Interpretation
A Journal of Political Philosophy

Spring 2023 *Volume 49* Issue 3

339 *Hannes Kerber & Svetozar Y. Minkov* — On Higher Education and the Crisis of Our Time: A Lecture by Leo Strauss

353 *David Fott* — Philosophy, Politics, and Rhetoric in Cicero's *On the Orator*

375 *Robert Wyllie* — "Solomon's Science": Spinoza on the Possibility and Limits of Ancient Philosophy

395 *Erfan Xia* — Montaigne and the Theological-Political Problem

Reviews

411 *Ida Friederike Görres* — "Satanic," "An Atheistic Doctrine of Woman": A Review of Simone de Beauvoir's *The Second Sex* (1951)

423 *Ralph C. Wood* — *Flannery O'Connor and the Perils of Governing by Tenderness* by Jerome C. Foss

435 *Angela Knobel* — *What Happened to Civility: The Promise and Failure of Montaigne's Modern Project* by Ann Hartle

441 *Alexander Orwin* — *Leo Strauss and Islamic Political Thought* by Rasoul Namazi

©2023 Interpretation, Inc. All rights reserved. No part of the contents may be reproduced in any form without written permission of the publisher.

ISSN 0020-9635

Interpretation

A Journal of Political Philosophy

Editor-in-Chief	Timothy W. Burns, Baylor University
General Editors	Charles E. Butterworth • Timothy W. Burns
General Editors (Late)	Howard B. White (d. 1974) • Robert Horwitz (d. 1987) Seth G. Benardete (d. 2001) • Leonard Grey (d. 2009) • Hilail Gildin (d. 2015)
Consulting Editors	Harvey C. Mansfield • Thomas L. Pangle • Ellis Sandoz
Consulting Editors (Late)	Leo Strauss (d. 1973) • Arnaldo Momigliano (d. 1987) • Michael Oakeshott (d. 1990) • John Hallowell (d. 1992) • Ernest L. Fortin (d. 2002) • Muhsin Mahdi (d. 2007) • Joseph Cropsey (d. 2012) • Kenneth W. Thompson (d. 2013) • Harry V. Jaffa (d. 2015) • David Lowenthal (d. 2022)
International Editors	Terence E. Marshall • Heinrich Meier
Editors	Peter Ahrensdorf • Wayne Ambler • Marco Andreacchio • Maurice Auerbach • Robert Bartlett • Fred Baumann • Eric Buzzetti • Susan Collins • Patrick Coby • Erik Dempsey • Elizabeth C'de Baca Eastman • Edward J. Erler • Maureen Feder-Marcus • Robert Goldberg • L. Joseph Hebert • Pamela K. Jensen • Hannes Kerber • Mark J. Lutz • Daniel Ian Mark • Ken Masugi • Carol L. McNamara • Will Morrisey • Amy Nendza • Lorraine Pangle • Charles T. Rubin • Leslie G. Rubin • Thomas Schneider • Susan Meld Shell • Geoffrey T. Sigalet • Nicholas Starr • Devin Stauffer • Bradford P. Wilson • Cameron Wybrow • Martin D. Yaffe • Catherine H. Zuckert • Michael P. Zuckert
Copy Editor	Les Harris
Designer	Sarah Teutschel

Inquiries ***Interpretation, A Journal of Political Philosophy***
Department of Political Science
Baylor University
1 Bear Place, 97276
Waco, TX 76798

email interpretation@baylor.edu

"Satanic," "An Atheistic Doctrine of Woman": A Review of Simone de Beauvoir's *The Second Sex* (1951)

Ida Friederike Görres

Translated by Jan C. Bentz and Jennifer Sue Bryson

Translators' Note

What follows is a translation of Ida Friederike Görres, "Die 'Erfindung' der Frau: Zu Simone de Beauvoirs Le deuxième sexe," *Wort und Wahrheit: Monatsschrift für Religion und Kultur* 6, no. 1 (January 1951): 58–63. The original German text does not have citations. It has, inconsistently, only a few in-text page references. To the extent possible, we have tried to find the quotations from de Beauvoir's work in an established English translation.

Ida Friederike Görres (1901 Bohemia – 1971 Germany, née von Coudenhove) was a Catholic author, most well-known for her works on the saints and the Catholic Church.[1] Görres was critical of the "women's movement" during her lifetime—rejecting, for example, calls for women's ordination.[2]

Jan C. Bentz is lecturer and tutor at the Studium of Blackfriars Hall, Oxford (jan.bentz@english.op.org).

Jennifer Sue Bryson is a fellow at the Ethics and Public Policy Center and a visiting researcher at Hochschule Heiligenkreuz, Austria (jennifersbryson@gmail.com).

[1] For more about Ida Friederike Görres and her work, see, e.g., Hanna-Barbara Gerl-Falkovitz, "'Only the Lover Discerns': A Brief Introduction to Ida Friederike Görres," trans. Jennifer S. Bryson, *LOGOS: A Journal of Catholic Thought and Culture* 23, no. 4 (Fall 2020): 117–22, as well as idagoerres.org.

[2] Ida Friederike Görres, "'Women in Holy Orders?,'" trans. Anon., *The Month*, n.s., 34, no. 2 (August 1965): 84–93. A second English translation was published in the United States as Ida Friederike Görres, "Women as Priests? This Woman Says 'No,'" trans. Anon., *Catholic Transcript*, December 17, 1965. Both translations are available at https://idagoerres.org/essays.

© 2023 Interpretation, Inc.

In his critical study of feminist theology, Manfred Hauke groups Görres among the "highly cultured women in the twentieth century who, from a Catholic perspective, have made outstanding contributions, and precisely to the question of women: the writers Gertrud von le Fort, Sigrid Unset, and Ida Friederike Gorres; the philosopher Edith Stein; the catechist Oda Schneider, the theologian Barbara Albrecht; and many others. Feminist theology is blind to testimonies like these."[3]

◆ ◆ ◆

Ida Friederike Görres: Review of Simone de Beauvoir's *The Second Sex* (1951)

That there is a "woman question" is arguably not disputed by any thinking person: that is to say, on one hand, there is the fact that the position of women within human society, which has been fairly uniform and stable for thousands of years in almost all known cultures, fluctuated for about a century and then changed rapidly and in many ways, and is still in the grips of change; and on the other, it is the case that this fact is judged differently—by some as necessary, as desired, as a long due and positive development, by others as questionable and deplorable, as a decay and degeneration of incalculable consequences. An extensive literature deals with these historical and social phenomena, making demands and accusing, or defending and justifying, depending on the point of view of the authors. Some may just start from practical impulses, prospects, and consequences, while others attempt the deepest metaphysical exploration of the human sexual binary; everyone will probably agree that this reorganization, whether it is rebellion or liberation, is inexorably underway.

We can analyze the beginnings of this movement in Europe in the late nineteenth century fairly precisely, down to its particular social and economic roots and catalytic moments. There is no doubt that the industrialization of food and clothing, in particular, has greatly shrunk the scope of the "house," as numerous vital tasks that have been left to housewives since the dawn of culture were suddenly relocated elsewhere. The female capabilities thus freed up demanded a different sphere of activity. In this respect, one can claim,

[3] Manfred Hauke, *God or Goddess? Feminist Theology: What Is It? Where Does It Lead?*, trans. David Kipp (San Francisco: Ignatius, 1995), 252–53.

even without "historical materialism," that at least the urgent initial stage of the German women's movement is a symptom of the crisis arising from the newly emerging, unrelenting, and irrevocable "unemployment" of bourgeois women. That is why this, at first, did not have an impact on "women" per se, but rather on the class affected by this—neither the peasant woman nor the aristocratic woman took notice of this. But the gradual transformation of the "upper middle-class young ladies"—this superfluous and senseless form of existence—into "working women" touched many other chords, including more essential ones. The new possibilities of higher education, the new indirect contact with the wider, male-dominated world, and the zeitgeist have profoundly transformed the female view of her own circumstance and her own, as yet unexplored, possibilities. The changed attitudes of men toward human beings and the world, toward law and duty, toward freedom and self-determination have influenced women directly and indirectly; perhaps it was precisely the "emancipated" women who showed themselves to be the most docile and uncritical students?

What the "working" woman experienced and thought also affected the life of the "domestic" woman to a large extent, and the life of daughters who were already being equipped and formed for a new future. More and more, the "practical" question reveals itself to be a metaphysical one. More and more, the question is shifting from the initial circumstance, from the question of what women can, may, and should *do*, down to the foundation: who and what a woman *is*—which embodiment of being human is actually assigned and entrusted to her.

It is probably widely understood that the term "human" is more comprehensive and deeper than "man" or "woman," that "being human" belongs to both of them, albeit in different molds, and that what they share together in existence is greater than the particularities of each. From this it follows, among other things, that each of the two suffers irremediable damage if one wants to confine and limit him or her to what is only-male or only-female, clinically completely separated from the other.

It is well known that this can happen and has happened again and again, and many contemporaries consider it normal and natural. It is precisely the woman, to the greatest extent, who was fated to be considered and evaluated not as a female human being, but exclusively as "the female," the pure sexual being, who is denied all possibilities of development that do not relate to these functions. In this sense, she was and is *less* than a human being; "woman = human minus what is common to humans"—in language, specifically in our

[German] language, classified as a thing: *the* female, not *the* woman.[4] The fact that a man is often also regarded as "only-a-man," in the sense that the English say "human" or "male," is not clearly evident in our [German] language. *The* zoological male [*Männchen*] is limited in linguistic usage to animals. But this effective limitation does not show itself so clearly in the exterior life of the human man.

Now, of course, there would be a lot of space to argue about the extent to which this or that—whether virtue, ability, career path, or item of clothing—is "human" or strictly masculine or feminine in the exclusive sense of the word. This is precisely what seems to us to be the most pressing issue in "the woman question." Because within patriarchal cultures, the man tends to demand that almost everything "generally human" be a male monopoly or else be allowed to apply only to that which has male characteristics.

It seems to us that the real task of the women's movement of our time is not to reshape what is masculine, but to retrieve or reshape broad aspects of what is human with a female configuration. However, the discussion always starts from the self-evident assumption that *there are* two human poles, the male and the female, and that an equitable balance of their rights, tasks, abilities, etc., is to be found.

The Second Sex (*Le deuxième sexe*, volume 1, *Les faits et les mythes*, and volume 2, *L'expérience vécue*, Gallimard, Paris 1949) by Simone de Beauvoir, Sartre's wife, cuts the Gordian knot of such questions with one amazingly simple blow. What is surprising is not the content. It is unfurled with truly professorial thoroughness, with an immensely rich compendium of almost all of the material from the literature of the older European as well as the more recent American women's movements. What is surprising is rather its thesis: Simone de Beauvoir insists *that there is no such thing as woman*. Woman as we know her is rather a fabrication, a myth, a "beautiful fictional character." The "female soul" is just as much a purposeful propaganda lie as the "Negro soul" or the "Jewish soul" or some other ethnic soul. Nothing about woman is natural; rather, she is an elaborate result of civilization.[5] Man *invented* woman—the "true" woman, the "female"; that is, he invented everything that differs from him except the sexual organs in the "authentic woman": he invented the "female nature," the "female character," the female disposition,

[4] That is, "wie ein Ding gewertet—*das* Weib, nicht *die* Frau."

[5] See, for example, Simone de Beauvoir, *The Second Sex* (New York: Vintage Books, 1989), xx. In the original review, Görres cites Simone de Beauvoir, *Le deuxième sexe*, vol. 1, *Les faits et les mythes* (Paris: Gallimard, 1949), 569. However, volume one of the 1949 edition does not have a page 569.

instincts, traits, the female destiny. Neither biology, nor psychology, nor psychoanalysis knew anything of the sort. Neither ovaries nor uteruses, that is, "birthing mothers" [*Gebärmutter*], could produce such a thing.[6] Everything that is called "particular to the female" is only the reflection of a circumstance, and this is imposed on women by men; "the 'true woman' is an artificial product that civilization makes, as formerly eunuchs were made. Her presumed 'instincts' for coquetry, docility, are indoctrinated…"[7] "Femaleness" is a euphemistic expression for adulteration and mutilation.

With a tremendous passion, brilliant mind, sparkling temperament, keen intellectual acrobatics, and a great deal of erudition, this thesis is presented over almost one thousand pages and built on a foundation of existentialism. This thesis is supposed to have been discovered, at long last, after being unknown for however many millennia, as if solving a seemingly unsolvable question with astonishing simplicity, that is to say, as the key to the gender problem that was understood by no one until now.

Because [claims de Beauvoir]: The actual definition of a human being is that of a being who is not "given," but rather continually makes him- or herself what he or she is. The human being is not a species, but a historical idea. Even the body is not a thing, but rather a circumstance. There is no essence, no given permanent being—only eternal, free, self-determined becoming. The human exists in that he or she continually and creatively overcomes what is given about him- or herself and his or her own worldly reality. This transcendence, however, is solely man's right of inheritance, while woman is condemned to immanence and mere facticity—in fact, condemned by man to be his opposite. This pure factuality is worthless and meaningless, it is a barrier and a prison. A human can transcend the right of inheritance only by disregarding it, breaking it, making it submit to his sovereignty; "the free spirit with all its riches must project itself toward an empty heaven that it is to populate."[8] There is no fate and no destiny. There is no being, no "nature," and *no good*. "Life" by itself has no reason to exist—and the curse of women is to be chained to the mere repetition and maintenance of what is in itself meaningless. "Being, persisting, and continuing" are merely negative concepts—that is why the man pushes them onto the woman and forces her

[6] Görres appears to intend the twofold meaning here of the German word *Gebärmutter*—the uterus as well as the literal meaning of this compound word, consisting of "birthing" (*Gebär-*) and "mothers" (*-mutter*), as if women who give birth reproduce only more women who give birth.

[7] De Beauvoir, *The Second Sex*, 408. Görres cites *Le deuxième sexe*, 1:174.

[8] De Beauvoir, *The Second Sex*, 712. Görres cites *Le deuxième sexe*, 2:448.

to represent them in order to become conscious of the contrast of his own, dynamic values, the only real ones. For "the inwardness of the existent is only nothingness"—*n'est que néant*—"and because he must project himself into an object in order to reach himself…"[9] "Whereas in serving the species, the human male also remodels the face of the earth, he creates new instruments, he invents, he shapes the future."[10]

All of this, that is, human existence in general, is denied to women. In her existence, even the word "truth" has lost its meaning, because she is unable to disclose the world by acting. She has no goals and no tasks, just "activities" to kill time. *Everything* that she is allowed to do, no matter how "public" and far reaching, has the inner weight of "ladylike handicrafts."

Woman knows no responsibility. Her entire existence consists of waiting on man or child, waiting in multiple forms—in eternal provisionality, in invalidity, in the unimportance of the lower world of immanence and contingency—and her vindication always lies in the hands of others. She is nothing but an element—and an insignificant one at that—of male life, while the man arranges her entire life. As a reward for complete slavery, the man grants her "a parcel of the world": she does not even have enough of a life of her own that she could oppose the truths and values that the man has created with a female counterworld. She can only deny his own truths and values (hence, woman's well-known contrariness!) or "swallow" them uncritically, submissively.

All she has left is to adjust stubbornly to the impossible perfection of "being" *instead of doing*, in three particular ways: in narcissism, in love, and in religion. That is, in each instance in the exaggeration, inflation, and deification of one's own tiny self, either in the idolatry of one's own vanity or of one's "own" husband, or in the absolutely delusional world of religious imagination, which promises her a "soul" and eternity.

Until now, woman has been "part victim, part accomplice,"[11] for, as is hammered into us with tireless repetition and variation, the worst thing about the tragedy of woman since the mists of ancient times is that she, robbed

[9] De Beauvoir, *The Second Sex*, 186.

[10] De Beauvoir, *The Second Sex*, 64.

[11] Perhaps Görres is paraphrasing this repeated theme, or perhaps quoting one of the following passages from de Beauvoir, *The Second Sex*: "her pose as victim, an accomplice" (548); "half consenting, half revolted" (383); "The fact is that the traditional woman is a bamboozled conscious being and a practitioner of bamboozlement" (709); "and here she is, victim and shrew in spite of herself" (723). The original has no citation for this.

of freedom, personal dignity, and self-worth, is transformed into being a thing, a quarry, an item of property, having made common cause with her vanquisher in shameful consent—*complicité*. She has accepted the assigned role of "vassal" and identified herself with it. She has eagerly endeavored to confirm the phony myths that the man wove and puffed up around her to his advantage. Woman has betrayed woman. The culmination of this dark deal, however, is that the vanquisher offers her, as a reward, the ambiguous compensation of being glorified as the "eternal feminine," an abysmally lying cult of her slave qualities, a comfortable delusion that mythologizes and absolutizes her submission, making her the "higher essence," exaggerated into the embodied "ideal," while every authentic portion of the world and life is still denied to her. Her dungeon is turned by ways of lies into a palace and a temple, her chains into jewelry. In the cult of the Madonna, the tremendous lie reaches its peak: the "Handmaid of the Lord"—the woman who kneels before her own son, adoring the man within her as her god—is crowned with pseudo-glory.[12] And the woman *goes along* in this because she has recognized that the way of submission, carefree-living, irresponsibility, and immaturity is the more comfortable manner of existence. Therefore, almost without exception—even in our enlightened times—she succumbs to the temptation to surrender herself to a "protector" and becomes more and more entangled in her innocent-indebted "curse," which crystallizes most sharply in the circumstance of marriage.

The core of this form of existence lies in the fact that the man has declared and stamped her as "an other" and accepts and admits her only as "an other." In fact, as an other "in the manner of one who is not real": not as a companion, not as a real, equal counterpart in mutuality, but as a fantastical, fictitious "other." She is everything that is not he, what he does not *want* to be and at the same time "longs for" in an unreal way, as the absolute opposite, the background against which he stands out and becomes conscious of himself. Thus, she is for him the "lovely deception," the embodied illusion, an object and property, and at the same time a "secret," eternally shimmering, an incomprehensible "nature," the faceless and contourless "all" that "everything" is allowed to be, but she is not man, not a person. Since no woman fulfills these requirements "naturally," she has been artificially made to do so: through continuous inexorable and systematic mutilation and deformation of her spirit

[12] Since Görres is describing de Beauvoir's view, we have written the words "son," "man," and "god" lowercase. The question whether to capitalize these arises only in English, not in German, because in German, all nouns are capitalized. So, in Görres's text there was no ambiguity. Opting for lowercase here is simply a decision of the translators.

and even of her body from childhood on, through deliberately cultivated "weakness" and "frailty," which is dependent on the protector and sustainer, by the "reification" of her body into mere "flesh" or a luxury article, by emptying her entire existence except for the relationship to a man as the sole meaning and content, by an artificially cruel increase in all reproductive problems, and by mercilessly eliminating every other possibility. What remains after such a process through many generations is: the "authentic woman."

"What a misfortune to be a woman! And yet the misfortune, when one is a woman, is at bottom not to comprehend that it is one" (Kierkegaard; the motto of volume 2 of *The Second Sex*).[13]

In summary: until now, the human being has been embodied only and exclusively in man. Only the man, only the default way of existence of the man *in its facticity* is human and suitable for being human.

That is the real surprise of this peculiar book. It is the most passionate, one-sided, narrow-minded apology and idealization (*apotheosis*) of man, as he is, that I have ever come across. And this despite innumerable hateful charges against men.

The author at one point asserts that there is no "myth of the male" alongside the many changing myths of the female, because every "myth always implies a subject who projects his hopes and his fears toward a sky of transcendence. Women do not set themselves up as Subject and hence have erected no virile myth…"[14]

It seems to me that this book presents precisely this myth. This woman, in any case, is so completely devoted to the "superiority," the glory of the man, the "male," that she rejects and denies everything, really everything, that is not expressly and emphatically "masculine" in the narrowest sense of the word. She is completely blind to all values outside of his sphere. Not only is there no "other," there should be no other that could exist. The fact that she has become "other" is the curse and fault of the woman; and her liberation, her salvation, and her humanization lie only on the path of the most perfect possible convergence with him. Here Simone de Beauvoir stands strangely enough side by side with the fanatical misogynists.

---

[13] Quoted in de Beauvoir, *The Second Sex*, 720.

[14] De Beauvoir, *The Second Sex*, 142. In the original article the opening quotation mark is erroneously placed before "Women."

It is also strange how this otherwise extremely sharp-sighted, analytically gifted author not only constantly confuses human beings with men, but also just as persistently confuses "man" as an archetype and a species with each individual man.

She always implies (with the exception of a few hesitant comments on the side) that men exist only in an "ideal form," in splendid versions—as thinkers, as creators, as heroes, and as conquerors: this ideal-man is always juxtaposed with the wretchedness of the unsuccessful and stunted female entity. Man is always occupied exclusively with modifying the face of the earth,[15] "bearing the tremendous responsibility for the whole of humanity,"[16] wafting heavenward on eagles' wings, challenging his century, and however else a girl with a crush may fancy her lover. Every single boy, of course, has "the whole world open"; each one plans and models his life as he sees fit, he victoriously overcomes all obstacles, compels the future, he is independent, is naturally qualified to such appropriation of the world, lives among decisions and deeds, in a "coherent universe that is a thought reality"—while she "struggles" only in immanence, in a "magic reality" that cannot be examined through thinking, abandoned to magic, superstition, and to religion absolutely on a par with these.[17] Simone de Beauvoir reproaches one of her critics right from the start that each of these gentlemen feels like a demigod vis-à-vis woman—but doesn't she confirm him, in a way that could not be more effusive? When one reads this book carefully, man appears as the "higher being" and woman seems *effectively* much closer to the beasts than to him.

It is impossible to count the passages in which the author, with innumerable variations, confuses the human being per se not with man, but with a "zoological male." As an example, for all the others, the following may apply: it is not surprising, in view of all this, that Simone de Beauvoir calls for free homosexuality for all women, yet one might expect the justification to be that women can, may, and should achieve independence in the erotic and sexual realms and make themselves independent of men—but far from it! Rather, the "reason" is that the female body itself is quite simply the object of *human*

---

[15] De Beauvoir writes, "in serving the species, the human male also remodels the face of the earth, he creates new instruments, he invents, he shapes the future" (*The Second Sex*, 64).

[16] Perhaps Görres is referring to one of these passages: "Woman preserves her transcendence by transferring it to him; but he must bring it to bear upon the whole world" (*The Second Sex*, 658); "For the individuals who seem to us most outstanding, who are honored with the name of genius, are those who have proposed to enact the fate of all humanity in their personal existences, and no woman has believed herself authorized to do this" (ibid., 713).

[17] De Beauvoir, *The Second Sex*, 726.

eroticism: so the woman proves herself human when she chooses a female mate. Therefore, moreover, every woman is "by nature" a lesbian—now suddenly there is a "nature"!—and behaves by nature in a hostile and disgusted manner toward the male body. A large amount of "documentation" from psychoanalytic consultation hours, from psychiatric clinics, etc., would be needed to provide the "proof" for this assertion. In the same way, the woman becomes human vis-à-vis the man (who apparently "unnaturally" cannot be completely eliminated in this territory) only when she is able to love "just like a man"—that is, in a manner that is episodic, uninvolved, detached. In other words: when she does not love like a man understood as a human being—with loyalty, responsibility, reverence—but like a "zoological male."

The Second Sex gives the impression that it was written, not by a woman, and certainly not by a man, but by a *transvestite man* who was brought up as a girl and as a woman from an early age—as a pampered "little princess," as a dissatisfied, idle "upper middle-class young lady"—and therefore lives in obstinate, poisonous hatred and implacable vengefulness for all things and everything "feminine," in raging envy of the masculinity that has been denied and having lost an objective view of both [the feminine and the masculine].

So, for example, there is the remarkable passage that laments with great pathos that one of the most serious and most consequential ways the woman is stunted is that she is denied the "experience of the fist"[18]—the violence—which boys are allowed to enjoy in fighting and hitting—an irreplaceable building block in the development of a real personality. What all-consuming and inconsolable envy speaks from these and similar sentences!

Unfortunately, however tempting it may be, there is little point in attempting to refute one by one this vast accumulation of errors, caricatures, and wild assertions. Not only would it require an entire monograph, but such a process, while interesting, would be rather unproductive. It seems more important to us to track down the hidden impetus under this huge mountain of images and theories.

First, here we find the most complete and most consistent exposition of an *atheistic doctrine of woman*: "religion" is treated on relatively few pages and in scattered marginal notes, with careless scorn and a clear gesture of indifference, which in itself is supposed to indicate the unspeakable irrelevance, quirkiness, and slightly comical silliness of the subject; only very rarely does

[18] Görres is referring to the phrase "blow of the fist" in de Beauvoir, *The Second Sex*, 423. "Experience of the fist" is our translation of Görres's "Erlebnis der Faust."

a flicker of the most poisonous hatred strike. But the whole book comes from the unwavering atheism of J.-P. Sartre.

We want to highlight just one aspect:

This fully developed, lavishly illustrated atheistic theory of woman betrays astonishingly clearly a basic trait of the satanic: boundless *hatred of Creation*.[19] It is actually quite clear: whoever hates the Creator, the "*Auctor*," must necessarily hate and deny, devalue and insult, what "is given," what is from him, *therefore* nature. The deeper we grasp the connection between Creator and creation, the more clearly this basic law of consistently anti-divine thinking reveals itself. Idolatry of the world is relatively harmless next to this; at least it still recognizes the merits of the Divine work, it admires the mirror image, even it prefers the mirror image to the archetype with conscious defiance. True anti-theism goes further: it hates everything that might be recognizable as a "trace," a shadow, a sign, a message of the One Who is hated from the outset.

From the ground up, our world is built and founded on two poles; every culture, every philosophy, every religion knows this. The tension of the binary goes much further than the merely human binary of man and woman, all the more so in what is strictly sexual; it not only pervades the organic world, it is reflected in the more comprehensive concepts and images of the pairs of reality, such as heaven and earth, day and night. Denying this binary aspect of Creation is the actual objective of this book—to deny and defame the concept of "other." Hence the truly satanic hatred of marriage *in and of itself*, not just of the various defective or degenerate forms of marriage. Hence the hatred of the "home," which is a small reflection of the world, a small self-contained cell of peaceful and fruitful unity in a binary. At the same time, what poets or religions have had to say and what is reflected in custom and tradition of the human experience in the home and the family is not unknown to the author; but it is shrugged off wholesale, as [the product of] a bourgeois-capitalist

[19] Görres expressed a similar sentiment in 1950 in chapter 1 of her book *The Church in the Flesh* (*Die leibhaftige Kirche*): "The Adversary is at work also, indeed precisely, in the realm of the visible. His grand intent is the alienation of the whole Creation from God, the misuse of it for the fight against the Most High. *No one hates 'nature' more than Satan*, because it is the work and reflection of God; and one of Satan's most cunning weapons is to repeatedly beguile man to believe that he must defend nature against God and save it, as it were. His, the Devil's, most essential work is 'throwing things into disorder,' as his name suggests, confusing and corrupting, perverting in every sense, seducing through appearances and deceit, through what is fake and alienated from itself. We are called to be extremely vigilant. We have something precious and irreplaceable to protect." Ida Friederike Görres, *The Church in the Flesh*, trans. Jennifer Sue Bryson (Providence, RI: Cluny Media, forthcoming).

ideology designed to obfuscate the most massive class interests, as mendacious male tirades designed to obscure female servitude, and the like.

It would be fruitful and interesting to examine the work in detail to see how its witty and poisonous hatred turns with unflinching accuracy against everything, affixes itself to everything in human existence that exhibits a "transparent character," a capacity to serve as a symbol for invisible reality.

In this sense, this strange and repulsive book, as it were an inverted mirror, is a testament to the elevated metaphysical importance of nature in general and of woman in particular. The human woman reveals herself as *the* symbol of the creature (like the way earth, water, and flower have always been understood as "feminine"), as the one who is a "subject" vis-à-vis God, related to Him, obedient, a receptive creaturehood: because that is what she is, she must disappear, she must be eradicated, her existence must be stamped as the embodiment of a lie. A "neutral" working animal with female genital organs would be harmless in this sense—useful, but metaphysically completely "mute."

At the same time, however, it must be said that this book contains a tremendous amount of important and interesting material—a large quantity of correct, sharp, lightning-bright observations from everyday life, a series of bold debunkings of the countless bourgeois lies and conventions about the lives of both sexes, genuinely and powerfully breaking through the sentimental masks and disguises of accumulated prejudice. The mosaic consists of countless "correct" and "verifiable" individual maneuvers, while the sham—because it is one—lies in the composition, structure, overlay, and lighting of this gigantic and imposing propaganda film.

It shows the need for similar material to be studied with equal boldness, critical perspective, and openness, but with an intellectual approach that is reasonable regarding and obedient to God, nature, and Truth, and for the results to be presented and discussed among Christians.