

Yankee Steve's Column

for the Week of October 27, 2011

Marriage and Divorce

One of the most curious things about celebrities is the way they refuse to give up on marriage. The moment one marriage fails they try another, and if that fails they go on to yet another. At last count, four celebs: Larry King, Joan Collins, Zsa Zsa Gabor, and Elizabeth Taylor, racked up 29 marriages between them. If we add Mickey Rooney the total comes to 37.

We need to look at this because it might give us an insight into people and the institution of marriage that presently is under attack in America. An assault launched in part by the very celebrities who keep getting married (because they make it look as if marriage is a temporary arrangement) and that I believe has its source in the Marxist school of economics.

Marxists believe that traditional marriage is a bi-product of capitalism. That would mean it is subject to redefinition. May I suggest that the attempt to promote homosexual "marriage" by some of the more untoward members of Congress has its source chiefly in the Marxist desire to transform society.

The Bible

People continue to marry, and marriage is a booming business in America. These are traditional marriages, one man and one woman.

The persistence of traditional marriage in the United States is due in part to the fact that 1) we have not legitimized homosexual "marriages" as they have in Europe with the effect that traditional marriage has gone out-of-style. And 2) traditional marriage persists in America because we are much more church-oriented than are the Europeans.

Marriage as we know it in America (one man and one woman) began before there was anything like capitalism and the free market?

The Bible teaches that in the beginning God instituted monogamy because of something that He built into human nature. The Scriptures tell us that before man fell into disfavor with God, before he became self-indulgent, haughty, lustful, and polygamous, God said something about the first man that would apply to his posterity as well,

“It is not good that the man should be alone; I will make him a help-meet for him.” [Genesis 2:18]

Apparently marriage was instituted as a cure for loneliness. But what is loneliness? Well it could mean that someone does not have another person to talk to or touch, or perhaps as I've seen in some households, there was a lot of talking and touching, and still there is of what I would call substantial loneliness.

Let me explain. The Hebrew language in which the biblical passage I quoted is emphatic. It could read this way, “Now it is really and truly not good that a man not have a wife because a man is at loose ends without a woman. He needs a woman because his life should be purposeful; it must be directed toward a goal, a place, a destination, which will be more easily arrived at if he is given help, the help of someone who is like him, an intelligent being made in the image of God.”

Women were designed with a purpose in mind. A woman is supposed to align herself with the need a man has to accomplish something. She is his help-meet. Something which man must accomplish is to provide for the family, which as we all know is becoming increasingly difficult at this time of economic crisis.

The Women's Movement and the Role of Women

The Women's Movement started out on a good footing. However, it fell into the hands of dedicated Marxists like Simone de Beauvoir [1908-86] the bi-sexual lover of Jean-Paul Sartre.

Beauvoir rejected the biblical idea which says that a woman will feel fulfilled if she knows that she contributes to her husband's goals. As I asked above, what is loneliness? For the man it is his not knowing if his wife is really on his side, a help-meet. And for the woman it is her not knowing that her man knows that he truly needs her in his life, especially because he has been caught up in the daily battle for bread. That very idea irks the women who sit on the left and idolize de Beauvoir. Why should the man be the provider? Why should the women stay at home with children? Is this not slavery? In her 1949 book *The Second Sex*, she refuses to even distinguish between feminine and masculine traits. A woman should be allowed to pick and choose from an assortment of human traits because essentially there are no real differences between the genders.

However, the ability a woman has to become pregnant and to suckle children at her breast does stand in the way, doesn't it? No wonder Simone set up an abortion mill in her home, and no wonder that so many divorces have accompanied the modern day Women's Movement. Maybe all those celebs that keep getting divorced need to rethink Marxism.

Ever yours,

Yankee Steve Cakouros

oldlineconservative.com