

## **FEMINISM - PART 2.**

We left part 1 with Marxism and the idea of a “class war” pitting women against men. This leads us into part 2 where we will begin by looking at some other varieties of feminist thought. **Marxist Feminists** seem to think that is impossible for anyone especially women living in a class society to get any realistic chance where the wealth of that society is provided by the many (powerless) only to end up in the hands of a few (the powerful). In this they agree with Friedrich Engels who claimed that women’s oppression began with the introduction of private property; an institution he claimed had obliterated whatever equality the human race had previously enjoyed. Thus he along with Karl Marx claimed that capitalism and corporate “imperialism” were to be overthrown.

Yet if we look at that thought carefully we will find that inherent in it is the implication that women really are to be liberated by socialism; but under socialism, however, no one would be economically dependent on anyone else. This then draws the conclusion that if women could be free from men then they *must be equal to them*. But think how different that king of equality is to the plan God for male/female relationship that being that they respect, complement and help each other. Think too how sad it is that equality is here based on economic wealth and not scripture.

**Liberal Feminism** on the other hand insists that the so called *Gender Justice* simply means that the rules of the “game” are equitable. According to this theory the race for society’s goods and services ensures that nobody is disadvantaged. The liberals feel that so called “female subordination” is grounded in customary and legal restraints that debar women from any entrance or success in the public arena. Notice how this fits into the liberal wing of the church. They too use custom and “law” to push the same agenda the truth is maligned in order to fit a mindset in both cases. In the case of liberal feminism; it is saying that this is the case because society has the false belief that women are by their nature less physically and intellectually capable than men are. It goes on to say that therefore women are excluded from work and academic opportunities. Thus because of such an exclusionist policy the potential of women is not able to be fulfilled. Liberal feminists then like Christian liberals think that the problem is simply one of *prejudice* and therefore ***the system needs correcting rather than being completely thrown out as the Marxist Feminists believe.*** Now that we can see in the Lord’s church today can we not?

**Radical Feminism** believes, however, that neither the Marxist’s nor the liberals have gone far enough (shades of ultra conservatism in the church). They agree that it is indeed the “patriarchal system” that oppresses women; and that that system is characterised by male power, domination, and a hierarchical system. This system, they claim, cannot be reformed and therefore “must be pulled out by the roots.” Notice, social and cultural institutions, ***especially the family, male academia, and the church.*** What is scary about this is that in this country at least these objectives have been achieved to a great degree mainly under the auspices of the Helen Clark led government of the previous 9 years. So then, radical feminists see the problem as patriarchy and they describe it as “an entire system of male power over women.” Therefore the Lord’s

church in this view is seen as *reinforcing this patriarchal power over all women*. So to combat this perceived threat they stressed a “women only” environment and campaigned for “women’s space and culture.” They also (rightly) campaigned against men’s violence, rape and pornography; thus today we have women’s centres, women’s refuges, rape crisis centres, and women against pornography organisations. None of these are wrong per sé but it has created a class “war” on two fronts since radical feminism claims the “all men” are rapists, violent or watchers or perpetrators of pornography etc. And also that men are one class and women are another class. Again this militates against the Biblical plan by pitting women against men rather than bringing them together as God would have it. Truly it is not in us to direct our own steps when our hearts are so far from God and His word that we throw out the only way in which we can heal the wounds and the rifts between us.

Other Radical Feminists went further by having no interest in preserving the natural order that God has created for men and women in the sexual realm. They claim that this has “negative effects biologically.” Many radical feminists therefore said that to be freed from this women must “escape the confines of heterosexuality (the God given order) and by doing this create an exclusively *female sexuality* through celibacy, auto-eroticism and lesbianism. Thus either alone or with other women, a woman can discover the *true pleasures of sex*; the implication being that women must feel free to follow the leading of their own desires. Romans 1: 18-32 deals with exactly this mindset. Add to this the profound effect this thinking has had on many girls and couple that with the “Gay Rights” agenda and we can see the awful consequences to God’s natural created order. Men in this view have become redundant in all areas, women don’t need men to become pregnant, raise a family or for sexual enjoyment as God would have it. Thus they try to circumvent God’s will for sex, marriage, and the family which is the pillar of a true and stable society.

**Social Feminism:** This sees the problem as a combination of class exploitation and male domination therefore their fight is against both. To them real liberation is not possible as long as power and wealth is under the monopoly of a minority; and social and economic life is ruled by that minorities lust for profit. This type of feminism put much emphasis on the making of alliances with other perceived oppressed classes or groups like anti royalists, unions, and they support left wing political parties. Remember Helen Clark? That is how she began, these feminists were engaged in endless dialogues with so called “progressive men” within such organisations about the meaning and validity of the feminist struggle and the way gender expression is reflected and reinforced in personal and family relationships and within the structures of liberation parties and movements. They predominated the women’s movement to begin with as it emerged from the societal protests and anti Vietnam War movement of the late 1960’s but by the end of the 1970’s the Radical Feminists grew more influential. Now you see how Helen Clark took New Zealand into the “Nanny State” it is in now. Our men and boys are suffering the consequences of that philosophy and this too has maligned God and His will for the country as well as the family.

**Post- Modern Feminism:** This began in 1968 and it signalled a shift in feminist theory. It developed from the deconstructionist philosophies and deconstructed “patriarchal discourses.” This development was influenced by the key analytical strategies of

contemporary thought such as psychoanalysis, post-structuralism, post-modernism and post-colonialism. This shift between feminism and post-feminism came on March 8, 1968 on the “International Women’s Day” in Paris France. Members of a group called “psychoanalyse et politique” (later named “politique et psychoanalyse” or “po et psyche”) marched through Paris carrying placards reading “Down with Feminism.”

The “po et psyche” formed in 1968 was the cultural and intellectual centre for the “Movement de Liberation des Femmes” or MLF. They founded a publishing company called “des Femmes.” The term MLF itself was coined by the French press in 1970 in order to identify the diverse feminism which had begun in France since 1968. The two wings of MLF, “feminist revolutionnaires” and “po et psyche” became identified with two distinct forms of feminism and that division characterised the division between French and American feminism. Post-modern feminism was once therefore called “French feminism” since most of the women holding this thought were French nationals or women who were living in France at that time. This type of feminism shared its thought with French post-modern philosophers such as Jacques Derrida and Jacques Lacan for example.

Now this raises a problem for feminism just as it has for religion and philosophy and that is this; since feminism is an *explanatory theory* it is now in danger of having to provide the explanation of why women are oppressed and how women can take the “true” course to achieve their “true” liberation. Since now post-modern feminism has to reject the traditional assumptions of truth and reality; therefore they cannot now give a one true explanatory theory since truth is now *relative* and this threatens the unity of the whole feminist movement; as well as posing theoretical problems for any feminist who wishes to provide us with one overarching explanation or solution to the oppression of women. So it appears then that it is better for women who are seeking liberation to avoid terms which suggest a unity that blocks difference. Doesn’t this sound like the same arguments used against the one true church of Christ, the one true God, and the one true Christian religion et al?

Post-modernism seems to take great pleasure in focusing on what it sees as *internal contradictions* in coherent systems of thought. This tries to assail ordinary ideas of like identity, authorship, and authority and then reinterpret them to fit their mindsets. Post-modernist feminist writers were also in the reinterpreting business; mainly they tried to reinterpret Freud’s psychoanalytic theory and its practice. “po et psyche” serves as the watchwoman for what Anglo-American audiences regard as “post-modern feminist texts.” If a writer didn’t share po et psyche’s interest in Semiotics or psychoanalysis and if a writer was seen as being “too feminist” that is too concerned with women’s actual condition then that writer’s work was rejected for publication.

One Antoinette Fouque Born 1936, who was a member of the European Parliament, was in 1970 offered a lectureship at Vincennes University of Paris. She was co founder of MLF, spokeswoman for the “po et psyche,” and the founder of the “des femmes” publishing house. The movement had two orientations one towards equality and the other towards identity which in this context is to be understood as *uniqueness of the other and not sameness*.

Monique Wittig born 1935, a professor in the department of French and Italian at the University of Arizona and spokeswoman for the “feminist revolutionnaires” (FR). She started a journal called “Questions Femistes” with Christine Delphy and Simone de Beauvoir. Wittig disputed the biological origins of gender difference. She believed that woman is not socially constructed and inscribed in the heterosexual binary framework of male/female. Therefore lesbians are not women because they are not *dependent on a male definition of women*. Thus women and lesbians are *cultural artefacts*, but unlike women, lesbians refute the heterosexually fixed connection between gender and sexuality. Can we begin now to see the convoluted and tortured path the feminists are on? Not only is it patently false but it is anti god in the extreme.

The “feminist revolutionnaires” were established in 1970 as a faction of the MLF. They adopted what has become known as the American model of consciousness-raising groups; and it opposed Freudian psychoanalysis. The FR stood for equality and had separatist tendencies which were particularly supported by lesbian members of the group. They believed that *lesbianism alone* could counter patriarchal oppression. However, there were internal struggles between these lesbian separatists and those who considered themselves to be “heterosexual radicals.”

The FR opposed the “po et psyche” group who preferred difference to what they deemed assimilation which would result from a desire for equality. The FR sought visibility through the Media and staged disruptive public actions. For example, a group of women placed a wreath at the tomb of the Unknown Soldier. They staged “manifestations” on mother’s and father’s days and organised “days for denouncing crimes against women” and sit ins to help unmarried mothers as well as disruptions to government meetings.

Thus we can see some of the roots and problems associated with the feminist movement. The question we must ask of this is why have so many women left God out of the equation and fallen for it? The answer seems to be that because they repudiated their true identity as God’s creation they must now manufacture one and they can’t unless they consider themselves separate from both God and men. This leaves them in “no man’s land” (no pun intended) and it increasingly isolates them. This in turn frustrates and angers them; thus all the problems surface and they will never be resolved until and unless God is re-introduced into their thinking. This actually applies to all worldly philosophies. Truly the way of the transgressor is hard when we leave God for when we do we must come up with something and feminism like evolution cannot do so without the devaluing effects both theories have on all humanity.