



The Phyllis Schlafly Report

VOL. 23, NO. 5, SECTION 1

BOX 618, ALTON, ILLINOIS 62002

DECEMBER, 1989

Insights Into Feminist Ideology

So That's Why The Feminists Are So Bitter!

Ever since the feminist ideologues burst into our national consciousness in the mid-1960s, I have wondered where they got their peculiar notions about men. Feminist ideology according to Simone de Beauvoir, Gloria Steinem, Betty Friedan, Kate Millett, and Germaine Greer teaches that men, especially husbands, are awful creatures and that a wife is just an unpaid servant-mistress. Simone de Beauvoir, whose 1949 book *The Second Sex* made her the acknowledged founder of the modern women's liberation movement, described marriage as an "obscene bourgeois institution." Her book is a staple of "women's studies courses."

I thought all this nonsense was a creation of their weird imaginations because it is so at variance with the men I know. Most American men are decent and honorable, working long hours (often moonlighting) to provide for a wife and children.

Now, at last, through the meticulous research of one of the 20th century's greatest historians, Paul Johnson, I have discovered where these feminists got their nutty notions. His newest book, *Intellectuals*, makes it clear that the leftwing intellectuals of the last two centuries really did treat their wives and mistresses like unpaid servants and usually treated their children even worse.

The intellectuals on whom Johnson reports were not just artsy celebrities who could assume the public would accept an immoral bohemian lifestyle. They were writers who arrogantly presumed to diagnose the ills of society, to prescribe cures, and to tell mankind how we should all live our lives and how society and the economy should be structured.

So how did they run their own lives? They were typically selfish and self-centered, cruel and violent, dirty (many of them seldom bathed), and never treated any women as equals. They built a reputation on the falsehood that their theories would help the working class, but they never knew any of the working class except as mistresses.

Jean-Jacques Rousseau, the French philosopher who wrote prolifically about "truth" and "virtue," kept an illiterate laundress as his mistress for 33 years, treating her like an unpaid servant, while he continued his affairs with many other women. He wrote that he "never felt the least glimmering of love for her . . . the sensual needs I satisfied with her were purely sexual and were nothing to do with her as an

individual." He was known for his theories about raising children — a subject he knew nothing about because he forced his mistress to abandon their five babies at birth on the doorstep of a foundling home. He never saw them again because, he wrote, children were "an inconvenience" and their noise would interfere with his writing. His only concern for his parents was to get cash from them, and he let his foster mother, who had rescued him from destitution at least four times, die indigent, possibly from malnutrition.

The poet Percy Bysshe Shelley saw himself first of all as one who tried to define the social purpose of literature and use poetry to stir social action. He was wildly promiscuous, drove his wife to suicide, treated his wife and mistresses shabbily, did not support his own children, and falsely accused his mother of adultery.

Karl Marx, who had more impact on actual events than any other intellectual in modern times, made his wife's life a nightmare. He kept her and their children destitute while he disdained work and seldom bathed. He denied his daughters an education and vetoed their careers because he thought women were suitable only to be clerical assistants. He kept a female slave in his household from the age of 8, never paid her a wage, used her as his mistress, and refused to acknowledge their child. She was the only member of the working class Marx ever knew well, and his alleged research about the so-called proletariat was a fabrication.

Henrik Ibsen, whose play *A Doll's House* is such a feminist favorite today, allowed his first mistress and their child to die destitute. He treated his wife shabbily (far worse than the wife in his famous play), and had a long succession of affairs with other women, who got younger as he got older until they were down to age 15 and even 10, and whom he exploited as models for characters in his plays.

Leo Tolstoy, who had the effrontery to think he was some kind of messiah destined to remake society, used and abused his wife, and forced her to read torrid accounts of all his sexual exploits in brothels and with a succession of whores, gypsies and peasant girls. He wrote that prostitution is "necessary for the maintenance of the family." He refused to acknowledge his illegitimate offspring, and refused to admit that a woman could be a serious, adult, intelligent human being.

Ernest Hemingway was abusive and alcoholic, publicly

humiliated his four wives, had numerous adulterous affairs with younger and younger women, and could not form any kind of civilized relationship with a woman except one based on her complete subservience. One complained, with justification, that she was leading "a slave's life with a brute for a slave-owner." A notorious liar, he was one of the most enthusiastic defenders of the Communists in the Spanish Civil War.

More Leftwing Intellectuals

Bertrand Russell, who ground out a steady stream of advice on almost every political and social issue from disarmament to religion, was one of the leading names in the 20th century movement to "emancipate" women from Victorian morality through "free love." He portrayed women as victims of an antiquated system of morality, while hiring lawyers to give his ex-wives as little support as possible. He had three wives and seduced almost any woman who was available, including chambermaids, governesses, and daughters of friends he happened to be visiting.

Jean-Paul Sartre, a professional philosopher who presumed to preach to a mass audience, aligned himself with the Communists. When he seduced Simone de Beauvoir, he said his credo was "Travel, polygamy, transparency." Sartre used her as his mistress, cook, laundress, seamstress, and housekeeper, all the while boasting of affairs with younger and younger women until he got to teenagers. He treated her like a slave, and didn't even leave her any money. But Simone de Beauvoir was an educated and able woman and she didn't have to live like a servant-mistress unless she chose that lifestyle.

Edmund Wilson, another adulterous literary notable, had four wives whom he abused. He voted Communist or Socialist in every election. He was forever demanding big government spending for welfare, but he refused to file his own income tax returns.

Victor Gollancz, the Englishman who became wealthy publishing pro-Communist books, hired women employees because he could pay them lower wages, impose harsher working conditions, and use them as his mistresses. He treated his wife like a slave, using her as housekeeper, chauffeur, barber and valet, and forced her to put up with his frequent adultery and his disagreeable habit of pawing other women in public. Like the other pro-Communist intellectuals, he had no contact with working people. He refused to publish the most brilliant author whose books were available to him, the anti-Communist George Orwell.

Intellectuals proves that the public posture of leading intellectuals cannot be separated from their private lives. The one explains the other. Women were "loved" only insofar as they were servile and acquiesced in being treated like man's property. Fortunately, the bizarre feminist theories about men and marriage are true only as to the crowd they associate with — the leftwing intellectuals.

I would not want anyone to get the impression that the substance of this important book is to recount sexual relationships. Paul Johnson's primary thesis is that the leftist intellectuals were liars who had no regard for the truth and falsified "evidence" for their Communist or Socialist economic

theories. That's not surprising, since a man who spends his life lying to women will probably lie about everything else, too. For that story, you'll have to read the book. (New York, Harper & Row, Publishers, 1988.)

Exposing The Monster Behind The Myth

What a loathsome, depraved, and vicious monster! That's the conclusion one is forced to accept after reading the definitive expose, *Picasso: Creator and Destroyer*, by Arianna Stassinopoulos Huffington.

The biographer has stripped off Pablo Picasso's phony mask of art and shown him to the world as a sadist who started in brothels and spent a 90-year lifetime abusing, beating, and deliberately humiliating a long succession of women who loved him. Along the way, he betrayed his friends and calculated the destruction of everyone who crossed his path.

The truth about Picasso has been a long time emerging. Fortunately, it fell into the hands of an author whose descriptive skills, powerful vocabulary, empathy with victims, and sense of drama were equal to the task of relating this sordid story.

Picasso has long been acclaimed as the greatest artist of the twentieth century. Picasso himself orchestrated that adulation by an expert manipulation of public attitudes and venalities in a way that Madison Avenue advertising companies might envy. As Mrs. Huffington reports, "Picasso had mastered the publicity game before the world knew that such a game existed."

Picasso stands in a class by himself as having milked the public during his own lifetime for more cash than any other artist in history. The more than 10,000 works he had produced by 1961 were then estimated to have a commercial value of \$100,000,000.

Picasso treated his customers with the same contempt as he treated his mistresses, wives, and friends. In 1912, Picasso denounced beauty as "crap," and set himself on his path of deliberate ugliness. "Museums are just a lot of lies," Picasso said in the 1930s, "and people who make art their business are mostly impostors." He should know; he was the chief charlatan.

In a 1952 confession to the Italian writer Giovanni Papini, Picasso confessed how he exploited the indolent wealthy who "desire only the peculiar, the sensational, the eccentric, the scandalous in today's art."

"Through amusing myself with all these farces," Picasso said, "I became a celebrity. . . . But when I am alone, I do not have the effrontery to consider myself an artist at all, in the grand old meaning of the word. I am only a public clown, a mountebank. I have understood my time and have exploited the imbecility, the vanity, the greed of my contemporaries."

When Picasso joined the Communist Party after World War II, he said, "Joining the Communist Party is the logical conclusion of my whole life, my whole work." The Soviet Union awarded him the Lenin peace prize in 1962 and adopted his peace dove painting as a Communist symbol.

Picasso was cruelly domineering and morbidly possessive of his mistresses, even while faithless to them all. He was vindictively jealous of every contemporary man or woman who displayed talent.

Picasso seduced an underage girl at a children's camp, inflicting on her the exotic sexual experimentation he had learned in 30 years of sexual experiences. He painted his violent *Guernica* at the same time that two of his mistresses were engaged in a fistfight alongside of him in his studio.

Picasso brutally beat his mistress Dora and many times left her lying unconscious on the floor. He burned his mistress Francoise's cheek with a cigarette and told her, "There's nothing so similar to one poodle dog as another poodle dog, and that goes for women, too."

Picasso callously refused to inconvenience himself by driving a few blocks out of his way to take Francoise to the hospital to have her baby, telling her to find her own way because he needed the chauffeur to drive him to the 1949 World Peace Congress.

Picasso's disordered paintings were mirrors of his deep and universal hatred of all women and his attitude that a woman is a servile animal. Women with distorted and deformed faces and bodies filled his paintings that purported to portray the modernist world.

Picasso's last self-portrait, painted in 1972 a year before his death, depicts the final anguish and despair of this egomaniac, still fueled by hatred. His widow, his longtime mistress, and his grandson all committed suicide after his death.

Mrs. Huffington has performed an international service to humanity by exposing the hypocrisy of Picasso: his sadistic abuse of women concealed behind his so-called charisma, his violence concealed behind his dove of peace, and his life pattern as a destroyer (of women, friends, values, and traditional beauty) concealed behind his pretensions of art. (New York, Simon and Schuster, 1988.)

Stop Making Heroes Out Of Rapists

Twenty years ago, the feminists developed the theory that rape has nothing to do with sex, that it is instead an act of violence, plus evidence of male hatred and aggressiveness toward women. Maybe this strange notion is the reason why we haven't heard any outcry from feminists about the new genre of heroes on television soap operas.

I'll admit I didn't discover this problem myself, as I am no watcher of soaps. It was discovered by *TV Guide* and the magazine caught my eye as I went through the checkout counter at the supermarket. At first I thought the article, called "Let's Stop Turning Rapists into Heroes," would be some kind of *National Enquirer* sensationalism.

But alas, the article was for real. It described a whole series of television soaps where a rapist became a hero soon after his crime. Let me recite the list so you will know I didn't make this up.

The first rapist listed showed his face ten years ago on ABC's *General Hospital* when Luke raped Laura, who eventually fell in love with and married him. The only other time I ever heard of such a disgusting scenario was years ago in Ayn Rand's *Fountainhead*, and I stopped reading that novel when I figured out how the plot was unfolding.

Whereas rape is (or should be) judged a crime, *General Hospital* made it look like an act of love. Laura even referred to the incident as "the first time we made love." There apparently was some flap from women when this sequence

aired several years ago, but there has been no particular opposition to the rape-romances of recent years.

On ABC's now-defunct *Ryan's Hope*, Roger unsuccessfully tried to force Maggie into bed, and two years later they were married. On ABC's *Dynasty*, Adam raped Kirby one season and proposed to her in the next.

The idea of a woman marrying her rapist is not only absurd, it is downright dangerous. It gives docu-drama authenticity to what is called the "rape myth," namely, the notion that women secretly want to be raped.

This rape myth is reinforced daily in much of pornography. Are we going to allow marriage to legitimize rape in much the same way that, in the years of Victorian sexual mores, a shotgun marriage could legitimize seduction? Is this one of the achievements of sexual liberation or women's liberation?

Back to the soaps, we see that rapists not only are accepted by their victims but then emerge as leading men and even heroes. *General Hospital's* Luke, who had played a minor role at the time of his crime, subsequently became the hero of the show and a star apparently very popular with women.

ABC's *All My Children* has a character named Ross who, in a drunken rage, raped his father's fiancée, Natalie. For this crime, he went to prison; so much, so good. But he immediately broke out of jail and then became a hero, starring in all sorts of heroic escapades.

CBS's *As the World Turns* presents Josh, another character who turns from rapist to hero, very sympathetically. No, he doesn't marry his victim; instead his victim's sister falls in love with Josh, and the victim and their mother both accept the relationship.

All these story lines have the effect of desensitizing viewers to the crime of rape. They present rape as the route to success and good sex.

On most college campuses today, date rape is a big concern. It's a new phenomenon that has come about along with sexual permissiveness and coed dorms. A recent issue of the Brown University monthly magazine said that 95 percent of those surveyed felt that acquaintance rape is a problem on their campus. The article goes on to relate several typical examples. It's clear that young men and young women at Brown have very different understandings and expectations of dates, sex, and the meaning of "no."

A campaign to get the soaps to cease and desist such anti-woman garbage would be a good project for the feminists. It's not only insultingly sexist but socially repugnant for television to teach that rape does pay.

But I'm not holding my breath until they do because the feminists have such a warped idea of what "sexism" is. They would probably prefer to continue attacking as "sexist" a husband who puts his wife on a pedestal and treats her like a queen. The feminists are also more eager to attack the alleged "sexism" of the Scholastic Aptitude Test because it uses more questions that involve "science, sports and war" and fewer on "relationships, clothing or appearances."

Signs of the Post-Feminist Era

The death this month of *Ms. Magazine*, the flagship publication of the feminist movement, is a sign that feminism is no longer saleable. Founded 17 years ago by Gloria Steinem

and a little coterie of her friends, *Ms.* always featured off-beat anti-male and anti-family feminist notions. Businesses were generous in placing ads, but most of their *Ms.* advertisements, especially for cosmetics, were aimed at the wrong audience.

In recent years, even occasional articles about "Learning to Flirt at 37" failed to change *Ms.*'s radical image. The precipitous drop in ad revenue caused the December issue to be cancelled. The new owner announced that future plans are uncertain.

If you watch the media closely, you can find many evidences that we are now in a post-feminist era. Despite our being harangued for the last 15 years about how degrading it is to call a woman a "girl," a recent cartoon in *The New Yorker* showed a modern young woman standing at a cocktail party and coyly saying to her male companion, "It's all right, now, to call me a girl."

Then, one day in a greeting card shop I came across a card with a picture of a woman echoing the lyrics of a favorite feminist song: "I am woman — strong, invincible." Inside the card was the rest of the sentence: "and lonely."

Sometimes post-feminist articles show up even in metropolitan newspapers. Sometimes they are written by women who have discovered that feminism led them down a marriageless or childless trail, and sometimes by women who are so surprised to discover that motherhood is a demanding and even fulfilling career.

A recent Op-Ed piece in the *New York Times* titled "Motherhood's Better Before 30" carried the subhead "Voices of the New Generation." The young female author felt the urge to make a statement that she and her contemporaries are NOT going to follow in the footsteps of '70s feminists who postponed motherhood in favor of careers and now find they are plagued by problems of infertility, amniocentesis, and lack of energy when a 45-year-old mom tries to keep up with her toddler.

Another 1989 Op-Ed piece in the *New York Times* described the bitter result when young women give their career top priority in their lives. "I am a walking cliché of my generation," this feminist sadly wrote, "a woman of 40 who put work ahead of motherhood and now longs for the latter." The problem is, she said, she now belongs to what she calls "the sisterhood of the infertile." After rejecting motherhood during her prime childbearing years, she is now spending thousands of dollars, traipsing around from one fertility clinic to another, trying to find a medical miracle that can help her to conceive and carry a baby.

The Feminist Mistake

Feminism falsely taught young women that marriage was a cage, that divorce was liberation, that child care was a burden, that abortion was women's right, and that devoting themselves to careers in their twenties and thirties would bring fulfillment.

Feminists reacted in holy horror when Felice Schwartz, whose article in the *Harvard Management Review* started the controversy about the Mommy Track, wrote that "maternity is biological rather than cultural" and that maternity is not simply childbirth but a continuum that continues from pregnancy through bonding and child rearing. The feminists simply cannot accept this because it violates their faith in the

"equality" of gender and marital roles.

Nor did the feminists want to hear Felice Schwartz recite the truism that a successful corporate or professional career means so many extra hours and personal sacrifices for women that it "requires that they remain single or at least childless or, if they do have children, that they be satisfied to have others raise them."

It is feminist dogma that men and women, husbands and wives, fathers and mothers, are fungibles, interchangeables. Feminists are offended by any term indicating that there may be a different role for men and women; they think that "role" is a dirty four-letter word. They believe women are oppressed when society expects mothers to take care of their own children. They argue that women must be relieved of this burden, or at least share it equally with men.

In a Washington conference in January 1989, the economist and social theorist George Gilder described how feminism has persuaded women to focus on their careers in their twenties and early thirties, competing intensely with men for advancement in their jobs, and then if perhaps they decide they want to "have it all," at about age 40 they can think about marriage. At that point, they discover that it is much harder for a woman to get married, or at least to marry the man she wants to marry.

Thousands, perhaps millions of American women made this tragic mistake. But having made it, they feel a compelling emotional need to defend it and to justify it. George Gilder explained that the real heart of the daycare controversy "is essentially about ratifying the feminist mistake — an attempt to give public ratification to the appalling error which millions of American women made in the 1970s and 1980s."

The biggest defect of feminism is that it attempts to change or even repeal human nature. There is no evidence that they will be successful in the foreseeable future.

Phyllis Schlafly has appeared in debate, in every type of media and forum, with all the leading feminists who have been willing to debate her. Her *Phyllis Schlafly Report* (monthly since 1967) and four of her fourteen books, *The Power of the Positive Woman* (1977), *The Power of the Christian Woman* (1981), *Equal Pay for Unequal Work* (1984), and *Who Will Rock the Cradle?* (1989) articulate the pro-family position in opposition to the feminist ideological, legislative, political and social goals. She is founder and president of Eagle Forum, a national conservative organization of 80,000 men and women who participate in the public policymaking process through volunteer action at every level.

The Phyllis Schlafly Report

Box 618, Alton, Illinois 62002
ISSN0556-0152

Published monthly by The Eagle Trust Fund, Box 618, Alton, Illinois 62002. Second Class Postage Paid at Alton, Illinois. Postmaster: Address Corrections should be sent to the Phyllis Schlafly Report, Box 618, Alton, Illinois 62002.

Subscription Price: \$15 per year. Extra copies available: 50 cents each; 4 copies \$1; 30 copies \$5; 100 copies \$10.