

How the Specter of Communism Is Ruling Our World:

Chapter Seven: Destruction of the Family (Part II)

Table of Contents

- 5. How Communism Destroys Families in the West (continued)
 - b. Promoting Feminism and Spurning the Traditional Family (continued)
 - c. Perverting the Family Structure Through Homosexuality
 - d. Promoting Divorce and Abortion
 - e. Using the Welfare System to Encourage Single-Parent Families
 - f. Promoting Degenerate Culture

- 6. How the Chinese Communist Party Destroys Families
 - a. Breaking Up Families in the Name of Equality
 - b. Using Political Struggle to Turn Husbands and Wives Against Each Other
 - c. Using Forced Abortion for Population Control

- 7. The Consequences of Communism's Assault on the Family

References

- 5. How Communism Destroys Families in the West (continued)
- b. Promoting Feminism and Spurning the Traditional Family (continued)

Results of the Feminist Movement: Broken Families, Degenerate Relationships, Confused Sex Roles

Feminism is now prevalent in all sections of society. According to a public survey conducted by Harvard in 2016, about 59 percent of women expressed support for feminist views.

One major assertion of contemporary feminism is that apart from the physiological differences in male and female reproductive organs, all other physical and psychological differences between men and women, including divergences in behavior and personality, are social and cultural constructs. By this logic, men and women should be completely equal in all aspects of life and society, and all manifestations of “inequality” between men and women are the result of a culture and society that is oppressive and sexist.

For example, the number of men working as executives in large companies, high-level academics in elite universities, and senior government officials far outstrips the proportion of women in similar positions. Many feminists believe this is mainly caused by sexism, when in fact a fair comparison between the sexes can be made only when considering factors such as ability, hours, work ethic, and the like. Success in high-level positions often requires long-term, high-intensity overtime work — the sacrifice of weekends and evenings, sudden emergency meetings, frequent business travel, and so on.

Giving birth tends to interrupt a woman’s career, and women are inclined to reserve time to spend with their families and children instead of dedicating themselves completely to their work. In addition, people with the aptitude to fill high-level positions tend to possess strong personalities, whereas women tend to be gentler and more agreeable. These are the main reasons why females fill such a small

proportion of high-level positions. However, feminists regard women's tendencies to be gentle and to orient themselves around family and children as traits imposed upon them by a sexist society. According to feminism, these differences should be corrected by services such as public daycare and other forms of welfare. [1]

Contemporary feminism cannot tolerate any explanation of inequality between men and women that bases its argument on natural physiological and psychological differences between men and women. All blame must be laid at the feet of social conditioning and traditional morality.

In 2005, Lawrence Summers, president of Harvard University, spoke at an academic conference to discuss why women are less likely than men to teach in the scientific and mathematics fields of top universities. In addition to the 80-some hours per week required for these positions, and their unpredictable work schedules (time most women would reserve for family), Summers proposed that men and women may simply differ in their competence when it comes to advanced science and math. Despite supporting his statements with relevant studies, Summers became the target of protests by the feminist organization NOW. The group accused him of sexism and demanded his removal. Summers was roundly criticized in the media and forced to make a public apology for his statements. He then dedicated \$50 million to increase the diversity of the Harvard faculty. [2]

In 1980, Science Magazine published a study showing that male and female middle school students had significant differences in their mathematical reasoning ability, with boys performing better than girls.

[3] A subsequent study that compared SAT math test scores for males and females found male examinees were four times as likely to achieve a score of more than 600, as compared with females. This gap became even more extreme at the 700-point threshold, where 13 times more male test-takers reached this score than did females. [4]

The same research team did another study in the year 2000, finding that both male and female SAT examinees who demonstrated mathematical genius on their SAT scores tended to obtain advanced degrees in science and math-related fields, and were satisfied with their achievements. Lawrence Summers's arguments were backed up by scientific data.

Some reports noted that Summers's treatment following the 2005 conference mirrors the re-education policies used by communist regimes to suppress dissidents. Even as the causes of inequality had yet to be determined, equality of outcome was enforced by encouraging "diversity" — that is, ensuring a larger number of female instructors in the math and scientific fields.

It is simple to see the links between feminism and socialism. The nineteenth-century French diplomat and political scientist Alexis de Tocqueville said: "Democracy and socialism have nothing in common but one word, equality. But notice the difference: While democracy seeks equality in liberty, socialism seeks equality in restraint and servitude." [5]

None of this is meant to prove that men are superior to women in intelligence or ability, as men's and women's talents manifest

themselves in different competencies. Deliberate attempts to eliminate differences between the sexes run counter to common sense and prevent both men and women from fulfilling their potential.

While the reasons for psychological and intellectual disparities between men and women may not be immediately obvious, denying their physical and reproductive differences flies in the face of fact. In the traditional view of both the East and the West, men are protective figures. It's normal that firefighters are overwhelming male. However, feminists, believing in absolute equality between men and women, demand that women take on traditionally male duties, with unexpected results.

In 2005, the New York Fire Department allowed a woman to become a firefighter without passing the physical trials, which typically include completing tasks while wearing oxygen tanks and other equipment weighing 50 pounds. Other firefighters expressed concerns about this, saying that colleagues who couldn't meet the standards would inevitably create burdens and danger for the rest of the team and for the public.

The fire department eventually hired the woman so as to avoid a lawsuit: Feminist groups had long blamed NYFD's high physical standards for the low proportion of women entering the firefighting force. [6] The Chicago fire department faced similar challenges and was forced to lower the standard in order to increase the number of female firefighters.

In Australia, many city fire departments have implemented gender quotas. For each male applicant hired, a woman has to be hired as well. In order to meet this requirement, vastly different physical standards have been set for men and women despite their applying for the same dangerous, high-stress job.

This illogical campaign for equality of outcome didn't stop there. The quotas created friction between male and female firefighters, who reported that their male coworkers blamed them for being unqualified and incompetent. Feminist groups latched onto this as “bullying” and “psychological pressure.” [7] The situation created yet another battle for feminists to fight in their ostensible crusade for equality.

But this absurdity is a deliberate step in the plans of the communist specter: By challenging the supposed patriarchy — that is, traditional society — feminism undermines the traditional family the same way that class struggle is used to undermine the capitalist system.

In a traditional culture, it is taken for granted that men should be masculine and women should be feminine. Men shoulder responsibility for their families and communities by protecting women and children — the very patriarchal structure that feminism challenges on the grounds that it confers unfair advantages to men while restraining women. Feminism has no place for the traditional spirit of chivalry or gentlemanly behavior. In a feminist world, the men aboard the sinking Titanic would not have sacrificed their places in the lifeboats so that the female passengers could have a better chance at survival.

Feminism's crusade against patriarchy has also entered the realm of education. In 1975, a Pennsylvania court ruling on a lawsuit against the Pennsylvania Intercollegiate Athletic Federation ordered that schools must include both male and female students in all physical activities, including wrestling and American football. Girls were not allowed to abstain on the basis of their gender alone. [8]

In her 2013 book *The War Against Boys: How Feminism Is Harming Our Young Men*, American scholar Christina Hoff Sommers argued that masculinity is coming under attack. [9] She showcased the example of Aviation High School in Queens, New York, which primarily accepts students from low-income families. The school raised these children to high standards of academic achievement and was ranked as one of the best high schools in America by US News and World Report.

The school specializes in teaching its students via hands-on projects such as constructing electrical mechanical aircraft, and unsurprisingly, the class body is overwhelmingly male. Girls, while forming a smaller percentage of students, also perform remarkably and earn the respect of their peers and instructors.

Nevertheless, Aviation High School faced increasing criticism and threats of lawsuit from feminist organizations demanding that more female students be admitted. Speaking at the White House in 2010, the founder of the National Women's Law Center took specific aim at Aviation High School as a case of "gender isolation" and said, "We are hardly going to rest on our laurels until we have absolute equality, and we are not there yet."

For feminists, raising boys to pursue masculine traits of independence and adventure, and encouraging girls to be gentle, considerate, and family-oriented amounts to nothing more than oppression and sexist inequality.

Modern feminism is forcing society into a gender-free future by attacking the psychological characteristics of men and women that characterize their respective sex. This has particularly severe implications for children and young people who are in their formative years and among whom increasing numbers are expected to become homosexual, bisexual, or transgender.

This is already underway in some European countries, where more and more children report feeling that they were born in the wrong body. In 2009, the Gender Identity Development Service (GIDS), based at the Tavistock and Portman NHS Foundation Trust in London, received 97 referrals for sex transitioning. By 2017, GIDS was receiving over 2,500 such referrals annually. [10]

Traditional society regards childbirth and the education of children to be the sacred duty of women, ordained by God or Heaven. In the annals of both East and West, behind every great hero is a great mother. Feminism discards this tradition as patriarchal oppression, and holds that expecting women to be responsible for raising their children is a key example of this oppression.

Contemporary feminist literature is replete with denunciations of motherhood and married life as being monotonous, boring, and unfulfilling. The bias of this dim view is apparent when considering the

personal lives of well-known feminists. Nearly all of them suffer from broken relationships or failed marriages, or they are childless.

Feminism has opened the door to all kinds of ridiculous notions. There are those who insist that the personal is political and see domestic conflicts as gender wars. Some consider men parasites who enslave women's minds and bodies. Others describe children as a hindrance to women looking to reach their full potential, and claim that the roots of oppression are in the family structure.

Modern feminism openly proclaims that its aim is to destroy the traditional family. Typical statements include the following: "The precondition for women's liberation is an end to the marriage system." [11] "The choice to serve and be protected and plan towards being a family-maker is a choice that shouldn't be." [12] "We can't destroy the inequities between men and women until we destroy marriage. [13]

Feminist movements resolved supposed social problems by promoting moral degeneracy and destroying human relations in the name of "liberation." According to Sylvia Ann Hewlett, an American economist and gender specialist, modern feminism is the major contributing factor to a large number of single-mother households, while no-fault divorce actually provides a convenient means for men to abandon their responsibilities. Ironically, feminism's assault on the existing family structure works to destroy the haven that ensures the happiness and security of most women.

Easy divorce did not emancipate women. Studies found that 27 percent of divorced women were living below the poverty line, a percentage

three times higher than that of divorced men. [14] The specter of communism cares nothing about women's rights. Feminism is merely its tool to destroy families and corrupt humankind.

c. Perverting the Family Structure Through Homosexuality

The lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) movement has been closely associated with communism ever since the first utopians began touting homosexuality as a human right. Since the communist movement claims to emancipate people from the bondage of traditional morality, its ideology naturally calls for supposed LGBT rights as a part of its program of "sexual liberation." Many proponents of sexual liberation who staunchly support homosexuality are communists or share their views.

The world's first major LGBT movement was started by senior figures of Germany's Social Democratic Party (SDP) during the 1890s. Led by Magnus Hirschfeld, this group promoted homosexuality as being "natural" and "moral." In 1897, the Scientific-Humanitarian Committee, known in German as the "Wissenschaftlich-humanitäres Komitee" (WhK), was founded by Hirschfeld to advocate for LGBT causes and began their first public campaign that year.

In 1895, when British writer Oscar Wilde was investigated for his sexual relationship with another man, the SDP was the only group that stood up in his defense. SDP leader Eduard Bernstein proposed a bill to overturn the law banning sodomy.

One of the most radical examples of sexual liberation in the era came following the Bolsheviks' October Revolution in Russia. Soviet sexual

policies, which were discussed earlier in this chapter, abolished legal prohibitions on homosexual relationships, making the Soviet Union the most liberal country on earth by leftist standards.

In 1997, the African National Congress (ANC) of South Africa passed the world's first constitution that recognized homosexuality as a human right. The ANC, a member of the Socialist International (formerly a branch of the now-defunct Second International), has consistently supported homosexuality.

Inspired by Hirschfeld's WhK, in 1924, Henry Gerber founded the Society for Human Rights (SHR), the first American LGBT rights organization. SHR was short-lived, as several of its members were arrested soon after its establishment. In 1950, American communist Harry Hay founded the Mattachine Society in his Los Angeles residency. The organization was the first influential LGBT group in the United States. It expanded to other areas and released its own publications.

In 1957, zoologist Evelyn Hooker claimed in her research that there was no mental difference between homosexual and heterosexual men. Her work then became the main "scientific basis" used to justify homosexuality. Hooker had links to a member of the Mattachine Society, who persuaded her to support homosexuality. Her study has been criticized for picking all its subjects from the ranks of the Mattachine Society. [15]

In the 1960s, accompanying the wave of sexual liberalization and the hippie movement, the homosexual cause went public. In 1971, the

National Organization for Women (NOW), a major American feminist organization, stated its support for homosexual rights.

In 1974, the American Psychiatric Association (APA) cited Evelyn Hooker's research as the main evidence for taking homosexuality off the list of mental disorders. But in the actual vote, this decision was opposed by 39 percent of the APA's members. In other words, the research was far from unanimously convincing.

Hooker and her follow-up researchers chose the so-called adjustment test results as a measure for the psychological status of homosexuals. To put it plainly, if a person can adapt to society, maintain self-esteem and good interpersonal relationships, and has no psychological barriers in his or her regular social life, he or she can be considered a psychologically normal person.

In 2015, Dr. Robert L. Kinney III published an article in the medical journal *Lincore* that discussed the flaws in the standard Hooker used to determine the presence or lack of mental disorder.

An example, there is a type of mental illness called xenomelia, which creates in its sufferers a strong desire to cut off their own healthy, functioning limbs. Similar to how some homosexuals are convinced they were born with the wrong sex organs, xenomelia patients strongly believe that one or more of their body parts do not belong to them. This kind of patient is fully capable of adapting to society, maintaining self-esteem and good interpersonal relationships, and has no psychological barriers to functioning in society. Patients experience

satisfaction when the offending limb is amputated and report that it improves their lives. [16]

Kinney's report cited other mental illnesses. For instance, people with a certain type of psychological disorder enjoy eating plastic. Nonsuicidal victims of another illness have a strong desire to hurt themselves physically, and so on. They often have good social "adjustment," evidenced by such qualifiers as having earned college degrees. All these conditions are nevertheless psychological abnormalities as recognized by the scientific community. [17]

Many studies confirm that homosexuals have significantly higher rates of contracting AIDS, committing suicide, and abusing drugs than the general population, [18] even in countries such as Denmark, where same-sex marriages have long been legal and destigmatized. [19] The prevalence of AIDS and syphilis among homosexuals is between 38 and 109 times that of the normal population. [20] Before the breakthroughs in AIDS treatment made in the 1990s, the average lifespan of homosexuals was eight to twenty years lower than the average population. [21] These facts do not suggest that homosexuality is normal or healthy.

As the LGBT movement continues to grow, the "politically correct" label of "homophobia" is used to attack those opposed to homosexuality, and experts who present findings that homosexuality is a mental illness are marginalized. A considerable number of homosexuals have obtained degrees in psychology and psychiatry and have become "experts" in "queer studies."

The supposedly scientific evidence widely quoted today to support homosexuality as “normal” behavior is the “Report of the Task Force on Appropriate Therapeutic Responses to Sexual Orientation,” written by a working group appointed by the APA in 2009. Kinney has noted that out of the seven members of the working group, six, including the chairman, were homosexual or bisexual. The study cannot be considered scientifically neutral.

Joseph Nicolosi, late president of the National Institute of Gay and Lesbian Studies, disclosed that at the time, the most qualified experts applied to join the working group, but because they belonged to the academic school that supported the use of treatment to correct homosexuality, none were accepted. [22] Nicholas Cummings, a former APA president, said in a public statement that politics trumps science in the Association, which has been taken over by advocates of homosexual rights. [23]

Today, the adjustment standard supported by queer-studies “experts” and proponents of the homosexual movement is also widely used by the APA to measure other sexual-psychological abnormalities, such as pedophilia. According to the APA, a pedophile is defined as an adult who feels intensely aroused or has sexual fantasies upon seeing a child, regardless of whether these impulses are acted upon or not. But as long as he or she is capable of demonstrating “adjustment,” then the pedophile’s sexual orientation should be considered “normal.” Rather, only when pedophiles feel shame, inner conflict, or other types of debilitating psychological pressure does it count as a disorder.

This standard of diagnosis runs completely counter to normal human values: According to the APA, a person who feels shame and guilt for having unacceptable impulses is mentally ill, but someone who is comfortable with these impulses is supposedly healthy. Homosexual marriage was legalized following this logic, and acceptance of pedophilia cannot be long in coming.

David Thorstad, a Trotskyite and member of the American Communist Party, founded the North American Man/Boy Love Association (NAMBLA). Another important figure in the American LGBT movement and a promoter of pedophilia is Allen Ginsberg, a communist, and admirer of Fidel Castro. Aside from NAMBLA, another major pedophile organization is the Childhood Sensuality Circle, founded in California in 1971 by disciples of the German communist and pioneer of sexual liberation Wilhelm Reich.

Pandora's box has been thrown wide open. According to the adjustment standard of today's psychology, various perverted sexual freedoms advocated by the utopian socialist Charles Fourier, including incest, group marriage, and bestiality, can also be considered normal psychological states. The divine union of husband and wife has been distorted to include same-sex couples. It follows that incestuous families and "marriage" between humans and animals can be legalized. The devil is reducing man to a beast, without standards or morals, so that he will be eventually destroyed.

The LGBT movement, sex liberation, and feminism have put the family structure and human morality under total siege. It is a betrayal of the traditional marriage that God arranged for mankind.

To treat homosexuals as fellow human beings is kind and good, but the devil has manipulated this kindness to deceive and destroy people who have forgotten that gods created men and women in their image and set the conditions for being human. When man is no longer man, and woman is no longer woman, when people abandon divine moral codes and side with the devil for the sake of their desires, then there is no escape from the abyss of damnation.

We may kindheartedly say “we respect your choice” to those who have gone astray and wandered to the edge of the abyss, but this serves only to push them closer to danger. True compassion is to tell those who are misguided to distinguish between right and wrong, to lead them back to the upright path, and help them avoid doom — even if it means being resented or misunderstood.

d. Promoting Divorce and Abortion

Before 1969, state divorce laws across the United States were based in traditional religious values. In order for a divorce to be considered, it required a legitimate claim of fault from one or both of the spouses. Western religion teaches that marriage was established by God. A stable family is beneficial to the husband, wife, children, and all of society. For this reason, the church and U.S. state laws all stressed the importance of preserving marriages except in extenuating circumstances. But in the 1960s, the ideology of the Frankfurt School had radiated out to society. Traditional marriage came under attack, and the most damage was done by liberalism and feminism.

Liberalism rejected the divine nature of marriage by reducing its definition to a social contract between two people, while feminism views the traditional family as a patriarchal instrument in the suppression of woman. Divorce was promoted as a woman's liberation from the "oppression" of an unhappy marriage, or her path to a thrilling life of adventure. This mindset led to the legalization of no-fault divorce, allowing either spouse to disband a marriage as irreconcilable for any reason.

The U.S. divorce rate grew rapidly in the 1970s. For the first time in American history, more marriages were being ended not by death, but by disagreement. Of all newlywed couples in the 1970s, nearly half would divorce.

Divorce has deep and long-lasting effects on children. Michael Reagan, the adopted son of former President Ronald Reagan, described the separation of his parents: "Divorce is where two adults take everything that matters to a child — the child's home, family, security, and sense of being loved and protected — and they smash it all up, leave it in ruins on the floor, then walk out and leave the child to clean up the mess." [24]

Promoting the "right to abortion" is another one of the methods the devil uses to destroy people. Initially, the discussion on legalized abortion was restricted to specific circumstances such as rape, incest, or the debilitating health of the mother.

Advocates of sexual liberation believe that sex should not be limited to the confines of marriage, but unwanted pregnancy presents a natural

obstacle to this sort of lifestyle. Contraceptives may fail, so the promoters of unrestricted sex took up the cause of legalized abortion rights. At the 1994 United Nations International Conference on Population and Development in Cairo, it was openly stipulated that “reproductive rights” are a natural human right, including the right to a “satisfying and safe sex life,” which covers abortion on demand. [25]

At the same time, feminists introduced “my body, my rights” to argue that women have the right to give to or kill their unborn children. The debate expanded from allowing abortion in special circumstances to giving women the power to unilaterally end human life.

While tempting people to give in to their desire, the devil uses feminism and sexual freedom to promote the massacre of the unborn. Not only have people been led to commit monstrous crimes, they have also abandoned the traditional understanding that life is sacred.

e. Using the Welfare System to Encourage Single-Parent Families

In 1965, just 5 percent of children were born to unmarried mothers. [26] In that time, it was taken for granted that children grew up knowing their biological fathers.

By the 2010s, however, unwed mothers accounted for 40 percent of births. [27] From 1965 to 2012, the number of single-parent families in America shot from 3.3 million to 13 million. [28] Though some fathers stayed, through cohabitation or later marriage, the majority of children born to these single mothers grew up without their fathers.

Fathers serve as role models to their sons by teaching them how to be men, and show their daughters what it feels like to be respected in the way women deserve.

Children suffer greatly from the absence of a father. Research shows that children who grew up without fathers often suffer from low self-esteem. They are likely to skip classes and drop out of school at a rate as high as 71 percent. Many do drugs, join gangs, and commit crimes: 85 percent of jailed youths and 90 percent of vagrants were raised in fatherless households. Early sexual experience, teen pregnancy, and promiscuity are common. People who grew up without their fathers are 40 times more likely to commit sex offenses compared with the rest of the population. [29]

The Brookings Institute offered three key pieces of advice for young people looking to escape poverty: Graduate from high school, get a full-time job, and wait until age 21 to marry and have children. Statistically speaking, only 2 percent of Americans who meet these conditions live in poverty, and 75 percent are considered middle class. [30] In other words, completing education, finding employment, marrying at a suitable age, and having children in the confines of marriage is the most reliable way to become a responsible adult living a healthy, productive life.

Most single mothers rely on government charity. A report published by the Heritage Foundation used detailed statistical data to show that the welfare policy so strongly advocated by feminists actually encourages the creation of single-mother households, even to the point of penalizing couples from marrying since they would receive fewer

benefits. [31] The government has effectively replaced the father with welfare.

Welfare policies have not helped families living in poverty. Instead, they have simply supported the ever-increasing number of single-parent families. With the children of such households themselves prone to poverty, the result is a vicious cycle of expanding reliance on state aid. This is exactly what the specter of communism aims to achieve: control over every aspect of the individual's life through high taxation and omnipresent government.

f. Promoting Degenerate Culture

The Wall Street Journal published a report quoting the U.S. Census Bureau finding that in 2000, 55 percent of people between the ages of 25 and 34 were married, and 34 percent had never been married. By 2015, these figures had changed to 40 percent and 53 percent respectively. Young people in the United States are avoiding marriage because in today's culture, sex and marriage are completely separated. What do they need to get married for? [32]

In this degenerate environment, the trend is toward casual, no-strings-attached hookups. Sex has nothing to do with affection, not to mention commitment and responsibility. Even more frightening is the profusion of myriad sexual orientations. Facebook's user profile options provide sixty different types of sexual orientations. If young people can't even tell if they are male or female, how will they view marriage? The evil specter has used the law and society to completely rework these God-given concepts.

Homosexuality and other degenerate sexual behavior was originally referred to as “sodomy” in English. Sodomy is a Biblical reference to the city of Sodom, wiped out in God’s wrath for people’s practice of sexual degeneracy. The word “sodomy” serves as a warning to humankind that disastrous consequences will occur if people stray from divine principles. The gay rights movement worked very hard to appropriate the term “gay,” a word with an originally positive meaning, and lead people to further sin.

“Adultery” used to be a negative term referring to immoral sexual habits. Today, it has been watered down to “extramarital sexual relations” or “cohabitation.” In *The Scarlet Letter*, by Nathaniel Hawthorne, Hester Prynne committed adultery and struggled to remake herself through repentance, but in today’s society, repentance is not necessary: Adulterers can enjoy life holding their heads high and proud. Chastity used to be a virtue in both Eastern and Western cultures. Today it is an anachronistic joke.

Passing judgment on homosexuality and sexual morality is forbidden in the dictatorship of political correctness. The only acceptable stance is to respect others’ “free choice.” This is true not only in everyday life, but throughout academia, where morality is divorced from practical reality. Deviated and degenerated things have been normalized. Those who indulge in their desires feel no pressure or guilt. The devil’s plot for humanity’s damnation is well underway.

Western people under the age of fifty can barely remember the culture that used to exist in society. At that time, almost all children grew up with the presence of their biological fathers. “Gay” meant “happy.”

White wedding gowns represented chastity. Pornographic content was banned from TV and radio. But that was undone in just sixty years, as the devil completely overturned the traditional way of life.

6. How the Chinese Communist Party Destroys Families

a. Breaking Up Families in the Name of Equality

Mao Zedong's slogan "Women hold up half the sky" has now made its way into the West as a trendy feminist catchphrase. The ideology that men and women are the same, promoted under the rule of the Chinese Communist Party, is essentially no different from Western feminism. In the West, "gender discrimination" is used as a weapon to maintain a state of "political correctness." In China, though it differs in practice, the label "male chauvinism" is used to similar destructive effect.

The gender equality advocated by Western feminism demands equality of outcome between men and women through measures such as gender quotas, financial compensation, and lowered standards. Under the CCP's slogan that women hold up half the sky, women are expected to show the same ability in the same work that is done by their male counterparts. Those who attempted to perform tasks for which they were hardly qualified were lauded as heroines and awarded titles such as the Holder of the March 8th Red Banner.

Propaganda posters in the 1960s or 70s typically portrayed women as physically robust and powerful, while Mao Zedong enthusiastically called on women to turn their love for makeup to military uniforms. Mining, lumbering, steelmaking, fighting in the battlefield — every type of job or role was opened up to them.

In an article published October 1, 1966, the People's Daily carried a story titled "Girls Can Slaughter Pigs Too." It described an 18-year-old girl who became a local celebrity working as a slaughterhouse apprentice, where studying Mao Zedong Thought helped her to work up the courage to slaughter pigs. She said, "If you can't even kill a pig, how can you expect to kill the enemy?" [33]

Although Chinese women "hold up half the sky," feminists in the West still find China's gender equality lacking in many areas. The CCP's Politburo Standing Committee, for example, never has any female members for fear that this would encourage a social movement for more political rights, such as democracy, which would pose a threat to the Party's totalitarian rule.

Out of similar concerns, the Party also refrained from publicly supporting homosexuality, instead taking a neutral stance on the issue. However, seeing it as a convenient tool in the destruction of humankind, the Party encouraged homosexuality to grow in China by using the influence of media and popular culture. Since 2001, the Chinese Society of Psychiatry no longer lists homosexuality as a mental disorder. The media also quietly substituted the word "gay" with "comrade," a term with more positive connotations. In 2009, the CCP approved the first Chinese LGBT event — Shanghai Pride week.

The approaches may vary, but everywhere the devil pursues the same goal: to abolish the traditional ideal of a good wife and loving mother, to force women to abandon their gentle character, and to destroy the

harmony between men and women that is needed to create a balanced family and bring up well-adjusted children.

b.

Using Political Struggle to Turn Husbands and Wives Against Each Other

Traditional Chinese values are based on family morality. The devil knows that the most effective way to undermine traditional values is to start from sabotaging human relations. In the continuous political struggles started by the CCP, family members reported each other to the authorities in the mad competition for a better political status. By betraying those closest to them, they could demonstrate a firmer, more loyal stance in favor of Party orthodoxy.

In December 1966, Mao's secretary Hu Qiaomu was dragged to the Beijing Iron and Steel Institute, where his own daughter took to the stage and shouted, "Smash Hu Qiaomu's dog head!" Although she did not actually smash her father's head, there were others who did just that. At the time, there was a "capitalist" family in the Dongsu subdistrict of Beijing. Red Guards beat the old couple nearly to death and forced their middle school-age son to beat them. He used dumbbells to smash his father's head and went insane afterward. [34]

Often, those condemned by the Party as "class enemies" would disown their families so as to spare them from implication. Even "class enemies" who committed suicide would first have to break off family ties lest the CCP hound their family members after their suicide.

For example, when the literary theorist Ye Yiqun was persecuted and driven to suicide in the Cultural Revolution, his parting letter read:

“Going forward, the only thing that is required of you, is to resolutely listen to the Party’s words, stand firm on the Party’s position, gradually recognize my sins, stir up hatred against me, and unwaveringly break off our familial ties.” [35]

The persecution against the Falun Gong spiritual practice, which has continued since 1999, is the largest political movement launched by the CCP in the modern era. A common strategy the authorities use against Falun Gong practitioners is to coerce their family members to aid in the persecution. The CCP imposes administrative harassment, financial penalties, and other forms of intimidation upon family members to get them to use any means to pressure practitioners into giving up their faith. The CCP blames the victims of persecution for practicing Falun Gong, telling them that their families are being implicated because they refuse to compromise.

Many Falun Gong practitioners have been divorced or disowned by their loved ones due to this form of persecution. Given the large number of people practicing Falun Gong, countless families have been torn apart by the Party’s campaign.

c. Using Forced Abortion for Population Control

Shortly after Western feminists succeeded in the battle to legalize abortion, women in the People’s Republic of China had abortion imposed upon them by the CCP’s family-planning policies. The mass killing of the unborn has resulted in a humanitarian and social disaster of untold scale.

The CCP follows Marxist materialism and believes that childbirth is a form of productive action no different from steelmaking or agriculture. It thus follows that the philosophy of economic planning be extended to the family. Mao Zedong said: “Mankind must control itself and implement planned growth. It may sometimes increase a bit, and it may come to a halt at times.” [36]

In the 1980s, the Chinese regime began to implement the one-child policy with extreme and brutal measures, as exhibited by slogans unfurled across the country: “If one person violates the law, the whole village will be sterilized.” “Birth the first, tie your tubes after the second, scrape out the third and fourth!” (A variation of this slogan was simply “Kill, kill, kill the third and fourth.”) “We would rather see a stream of blood than a birth too many.” “Ten more graves is better than one extra life.” Such bloodthirsty lines are ubiquitous throughout China.

The Family Planning Commission uses heavy fines, plunder, demolition, assault, detention, and other such punishment to deal with violations of the one-child policy. In some places, family-planning officials drowned babies by throwing them into paddy fields. Heavily pregnant women were not exempt. Even with childbirth just days away, they were forced to have abortions.

According to incomplete statistics published in the China Health Yearbook, the total number of abortions in China between 1971 and 2012 was at least 270 million. That is, over a quarter of a billion unborn children were killed by the CCP over this period.

One of the most serious consequences of the one-child policy is the disproportionate number of female infants aborted or abandoned, leading to a serious imbalance in the sex ratio of Chinese under the age of 30. Due to the shortage of girls, it is estimated that by 2020, there will be some 40 million young men who cannot marry a woman of childbearing age.

China's man-made sex imbalance has triggered serious social problems, such as an increase in sexual abuse and prostitution, commercialized marriage, and trafficking of women.

7. The Consequences of Communism's Assault on the Family

Marx and other communists advocated the abolition of the family by pointing out and exaggerating the existence of phenomena such as adultery, prostitution, and illegitimate children, despite the fact that the communists themselves were also guilty of these things.

The gradual degeneration of morality that occurred in the Victorian era eroded the sacred institution of marriage and brought people further from divine teachings. The communists urged women to violate their marital oaths for the sake of their supposed personal happiness. But the result was the opposite, like drinking sea water as a remedy for thirst.

The communist specter's "solution" for oppression and inequality amounts to nothing more than dragging down the standards of human morality to hellish depths. It made behavior once universally condemned as ugly and unforgivable into the new norm. In the

“equality” of communism, all are marching to the same fate of destruction.

The communist specter created the mistaken belief that sin is not caused by the degeneration of morality, but by social oppression. It led people to find a way out by turning their backs on tradition and moving away from God. It used the beautiful rhetoric of freedom and liberation to advocate feminism, homosexuality, and sexual perversion. Women have been stripped of their dignity, men have been robbed of their responsibility, and the sanctity of family has been trampled upon, turning the children of today into the devil’s playthings.