

Yankee Steve's Column
for the week of October 15, 2009

The French Revolution and the Women's Movement

Last week we visited France circa 1789. We only wanted to stop off long enough to show that the American Revolution was essentially different from that of the French. The difference was not one of degree, but one of kind. The people who inspired the Yankee spirit were Capitalists. The people who stirred up the French Revolution were Socialists.

The French Revolution was utopian, or to put it another way, it was the creation of a number of people who had no real understanding of human nature. Utopians are dreamers. They do not factor in the lust for power that has always characterized the humankind.

In respect of this the founders of America were much wiser than most men. For one thing they never bought into the thinking of Jean Jacques Rousseau [1712-78]. He was a dreamer and profligate who put forward a case for what he called the "Noble Savage." The founders saw things differently. They focused their attention on savage nobles. The American Revolution succeeded whereas the French did not because the United States' founders did not trust human nature.

Socialism, another name for utopianism, was all the rage in France. We can cite one French intellectual who may have had too much of French wine, "The moment has come to found the REPUBLIC OF EQUALS, the great hospice open to all men." Years later, one writer after becoming disillusioned with Socialism, garnered favor among conservatives when he commented on this kind of thinking, "**Socialism is the opium of the intellectuals.**"

What the utopians wanted, a world where everyone has what everyone has, can never and will never be realized. The French being eloquent and impassioned made it sound good but it was all "pie in the sky." The infamous Reign of Terror which followed the displacement of the monarchy in France, where countless innocents were dragged to the guillotine, demonstrates in its own way that the French revolt had its source in something unfamiliar to the Yankee of America - a jealousy and envy that has influenced every move toward Socialism from then until now.

Alexis de Tocqueville says that an American when eyeing a rich man said to himself, "I will someday be just like that." The envy which boiled over in the Reign of Terror was foreign to the Yankee. Why should he rage against the rich when it was likely that he too would be rich some day?

The Unexpected Fringe Element

The French revolutionaries who pieced together documents like the *Manifesto of Equality* maintained that they could create a society in which the only difference that would be tolerated in their new world order would be determined by gender. Believe it or not, now we have to deal with something that came out of France that even does away with gender.

Everywhere we turn these days there are those who are telling us that we need to fashion a new society unlike the old one. We must no longer tolerate the use of pronouns like “he,” “she,” “her,” or “him.” Alas we are told the men who stormed the Bastille did not go far enough! They were suffering from a kind of myopia. In the *Manifesto* they held on to the old distinctions between male and female. In the new society those distinctions will simply disappear. As a matter of fact that new society, where there is no male or female, is about to make its entrance. *Even the Bible is being reprinted by one publisher so that any and all references made to God, which might give the impression that God is a He or a Him, have been de-gendered?*

A call has gone out for an androgynous society.

The Dirty Duo

We must stay a bit longer in France, so we can uncover the origins of the modern day Women’s Movement, typically referred to as Feminism which is in the forefront of the demand for a genderless society. “Feminism” seems to be a misnomer if ever there was one. (Feminists seem to prefer masculinity to femininity. Lesbian or “Boston marriages” are not at all uncommon among them. Frances Perkins, the Feminist behind the New Deal of FDR, had her Mary Harriman, and Eleanor Roosevelt, wife to FDR and a radical Socialist, had her Lorena Hickok.)

Our search for the origins of Feminism in France throws a spotlight on two of the most unsavory characters that have ever darkened the streets of Paris, philosopher and playwright Jean-Paul Sartre [1905-80] and his free wheeling lover Simone de Beauvoir [1908-86], author of *The Second Sex* [1949]. Interestingly she wrote, “One is not born, but rather becomes, a woman.” In other words the differences between women and men are not due to nature but nurture. Women should be able to pick and choose from an assortment of things, both masculine and feminine, which if used properly will grant them the elusive womanhood.

However the problem is that Feminists want everything that belongs to men and everything belonging to women they are ready to discard. Many a brassiere has been burnt. And more importantly not a few marriages have failed because Beauvoir looked at marriage from the standpoint of a Marxist: that it was a form of “slavery” established in order to serve the economic interests of the bourgeois.

Had Beauvoir read Ludwig von Mises she would have discovered that Capitalism not Socialism has empowered women so that marriage cannot be considered slavery. Von Mises wrote, **“As the idea of contract (based on capitalism) enters the Law of Marriage, it breaks the rule of the male, and makes the wife a partner with equal rights. From a one-sided relationship resting on force, marriage thus becomes a mutual agreement.”**

Standing directly in the path of Feminism is child-bearing and -raising which in most cases keeps women out of the workplace for periods of time. Since these women have been influenced by Marxism this is important to them. The Marxist, according to Friedrich Hayek, says that freedom is based on wealth because wealth endows you with power.

Feminists reason that if you are denied access to the workplace (because you are giving birth and nurturing children) that means you are not as free as men because wealth equals power and freedom. Not surprisingly Beauvoir turned her Paris apartment into an abortion mill where women could do away with their unborn children. This must have satisfied her notion that wealth equals power and freedom.

In his classic, *The Road to Serfdom*, Hayek took up the question of what freedom is to a Socialist. Hayek, the noted economist, said that according to a Socialist “freedom” is “merely another name for power or wealth.” This would indicate that the poor cannot be as free as the rich because wealth allows you to do things that would otherwise be denied you. He supports our contention that the influential American educator John Dewey made it his business to confuse Americans about this. Hayek wrote, **“The most explicit defender of this confusion is, significantly, the leading philosopher of left-wingism, John Dewey, according to whom ‘liberty is the effective power to do specific things’ so that ‘the demand for liberty is demand for power.’”** [Hayek, Friedrich, *Road to Serfdom*, p. 26, citing *Liberty and Social Control in Social Frontier*, 1935, p.41].

In other words if you cannot do all that you want to do, or what others with more money can do, you are not free. That kind of thinking calls for a redistribution of wealth and it permits the Women’s Movement to disparage motherhood because it keeps women out of the workplace where people earn money.

We now see why Feminists like Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg are fiercely opposed to the pro-life movement. Justice Ginsburg is confused. She is a Dewey-ite.

Skeletons

Joining forces together, in a union based on a disgusting kind of free love and permissiveness the Dirty Duo set out together like all so-called “intellectuals” to change society. (Beauvoir’s heterosexual and homosexual love trysts did not bother Sartre, nor did his numberless love relations disturb her; as a matter of fact and in order to keep him happy and productive she found ways to procure women for him much like actress Jane Fonda did for her first husband, Roger Vadim.)

This is not just about gossip. This is important because the Beauvoirs of our world cannot, no matter how skilled they are in using the written and spoken word or how intellectual, provide us with leadership. They cannot by example point the way for the rest of us. Paul Johnson, in his 1988 book entitled *Intellectuals*, he demonstrates this about as well as anyone. Those who do not show character in their sexual dealings will likely reveal that they lack character in general.

Sartre and Beauvoir prove this point that those who are loose sexually are more often than not without character. When push came to shove these two messengers of the night collaborated with the Nazis. Sartre was even charged with anti-Semitism. We see then that he was not just a womanizer or a drug user but a misanthrope.

Most distasteful is the way Beauvoir fawned over Fidel Castro and Che Guevara of Cuba.

After the Bay of Pigs [1956] in which President John F. Kennedy failed to support an effort to displace Castro, Sartre patched things up with the Soviets. Previously they had a falling out because Soviet tanks rolled through the streets of Budapest but somehow things returned to normal and Sartre began to sing the praises of Marxism.

Later the Dirty Duo made their way to Cuba in 1960 where Marxism had been violently installed. On arriving in Cuba the ecstatic Sartre was heard to say, "It is the honeymoon of the Revolution."

The editor of the largest newspaper in Cuba, *Revolution*, invited the avant-garde couple to meet Castro and Che Guevara who at that time was finance minister in Cuba. They were feted like heads of state. Did they visit the dungeons where Castro kept his political prisoners or the graveyards where he sent many of them to a premature death? You know the answer.

At that time these two knock-down, drag-out harpies found common ground for their politics. Both were happy with what they saw in Communism.

In Cuba and Brazil, says (Beauvoir's adopted daughter) Sylvie Le Bon-de Beauvoir, 'Beauvoir and Sartre were in total accord.' Politically, yes: the energy and vigor of the young Castro, with whom they toured the streets of Havana in an open car, enchanted them . . . Photographs show his and Beauvoir's rapt, adoring expressions as they listen to Castro's speeches, or perch on a sofa in front of Che. **'Is it my fault that reality is Marxist?'** demanded the young revolutionary. This rhetorical question impressed Sartre so much that he often repeated it, as he and Beauvoir embarked on a love affair with a string of Third World leaders which would mark their future globe-trotting. [excerpt from *A Dangerous Liaison*, Carole Seymour-Jones]

One half of the Dirty Duo was a woman who managed to export the Women's Movement to the rest of the world, a thing which took the Socialist French Revolution all the way from Socialism to the edge of reality, to that place where we are expected to do away with things such as male and female where every one becomes a hermaphrodite.

Is this what the authors of the French *Manifesto of Equality* wanted when they stormed the Bastille on July 14, 1789? Is this the "second revolution" French revolutionaries thought would someday follow the first one? I really don't think so. The Feminist movement perches on the fringe of reality. It is madness.

Not even Robespierre once the leader of the French Revolution who later was himself dragged to the guillotine was that crazy. No one expresses this better than the character Olive, played by Abigail Breslin in the 2006 film *Little Miss Sunshine*. On being told that her uncle Frank (Steve Carell) wants to marry another man she blurts out, "That's crazy!"

Yankee Steve says, "Is it our fault that reality is heterosexual?"

Conclusion

According to the *Wall Street Journal* the Feminist movement in America (which marched under the banner of the ERA - Equal Rights Amendment) before it was turned back by Congress had hoped to secure the same pay for a janitor with eight children as it would have for a surgeon who had less needs. It was “each according to his needs” to use an expression from Marx and not each according to how hard he worked, or how many years he studied, or how gifted he was, or how deserving.

In a word it was the Communism of the old Levelers of England, or worse yet the Communism of the Soviets. At least the Levelers prayed. Do modern day Feminists pray? One thing is for certain, they stay away from those parts of the Bible that forbid homosexual unions.

Ever yours,

Yankee Steve Cakouros
oldlineconservative.com