

The Schwarz Report

Dr. Fred Schwarz

Volume 45, Number 1

Dr. David Noebel

January 2005

Our 51st Year!

Inside

The Schwarz Report Bookshelf

To see a complete list of books recommended by the Christian Anti-Communism Crusade please check out our website at www.schwarzreport.org. This site also has back issues of *The Schwarz Report* as well as other great resources.

21st Century's Class Warfare

by David A. Noebel and Chuck Edwards

“Multiculturalists, influenced by Marxist thinking, appear to want America to become a divided country.”¹
—Alvin Schmidt

“[Socialism] lacks a central principle of virtue. Instead, it proposes a whole set of virtues, the “liberal” virtues—toleration, pluralism, relativism—which, one might say, construct a supermarket of possible good and decent lives. This is a prescription for moral anarchy, which is exactly what we are now experiencing.”²

—Irving Kristol

“Most Christians do not perceive the Church to be in the midst of the most severe struggle it has faced in centuries.”³
—George Barna

Friedrich Nietzsche and Michel Foucault may well be the philosophical bookends of the last century. Both were brilliant, yet tragic, figures. German-born Nietzsche died in 1900 at age 54 after battling venereal disease and insanity. Foucault was a leading French intellectual who, by virtue of a promiscuous homosexual lifestyle, died of AIDS in 1984. And yet, at the dawn of the twenty-first century, both Nietzsche and Foucault are hugely popular on college campuses. Given their unsavory lifestyles, why the popularity? The answer lies in how their ideas have fueled the postmodern mindset of our current age.

According to philosophy Professor Lawrence Cahoon, Nietzsche coined the phrase, “God is dead,” to signify the “waning of Christianity in an increasingly secular Europe.”⁴ Nietzsche wrote, “The most important of more recent events—that ‘god is dead’, that the belief in the Christian God has become unworthy of belief—already begins to cast its first shadows over Europe. . . . In fact, we philosophers and ‘free spirits’ feel ourselves irradiated as by a new dawn by the report that the ‘old god is dead’; our hearts overflow with gratitude, astonishment, presentiment and expectation.”⁵ But, for Nietzsche, God’s death ushers in the realization that we are alone in the universe with no one higher than ourselves to rely on. Cahoon continues, “Nietzsche’s radical critique of metaphysics, the unity of the self, even of truth itself, and his conception of all reality and all values as expressing the ‘will to power,’ make him the grandfather of postmodernism.”⁶

Foucault, having embraced the writings of Marx and Nietzsche, wrote, “‘Truth’ is linked in a circular relation with systems of power which produce and sustain it. . . .”⁷ That is to say, what is considered “true” for any particular society is an expression of what those in power (politicians, scientists, the military, or the media) say it is. Therefore, any idea or statement is not true in any absolute sense but, instead, is defined by the particular culture in which it is communicated. Marx and Engels, in *The Communist Manifesto*,

And do not participate in the unfruitful deeds of darkness, but instead expose them. Ephesians 5:11

“Dwell on the past and you’ll lose an eye; forget the past and you’ll lose both eyes.” Old Russian Proverb

put it plainly, “The ruling ideas of each age have ever been the ideas of its ruling class.”⁸ To the Postmodern Marxist, all “truth” is relative. Today we hear this philosophy echoed in the phrase, “That’s just *your* interpretation.”⁹

In our postmodern condition—which associates truth with whomever is in authority—the only determinant of right and wrong that remains is the “politics of power.” The important thing for the postmodernist, then, is to use whatever power structure is available—whether the state, the school administration, or the media—to change society. Those who have been on the margins (by the Marxist’s definition) are brought to center stage. As a result, they promote the rights of “oppressed” groups such as women, racial minorities, and homosexuals. An aggressive agenda to bring about social change is evident everywhere we look, from the classroom to the boardroom. Because the influence is so pervasive, we must understand a Postmodern Marxist approach to sociology, focusing especially on its affect on our educational institutions and our concept of the family.

Education, Postmodern Style

Writing from their background in education and experience of ministering in a postmodern culture, Gary DeLashmutt and Roger Braund state, “No area of society has been more influenced by postmodern thought than education.”¹⁰ The postmodern idea that truth is not objective but is simply a social construct has specific implications for how race, gender and sexuality is currently taught in school, from kindergarten through graduate level.

To glimpse the influence of Nietzsche and Foucault’s worldview on higher education, we need only look at the course offerings of our major universities. Young America’s Foundation compiled course titles and descriptions from fifty of the most prestigious universities in the United States. Their annual publication, *Comedy and Tragedy: College Course Descriptions and What They Tell Us About Higher Education Today*, documents the depths of which academia has drunk from the well of postmodernism. According to an article by Don Feder, these courses reveal politically correct indoctrination coupled with antagonism toward traditional religion, all at taxpayer expense! Feder explains:

Moving on to hard-core indoctrination, . . . with the exception of Princeton, every Ivy League school now offers more courses in women’s studies than economics. Cornell’s “The Social Construction of Gender” “emphasizes the social psychology processes by which the culture transforms male and female newborns into ‘masculine’ and ‘feminine’ adults. . . . Courses simultaneously advancing two or more isms are popular. Examples include ‘Black Marxism’ at Uni-

versity of California at Santa Barbara, ‘Eco-Feminism’ (Villanova) and ‘Chicana Lesbian Literature’ (UCLA). . . . Traditional religions are popular targets. Thus a course at the University of Pennsylvania, ‘The Historical Origins of Racism: Views of Blacks in Early Judaism, Christianity and Islam,’ indicts these faiths for racial hatred. Dartmouth’s ‘Women and Religion: New Explorations’ ‘documents sexism. . . in the canonical writings and institution forms of Judaism and Christianity.’ And Harvard offers ‘Feminist Biblical Interpretation.’”¹¹

After that last course title, Feder dryly comments, “A course on ‘Christian Interpretation of Feminism’ would be unthinkable.” But his remark raises a central question: *Why* is a course on a Christian critique of feminism “unthinkable”? The answer reveals the deeply entrenched Postmodern mindset in academia. The postmodernist considers Christianity the focal problem in society because it has been a dominant force in Western culture over the past 1600 years. Its white, European, male-dominated social structures are seen as oppressing women and people of other cultures.

That is why battle lines are drawn and postmodern troops rally around the flag of liberation for these supposedly besieged fringe groups. The classic Marxian struggle for economic equality of the oppressed class, originally understood to be the proletariat (non-property owners), has now become the struggle for equality of gender, race, and sexual preference. Marx’s underlying hatred for God makes the worldview connection between theology and another discipline, sociology, with its sweeping impact on American education.

Traditional education in America included rigorous study of philosophy (including logic), language, history, theology, and rhetoric. In fact, in the 1600s and 1700s, in order to pass the *entrance* exam for Harvard University, a student needed a working knowledge of both Latin and Greek. Yet, during the past century, standards such as these have been lowered throughout our American educational system.

This dumbing down of curriculum was not done in a worldview vacuum. Marxist educators understand that to convince the majority of people that the Postmodern Marxist worldview is correct, students must first be re-educated away from the traditional values and religious instruction they learned at home and in church. Only then will students accept uncritically the dictates of their social handlers. This strategy comes right out of the Marxist playbook. As B. K. Eakman points out:

Most Americans believe that Russian education [under Communism] was highly academic despite its political propagandizing. They would be

surprised to learn that one of Lenin's first official acts was to eliminate examinations, homework, failure and punishment, as well as to collectivize (consolidate) the schools. Even more remarkably, he began disseminating the works of [John] Dewey! By 1924, Soviet education theorists were saying that holding the correct viewpoints, including a "collective spirit," was more important than substantive knowledge. Indeed, the first Communist Five-Year Plan in 1927 included several education provisions aimed at building the "new socialism" that was going to usher in a worker's paradise. Today, experts in America say something similar, that it will usher in a new era of competitiveness, prosperity and lead to less world conflict. New promises; same old collective philosophy.¹²

Multiculturalism and Diversity

Multiculturalism is another offspring of the marriage of atheism and radical social equality. According to Richard Bernstein, multiculturalism was "inspired by the ideas of French philosopher Michel Foucault, the jargon represent[ing] the reformulation of basic nineteenth-century Marxist ideas that have been borrowed by generations of intellectuals bent on showing that the world as it exists is the creation (the 'social construction') of the groups that hold power...."¹³ Alvin Schmidt agrees with Bernstein when he writes, "Marxism flourishes in the ideology and politics of present-day multiculturalism."¹⁴

Whereas *multicultural* education seeks to introduce students to societies different from their own (a positive approach that broadens students' understanding and appreciation for people who are different from them), *multiculturalism* is the view that all societies are culturally equal. That is, no one social system is to be considered superior to any other. In practice, this translates into emphasizing the evils of Western culture while at the same time elevating the virtues of non-western societies. In the late 1980's at Stanford University, for example, traditional Western Civilization courses were replaced with an eight-track series called *Culture, Ideas, and Values* (CIV). Alvin Schmidt gives an account of what multiculturalism looks like under this new liberal ideology:

The president, Donald Kennedy, and advocates of the CIV deceptively announced that little had really changed vis-à-vis the previous offerings. They stated that selections from Plato and from the Bible were still being read, but what they did not tell the students or the alumni was that some of the CIV sections taught that Genesis was rife with sexism and made St. Paul politically correct

by saying that he may have been a homosexual. Shakespeare is still studied, but *The Tempest* is now viewed from a "slave's perspective" and is made to serve as an instructive lesson in Western imperialism.¹⁵

Changing the minds of students is appreciably easier if they arrive at college already prepared for indoctrination. Hence, multiculturalism is not confined to the university setting. Public school texts paint rosy pictures of other cultures while emphasizing the negative aspects of Western societies. For instance, in one high school text, the ancient Maya are described as people who "built great cities" and had a "remarkable history." We are told that "religion played an important part in city life" and that priests performed "elaborate rituals for their gods."¹⁶ What is left out of this telling is that the elaborate Mayan rituals included human sacrifice. We are dependant on outside sources, such as Howard La Fay, to tell us in *National Geographic* that these "elaborate rituals" were where "a priest ripped open the victim's breast with an obsidian knife and tore out the still-beating heart," or "cut holes in their [prisoners'] tongues and drew rope festooned with thorns through the wound to collect blood offerings."¹⁷

The similarly cruel history of the Central American Aztecs is glossed over. One history textbook mentions, almost in passing, "The Aztec believed that the sun needed human blood to survive. Without this sacrifice, it would stop shining and all life would perish. The king and his high priests had the sacred task of preventing this disaster from occurring. Throughout the year, captives were led up the steps of the Great temple to be sacrificed."¹⁸ The next paragraph demurely concludes, "Year after year, the sun continued to rise and set. The Aztec continued their traditional ways unaware that other worlds lay on the other side of the oceans."¹⁹

There is no mention that tens of thousands of human sacrifices were offered at the "Great temple," where, like the Mayas, slaves, children of conquered tribes, and captured warriors had their hearts ripped out of their living bodies while a leg or arm was removed to be eaten by the Aztec warrior and his family in a ritual feast.²⁰ Neither do we read in this text of the brutal patterns of everyday life for these people. Thomas Sowell fills in the gaps: "Many conquered peoples were reduced to being serfs tied to land controlled by their Aztec overlords. An even worse fate could await conquered areas that later rebelled, which could lead to a wholesale slaughter of the population. Wanton brutality was not the whole story however. The Aztecs... used terror as a weapon to demoralize their enemies and keep the subjugated peoples in line."²¹

The same is true when detailing the spread of Islam in the 700s. A section title of one high school history book simply says that "Islam expanded east and west" and explains how

“the Arabs were passionate in their new faith. The Koran taught that wars fought for God were just. A warrior killed in a jihad (jih-HAHD), or holy war, was promised immediate entry into paradise. With this belief, Muslims rushed fearlessly into battle.”²² The text even adds, “The Arabs proved tolerant rulers.”²³ Again, one has to go to an outside source to discover how ruthless and heartless Mohammad and his band of mercenaries actually were in their dealings with surrounding tribes. Historian Robert Payne paints a more accurate picture with this episode (which represents only one of many that could be cited):

Muhammad ordered an attack on the treacherous Bani Quraiza in their towers of refuge. He was in no mood to show mercy. . . . For twenty-five days the fortresses were besieged, while Muhammad debated with himself what he would do to the traitors. . . . When the starved defenders in their fortresses were seeking peace at any cost, Muhammad offered to allow them to surrender on condition that the Aus, their supposed allies, should decide their fate. . . . The chief of the Aus. . . Sa’d ibn Muadh. . . said: “I condemn the men to death, their property to be divided by the victors, their women and children to be slaves!” There was a long silence followed by a torrent of objections, and then Muhammad said: “Truly Sa’d has declared the judgment of God from beyond the Seventh Heaven!”

The terrible judgment was carried out to the last detail, with Muhammad himself superintending the general massacre, even helping to dig the trenches in the market place. The next morning the Jews, with their hands tied behind their backs, were taken out in batches of five or six at a time and forced to sit on the edge of the trench; then they were beheaded, and their bodies were tumbled into the trench.²⁴

While the same public school text cited earlier is coy about revealing the unsightly side of the Mayas, it is *not* shy about describing blood and gore when it comes to *Christian* endeavors. Recalling the Christian Crusaders who reached Jerusalem in 1099 A.D., the *World History* text explains:

A dreadful slaughter followed, as Muslim men and women were chased through the streets and murdered. The Jews of the city were rounded up, herded into a temple, and burned to death. One eyewitness reported: “Piles of heads, hands, and feet were to be seen in the streets of the city. . . . But these were small matters compared to what happened at the Temple of Solomon

[where] men rode in blood up to their knees and bridle reins.”²⁵

We use these examples to show that those who teach multiculturalism are not so interested in providing a balanced view of past cultural extremisms as they are in creating the impression that Western civilization in general and biblical Christianity in particular are the prime sources of the world’s oppression, misery, and intolerance.

Class Warfare, Feminist Style

“The social construction of race, class, or gender creates the premise that it is socially ‘oppressed,’” writes former Marxist David Horowitz. “Thus women have been historically excluded from certain roles not as a result of biological realities—for example, the hazards of childbirth before the development of modern medical techniques—but because ‘patriarchal society’ has *defined* their roles in order that men can oppress them.”²⁶ If men are the oppressors, as radical feminists claim, then women must take it upon themselves to create a revolution to overthrow male domination. According to a Postmodern Marxist worldview, this is the only sensible and right thing to do.

B. K. Eakman traces the idea of gender oppression back to Marx. She writes:

Most people don’t realize the extent of anti-family bias in the philosophy of Marx and his close colleague Friedrich Engels. But it was part and parcel of their radical economic theory, the family’s eradication was key to the “worker’s paradise” they envisioned. Engels devoted an entire book to the subject, *Origin of the Family*, in which he advocated its “liberation”—ostensibly so that women would be “free.” Engels wrote: “the first condition for the liberation of the wife is to bring the whole female sex back into public industry, and this in turn demands the abolition of the monogamous family as the economic unit of society.”²⁷

Margaret Sanger is one who picked up on Engels’ theme in the early 1900s. An early feminist, Sanger founded Planned Parenthood and heralded her cause by publishing a paper called *The Woman Rebel*. George Grant writes, “It was an eight-sheet pulp with the slogan ‘No Gods! No Masters!’ emblazoned across the masthead. She advertised it as ‘a paper of militant thought,’ and militant it was indeed. The first issue denounced marriage as a ‘degenerate institution,’ capitalism as ‘indecent exploitation’ and sexual modesty as ‘obscene prudery.’”²⁸ Sanger also started a newspaper in which she admitted “Birth control appeals to the advanced radical because it is calculated to undermine the authority of the Christian churches. I look forward to seeing humanity free some-

day of the tyranny of Christianity no less than Capitalism.”²⁹

Sanger had learned her atheistic socialism and commitment to sexual freedom while attending meetings organized by various radical groups, including lectures on Nietzsche’s moral relativism, during her one-year stay in England (where she had fled to avoid standing trial in the U.S. for including lewd and indecent articles in her paper). Planned Parenthood’s attack on the church, began by Sanger one hundred years ago, continues to this day. Grant comments, “In its advertisements, in its literature, in its program, and in its policies, the organization makes every attempt to mock, belittle, and undermine Biblical Christianity.”³⁰ Those who follow in the footsteps of Sanger understand the real issue is not women’s liberation or sexual freedom, but whether God is “there and not silent” (to use Francis Schaeffer’s phrase) about His design for our sexual expression.

One of Sanger’s followers and the chief architect of the modern feminist movement is Betty Friedan, author of the groundbreaking book, *The Feminist Mystique*. In her book, Friedan presents herself as a typical suburban housewife ‘not even conscious of the woman question’ before she began work on her manuscript. Yet, according to David Horowitz, a recent biography of Friedan reveals “nothing could be further from the truth.”³¹ Horowitz continues:

Under her maiden name, Betty Goldstein, the record shows that Friedan was a political activist and professional propagandist for the Communist left for nearly thirty years before the 1963 publication of *The Feminist Mystique*. . . . Friedan, from her college days and until her mid-thirties, was a Stalinist Marxist (or a fellow traveler thereof), the political intimate of leaders of America’s Cold War fifth column. . . . Not at all a neophyte when it came to “the woman question” (the phrase itself is a Marxist construction), she was certainly familiar with the writings of Engels, Lenin and Stalin on the subject and had written about it herself as a journalist for the official publication of the Communist-controlled United Electrical Workers union.³²

Simone de Beauvoir, another feminist, regards the radical alteration of parenting as more than a utopian fantasy. In his book, *Feminism and Freedom*, Michael Levin, writes that de Beauvoir:

finds it “easy to visualize” a world “where men and women would be equal,” for “that is precisely what the Soviet Union promised: women trained and raised exactly like men...[M]arriage was to be based on a free agreement that the spouses could break at will; maternity was to be

voluntary; pregnancy leaves were to be paid for by the State, which would assume charge of the children, signifying not that they would be taken from their parents, but that they would not be abandoned to them.” De Beauvoir is so far from alone among feminists in admiring Marxist-Leninism that this admiration, together with hostility to “capitalism,” can be considered virtually a further distinguishing mark of feminism. . . . a great many well-known feminists. . . identify themselves as socialists or Marxists of some sort.³³

Feminism is evident on campuses across the United States. According to the *Chronicle of Higher Education*, among the 350 best universities in the nation, 41 per cent of the literature courses are taught from a Marxist perspective, and 61 per cent approach the subject from a feminist point of view. Phyllis Schlafly indicates there are over 900 women’s studies courses taught nationwide. Regarding one such program, she writes, “At the women’s studies program at the University of South Carolina, students must acknowledge the existence of racism, classism, sexism, heterosexism and other institutional forms of oppression of women before being permitted to participate in class discussions.”³⁴ She goes on to reveal that “The textbooks in women’s studies programs teach that women are the victims of a male-dominated society, that marriage is an ‘instrument of oppression,’ and that fathers are ‘foreign male elements’ who stand between mothers and daughters. This was the conclusion of an Independent Women’s Forum review of five of the most widely used textbooks and 30 course outlines from major universities.”³⁵

Elementary students also are targeted by the feminist agenda. *The Washington Times* reviewed a book by research associate Sandra Stansky at the Harvard Graduate School of Education. The *Times* writes:

Mrs. Sandra Stotsky’s analysis of the history and civics readers used in elementary schools is also important. Feminists and multiculturalists, she contends, have cleansed fifth grade textbooks. The result: children will learn nothing about inventors, explorers, soldiers and all presidents except for Abraham Lincoln. “Stories about the great achievements in American science, technology and political life in the past 200 years are missing,” she writes, “and they are missing it seems simply because stories about them would call attention to a white male.”³⁶

The feminist attack on the family is evidenced throughout society in the changing attitudes of the general public as well as our elected politicians. The resulting affect on public policy

is noteworthy, as Irving Kristol points out:

...it remains true that one of the inherent weaknesses of even moderate socialist movements and governments is this ingrained hostility to the family. We are coming to recognize that this hostility, now cloaked as indifference, is a major factor in the political torment of what we still call “liberalism” in the United States. That the hostility is there is revealed by the complaisance of liberalism before the assaults on the family by contemporary radical feminism and the “gay-rights” movement. All liberal politicians today feel it necessary to speak highly of the family, but they cannot bring themselves to defend it against its enemies.³⁷

We are not suggesting that everything feminists call for should be discarded. For example, a case can and should be made for “equal pay for equal work” regardless of the gender of the person doing the job, and certainly the contribution of women to society should be taught in social studies classes. What we take issue with here are the *radical* feminist ideas that have gained such a foothold in many segments of our society. This set of ideas extends far beyond equal pay and seeks to impose the entire Postmodern Marxist worldview on the rest of society—the baseless ideas that there are *no* differences between men and women, that women do not need men, and that the family, education, business, government, the military—our entire society—should be restructured to accommodate their radical vision for social relationships.

Countering Postmodern Sociology

Francis Schaeffer describes a picturesque village in the Swiss mountains where Nietzsche spent several summers writing. Honoring the famous philosopher, a plaque is inscribed with a quote from one of Nietzsche’s works. It reads, in part,

Oh man! Take heed
of what the dark midnight says...

The world is deep—more profound than day
would have thought...

Woe speaks; pass on.

But all pleasure seeks eternity—
a deep and profound eternity.³⁸

Schaeffer comments on Nietzsche’s words: “Surrounded by some of the most beautiful scenery in the world, Nietzsche knew... with no personal God, all is dead. Yet man... cries out for a meaning that can only be found in the existence of the infinite-personal God... and in the existence of a personal life continuing into eternity.”³⁹

Nietzsche could not bear the reality his own worldview had constructed. He claimed to believe God was dead and that life had no meaning, yet his heart longed for a very differ-

ent reality and for a different life-story—one of significance that goes beyond the grave, one of “a deep and profound eternity.” Nietzsche’s worldview met reality head-on, and was knocked to the ground, because in the real world, the Bible tells us God has set “eternity in the hearts of men...” (Ecclesiastes 3:11).

Like Nietzsche’s view of life’s meaning, multiculturalism is an idea at war with itself. To claim that all cultures are equally valid runs counter to what we know intuitively to be true. It is *not* defensible that sacrificing infants to a sun god, as practiced by the ancient Aztecs, is on equal footing with the biblical injunction that parents love and care for their children (see Ephesians 6:4 and Titus 2:1). Neither is the Hindu custom of burning young widows with their deceased husbands—a practice that was outlawed through the tireless efforts of Christian missionary William Carey because of his concern for women (Luke 7:12-13; 1 Timothy 5:4-9). And it does not take much reflection to recognize that the wholesale slaughter of innocent men, women and children because of their race as carried out through Hitler’s Holocaust against the Jews or Saddam Hussein’s more recent ethnic cleansing of Kurds in northern Iraq runs counter to the idea that individuals have intrinsic worth—a concept stemming from the biblical notion that we are created in God’s image (Genesis 1:27).

We should be careful to note, however, when talking about multiculturalism, that not every educator who teaches out of current history and social studies textbooks understands the worldview from which this perspective comes. As Alvin Schmidt, in *The Menace of Multiculturalism*, suggests, “Some multiculturalist advocates, including many well-meaning teachers and school administrators, are not aware of the leftist (Marxist) concepts and assumptions operative in multiculturalism. Unwittingly, they often give aid and comfort to a radical leftist philosophy. If the unsuspecting advocates of multiculturalist practices were aware of the Marxist threads in the fabric of multiculturalism, they would be a lot less eager to advance its principles and policies.”⁴⁰ This makes it all the more critical that those involved in shaping educational policy *do* understand the background and danger of this postmodernist approach. Christians need to find a place on school boards, curriculum selection committees, as principals and teachers, and as officials on the state and federal levels of education to counter the destructive trends that have overrun public education in America.

Instead of the multiculturalist approach, our children need to understand that the Western tradition is the source of the concepts of individual freedom and political democracy to which most of the world aspires today. And while the West in its darker moments has committed its own crimes against humanity, its higher ideals, rooted in biblical principles, have pro-

vided the necessary foundation for correcting such abuses of power. The *Declaration of Independence* records these words: “We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights...” These twin ideas—of humankind’s equality before God and God-given rights—motivated Christians in the 1800s to seek the eradication of slavery both in Great Britain and America. And it was these very same words Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. drew upon in the 1960s when he called for revising the laws of our land to reflect the equality of races in America. So even though Western Civilization has not always lived up to its own ideals, without them where would we be?

As multiculturalism fails to reflect cultural realities, radical feminism conflicts with what we know to be true about femininity, marriage, and the family. To get at the truth about the benefits of marriage, sociology professor Linda J. Waite developed original research and synthesized hundreds of cross-disciplinary scientific studies in sociology, economics, medicine, psychology, sexology, and law. In her book, *The Case for Marriage*, she and co-author Maggie Gallagher document the ways in which marriage is good for husbands, wives, and children. Waite and Gallagher convincingly argue that:

...by a broad range of indices, being married is actually better for you physically, materially, and spiritually than being single or divorced. Married people live longer, have better health, earn more money and accumulate more wealth, feel more fulfilled in their lives, enjoy more satisfying sexual relationships, and have happier and more successful children than those who remain single, cohabit, or get divorced. Statistics show, for example, that violence is less prevalent in married households and that divorce reduces male life expectancy on the order of a pack-a-day cigarette habit.⁴¹

The Case for Marriage confirms what the Bible affirmed centuries ago, “It is not good for the man to be alone. I will make a helper who is like him. ... This is why a man leaves his father and mother and bonds with his wife, and they become one flesh” (Genesis 2:18, 24). In addition, Paul instructed husbands to “love your wives, just as also Christ loved the church and gave Himself for her... [and] love their wives as their own bodies” (Ephesians 5:25, 28). God has built into each of us a desire for this kind of loving relationship. As part of God’s design, it is not only good for us as individuals, but it is good for society.

Another problem with multiculturalism and feminism is their focus on the group over the individual. They emphasize

that individuals are products of their particular social settings, and this “group identity” keeps anyone from empathizing appropriately with those of another group, thus setting up barriers to communication and any sense of community. On the other hand, Christianity emphasizes the individual, not the group into which one is born. The Apostle Paul wrote that in Christ “there is no Jew or Greek, slave or free, male or female” (Galatians 3:28).

“Individualism, united with altruism,” writes Karl Popper, “has become the basis of our western civilization.” This well-known philosopher of science and critic of Marxism continues, “It is the central doctrine of Christianity (‘love your neighbor,’ say the Scriptures, not ‘love your tribe’); and it is the core of all ethical doctrines which have grown from our civilization and stimulated it.”⁴² Postmodernism’s attack on the individual is tantamount to an attack on Christianity and the entire Western enterprise.

An article in *Newsweek* sums up the matter, revealing how multiculturalism, far from being the enlightened, progressive view claimed by its advocates, is a throwback to ancient, pre-Christian ways of looking at society:

Christianity “discovered” the individual. In the ancient world, individuals were recognized as members of tribes or nations or families, and conducted themselves accordingly...the Gospels are replete with scenes in which Jesus works one on one, healing this woman’s sickness, forgiving that man’s sins and calling each to personal conversion. He invites Jews and Gentiles alike to enter God’s kingdom. “Christianity discovers individuality in the sense that it stresses personal conversion,” says Bernard McGinn, professor of historical theology at the University of Chicago Divinity School. “This is a crucial contribution to Western Civilization because it releases the individual from the absolute constraints of family and society.”⁴³

In order for those who have been captured by our postmodern culture to hear and receive the Gospel, Christians must re-enter the discussion concerning multiculturalism and radical feminism and point out to any who have ears to hear how these ideas are destructive to individuals as well as society. This means teaching a biblical Christian worldview of sociology in our churches, initiating discussions on these issues with our neighbors and in our schools, and insuring that those in political leadership have a firm understanding and commitment to the role of the family in society. To refrain from this battle of ideas in any of these arenas is to admit defeat and turn from Jesus’ call to be the “salt and light” of society (Matthew 5:13-16). As Francis Schaeffer put it so

succinctly, “The Christian must resist the spirit of the world in the form it takes in his own generation. If he does not do this, he is not resisting the spirit of the world at all.”⁴⁴

Endnotes

¹ Alvin J. Schmidt, *The Menace of Multiculturalism*, (Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers, 1997) p. 29.

² Irving Kristol, “Countercultures,” *Commentary*. New York: Dec 1994, Vol. 98, Issue 6, p. 35.

³ George Barna, *The Frog in the Kettle: What Christians Need to Know About Life in the Year 2000* (Ventura, CA: Regal Books, 1990), p. 123.

⁴ Lawrence Cahoon, editor, *From Modernism to Postmodernism: An Anthology*, (Cambridge, MA: Blackwell Publishers, Inc., 1996), p. 102.

⁵ Quoted in Colin Brown, *Philosophy and the Christian Faith* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1968), p. 139.

⁶ Cahoon, *From Modernism to Postmodernism*, p. 102.

⁷ Michel Foucault, “Truth and Power,” quoted in Cahoon, p. 380.

⁸ Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, *The Communist Manifesto* (New York, Pocket Books: 1964), p. 91.

⁹ This statement is the title of a book, *That’s Just Your Interpretation*, written by Paul Copan. It is an excellent examination of a number of common misconceptions about the Christian worldview.

¹⁰ Dennis McCallum, editor, *The Death of Truth* (Minneapolis, MN: Bethany House Publishers, 1996), p. 96.

¹¹ Don Feder, *The Washington Times*, September 6, 1997.

¹² B. K. Eakman, *Cloning of the American Mind*, (Lafayette, LA: Huntington House Publishers, 1998) p. 134.

¹³ Richard Bernstein, *Dictatorship of Virtue*, p. 227

¹⁴ Alvin J. Schmidt, *The Menace of Multiculturalism*, (Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers, 1997) p. 25.

¹⁵ Schmidt, *The Menace of Multiculturalism*, p. 164.

¹⁶ *World History: Perspectives on the Past* (D.C. Heath and Co, 1994), p. 333.

¹⁷ Howard La Fay, “The Maya: Children of Time,” *National Geographic* (December 1975), p. 734, quoted in Schmidt, p. 46-47.

¹⁸ *World History*, p. 335.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*

²⁰ See Thomas Sowell, *Conquests and Cultures* (New York: Basic Books, 1998), p. 276.

²¹ Thomas Sowell, *Conquests and Cultures*, p. 276-277.

²² *World History*, p. 188-189.

²³ *Ibid.*, p. 189.

²⁴ Robert Payne, *The History of Islam* (N.Y.: Dorset Press, 1959), p. 46-47.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 242.

²⁶ David Horowitz, “The Queer Fellows,” *American Spectator*, January 1993, p. 43.

²⁷ B. K. Eakman, *Cloning of the American Mind*, p. 132, 133.

²⁸ George Grant, *Grand Illusions: The Legacy of Planned Parenthood* (Franklin, TN: Adroit Press, 1992), p. 53.

²⁹ George Grant, *Grand Illusions*, p. 53.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 65

³¹ David Horowitz, *Heterodoxy*, March 1999, p. 14.

³² *Ibid.*

³³ Michael Levin, *Feminism and Freedom*, p. 26.

³⁴ Phyllis Schlafly, *The Washington Times*, March 29, 2003, p. A 13.

³⁵ Schlafly, *The Washington Times*, p. A 13.

³⁶ *The Washington Times*, May 2, 1999, p. B6. Mrs. Stotsky is a research associate at the Harvard Graduate School of Education and her book is entitled: *Losing Our Language: How Multicultural Classroom Instruction Is Undermining Our Children’s Ability to Read, Write and Reason*.

³⁷ Irving Kristol, “Countercultures,” *Commentary*. New York: Dec 1994. Vol. 98, Issue 6; pg. 35.

³⁸ Francis Schaeffer, *How Should We Then Live?* (Old Tappan, NJ: Fleming H. Revell Co, 1976), p. 180.

³⁹ Schaeffer, *How Should We Then Live?*, p. 180.

⁴⁰ Schmidt, *The Menace of Multiculturalism*, p. 25.

⁴¹ Linda J. Waite and Maggie Gallagher, *The Case for Marriage: Why Married People Are Happier, Healthier, and Better Off Financially* (New York: Doubleday, 2000) Inside jacket cover.

⁴² Karl R. Popper, *The Open Society and Its Enemies* (Princeton University Press, 1971), p. 102.

⁴³ *Newsweek*, March 29, 1999, p. 56.

⁴⁴ Francis Schaeffer, *The God Who Is There*, vol. 1, bk. 1 of *The Complete Works of Francis A. Schaeffer* (Good News Publisher, 1982), p. 11.

—This article by your editor and Chuck Edwards is a chapter in *Countering Culture: Arming Yourself to Confront Non-Biblical Worldviews*. *Countering Cultures* is a 13-week curriculum study available through Broadman and Holman Publishers or Summit Ministries, PO Box 207, Manitou Springs, CO 80829, 719-685-9103, or www.summit.org.