to be careful. We need to ask why is the law wrong and what are we trying to do by the law.

A. In that regard, a question we should ask is "What does the law assume about the nature of man and in what way does it take that into account?"

In other words, does the law work only if we assume man is inherently good? If you think man is fallen and his tendency is toward evil – particularly abusing power, shifting blame and responsibility – does the law adequately take that into account?

B. Another question we should ask ourselves in regard the question of whether there is a problem with the law, what it is, and what are we trying to accomplish by the law is does the law operate on the assumption that if we change or manipulate man's circumstances or environment, then man will do the right thing? Put another way, are we trying to make man better by using the law to make his circumstances better on the assumption that if we can change the circumstances or the environment some inherent goodness in man will flourish.

Examples:

On the bill to extend unemployment compensation there was some interesting worldview discussion when some Republicans raised the question of whether extending the benefits would undermine the incentive to some to take a job.

Another example is education. Education is important and it opens the door to a wider range of opportunities, but there are many who have some utopian belief that education is the panacea that will cure everything - clean out our prisons and make our economy work.

SOCIOLOGY of MARXISM

One other thing we need to appreciate before we speak of feminism is that it has a view of sociology, which is the "science of society, social institutions, and social relationships." We'll focus on the Marxist's view of family.

Because in Marx's time families were the economic engine of society, the private property that Marx thought brought the divisive class distinction was held or accumulated by families. So, for the Marxist, the traditional family, that as a Christian I would say God designed, was a problem.

Engels, in his book *The Origin of the Family, Private Property, and the State*, said:

With the transfer of the means of production into common ownership, the single family ceases to be the economic unit of society. Private housekeeping is transformed into a social industry. *The care and education of the children becomes a public affair; society looks after all children alike, whether they are legitimate or not.* This removes all the anxiety about the consequences which today is the most essential social-moral as well as economic factor that prevents a girl from giving herself completely to the man she love. Will not that suffice to bring about the gradual growth of unconstrained sexual intercourse and with it a more tolerant public opinion in regard to a maiden's honor and a woman's shame.

There was a sense that the "school becomes literally a home" in a socialist society so complete control of education (no private or church-related schools) and compulsory attendance laws were imperative to achieve the Marxist's vision.

Feminism, at least among its early founders and those who now tend to dominate feminist organizations, their worldview is Marxism modified to accommodate their belief that the source of evil – the what's wrong in the feminist worldview story - are men, rather than private property, and the patriarchal society that flows from that, just as capitalism was the problem that flowed from the evil of private property.

And there is another parallel here to the sin of greed that gets associated with capitalism that made socialism seem attractive as a means of eliminating greed.

Women were at one point treated as property, they were not encouraged to pursue an education, and other real things that needed to be changed. But like Marxism, where "redemption" was obliterating capitalism, feminism thought the way to "redeem" a patriarchal society was to obliterate all distinction between men and women.

Two more moderate feminist, Daphne Patai and Noretta Koertge, in their book, *Professing Feminism: Cautionary Tales from the Strange World of Women's Studies*, in 1994 wrote that today's feminism is

Not merely about equal rights of women. ... Feminism aspires to be much more than this. It bids to be a totalizing scheme resting on a grand theory, one that is as all-inclusive as Marxism, as assured of its ability to unmask hidden meanings as Freudian psychology, and as fervent in its condemnation of apostates as evangelical fundamentalism. Feminist theory provides a doctrine of original sin: The world's evils originate in male supremacy.

As Carol Iannone, a conservative commentary, literary critic, and author of *The Barbarism of Feminist Scholarship*, wrote, "Like Marxism, feminism can explain everything from advertising to religion by following its single thread, the oppression of women."

In the feminist lexicon, "sex" is merely a biological term while "gender" is a reference to roles in society and so, to the feminist, gender and gender roles are said to be "socially constructed." In other words, everything about men and women, other than their reproductive organs, can be changed if we change in the social and cultural environment. Sound like Marx.

So, one implication is that to suggest there are any difference between men and women other than reproductively is to them an assertion of some kind of male superiority and oppression.

Look at the situation with our military. Want to know what feminist decry any attempt to limit women in combat? Now you have the answer. Just in the last week or two there's been a big flap within the Marine and the physical test. A major implication is that human sexuality has no natural form but is culturally conditioned. Thus heterosexuality is a social construct and no more natural or unnatural than homosexuality.

<http://www.foxnews.com/politics/2014/01/02/marines-delay-female-fitness-plan-after-half-fail-pullup-test/>

More than half of female Marines in boot camp can't do three pull-ups, the minimum standard that was supposed to take effect with the new year, prompting the Marine Corps to delay the requirement, part of the process of equalizing physical standards to integrate women into combat jobs.

The delay rekindled sharp debate in the military on the question of whether women have the physical strength for some military jobs, as service branches move toward opening thousands of combat roles to them in 2016.

This is what's behind the "War on Women"

Summary – see chart

Marxist find fault in some aspect of society culture – private property and an impediment to common ownership is the family so we need to rid ourselves of the traditional family.

Feminists find fault in some aspect of society – male superiority and a patriarchal society and that is expressed primarily through the traditional family.

And they each need big government to achieve their end by reforming society.

They each need strong public schools and compulsory education in order to "reprogram" our thinking in regard to the way things should be, what's wrong, and how we fix it.

They each need to undermine the traditional family.