

## INFORMATION TO USERS

This material was produced from a microfilm copy of the original document. While the most advanced technological means to photograph and reproduce this document have been used, the quality is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help you understand markings or patterns which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting thru an image and duplicating adjacent pages to insure you complete continuity.
2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a large round black mark, it is an indication that the photographer suspected that the copy may have moved during exposure and thus cause a blurred image. You will find a good image of the page in the adjacent frame.
3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., was part of the material being photographed the photographer followed a definite method in "sectioning" the material. It is customary to begin photoing at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue photoing from left to right in equal sections with a small overlap. If necessary, sectioning is continued again — beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.
4. The majority of users indicate that the textual content is of greatest value, however, a somewhat higher quality reproduction could be made from "photographs" if essential to the understanding of the dissertation. Silver prints of "photographs" may be ordered at additional charge by writing the Order Department, giving the catalog number, title, author and specific pages you wish reproduced.
5. PLEASE NOTE: Some pages may have indistinct print. Filmed as received.

### University Microfilms International

300 North Zeeb Road  
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106 USA  
St. John's Road, Tyler's Green  
High Wycombe, Bucks, England HP10 8HR

77-9961

WELIKY, Deirdre Gail Berlin, 1948-  
THE STUDY OF INTERHUMAN RELATIONSHIPS  
IN THE WORK OF SIMONE DE BEAUVOIR.

City University of New York, Ph.D., 1977  
Literature, modern

**Xerox University Microfilms,** Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106

© COPYRIGHT BY

DEIRDRE GAIL BERLIN WELIKY

1976

PLEASE NOTE:

This is original copy. Some  
pages have very light print.  
Filmed as received.

UNIVERSITY MICROFILMS INTERNATIONAL

THE STUDY OF INTERHUMAN RELATIONSHIPS  
IN THE WORK OF SIMONE DE BEAUVOIR  
by  
DEIRDRE GAIL BERLIN WELIKY

A dissertation submitted to the Graduate  
Faculty in French in partial fulfillment of  
the requirements for the degree of Doctor of  
Philosophy, The City University of New York.

1976

This manuscript has been read and accepted for the Graduate Faculty in French in satisfaction of the disseration requirement for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

12/14/76  
date

Jacques J. Zepher  
Chairman of Examining Committee

XII/14/76  
date

Henri Peyre  
Executive Officer

Therese Louisa  
Henri Peyre  
Supervisory Committee

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am deeply indebted to my Dissertation Director, Professor Jacques Zéphir, and to my Dissertation Readers, Professor Yvette Louria and Professor Henri Peyre, for their valuable advice and continued encouragement which helped me in successfully completing this study.

CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS . . . . .	iv
INTRODUCTION . . . . .	1
Chapter	
I.    THE MEETING WITH OTHERS . . . . .	6
The existence of and need for the other . . . . .	7
Withdrawal from others . . . . .	14
Using weapons against the other . . . . .	25
Our situation: freedom and others . . . . .	41
II.   DIFFICULTIES OF INTERHUMAN RELATIONSHIPS . . . . .	63
The subject-object relationship . . . . .	63
Negative influences on the subject- object relationship: "chosification," masochism and sadism, jealousy . . . . .	91
Love and the subject-object relation- ship . . . . .	112
III.  HUMAN RESPONSIBILITY AND SOLIDARITY . . . . .	132
The interdependence of humanity . . . . .	132
Responsibility: bad faith and others . . . . .	143
Responsibility and action: consequen- ces, guilt, and sacrifice . . . . .	149
Solidarity and friendship . . . . .	163
IV.   SOCIAL ACTION AND POLITICAL COMMITMENT . . . . .	179
Action and limitations, the role and commitment of the writer and intellec- tual . . . . .	179
Renunciation of action and the myth of "les mains pures," rejection of the bourgeoisie . . . . .	207
Creation of a flexible moral ethic . . . . .	225
CONCLUSION . . . . .	253
SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	263

## INTRODUCTION

Why choose to do a study on a topic related to existentialism and then select Simone de Beauvoir and not Jean-Paul Sartre as the focal point of such a study? Although Sartre's philosophy and literature are always discussed in courses pertaining to the twentieth century, Simone de Beauvoir often receives no mention, or when she does, her works and stature are always considered in the shadow of Sartre's contributions in the same fields, and therefore relegated to a secondary status. Inasmuch as Beauvoir's subordinate position is never sufficiently justified in these courses and since the author has always intrigued us, it seemed logical to pursue this interest and to also attempt to discover whether or not her position of lesser status is justified.

Having decided to concentrate our efforts on Beauvoir as an author, it remains for us to determine the precise subject to be examined. One of the factors guiding the present choice is a desire to avoid those topics which have been studied previously as well as the desire to make an original contribution to the existing criticism of Beauvoir. We therefore feel justified in selecting as our topic the study of interhuman relationships, a choice which logically

lends itself to treatment from a moral or philosophical point of view rather than a literary point of view.

After choosing a topic which could encompass much material, it is necessary next to limit its eventual scope. The philosophical basis for a study of interhuman relationships (which is basically the problem of existing with others), is presented by Sartre in L'Être et le néant and briefly summarized in the well-known quotation from Huis Clos, "L'enfer, c'est les autres." Beauvoir has acknowledged that after much analysis and evaluation she has accepted Sartre's philosophy as her own. Our interest now lies in seeing how Beauvoir develops and applies this philosophy in both her fiction and non-fiction works. In her works, we discover that Beauvoir considers the relationship with others on both a small and a large scale: from the individual to the group consisting of many individuals.

Although Beauvoir's quantitative contribution to literature is not beyond the reach of a dedicated reader, for the purposes of the present study it seems practical to limit those works which will be considered in detail. While concentrating on Beauvoir's major works of fiction and philosophy as well as on her essays concerning various aspects of the human condition, we will touch only lightly upon her autobiography. Those works which we will not consider in this analysis include most of her recent fiction as well as her studies of the United States and China.

The problem of relationships with the other is a center of interest in three of Beauvoir's novels which are to be discussed in this study: L'Invitée, Le Sang des autres, and Tous les hommes sont mortels. Each one of these books considers a specific aspect of interhuman relationships and arrives at a conclusion for each aspect examined.

In L'Invitée, Beauvoir concentrates on examining the relationship between two individuals in conflict: Françoise and Xavière. The solution chosen in this particular conflict, the murder of Xavière by Françoise, and summarized in capsule form by the book's opening quotation from Hegel, "Chaque conscience poursuit la mort de l'autre," is obviously unsatisfactory since it does not solve the conflict. It would be unreasonable to use murder as a solution if, at some later date, Françoise were once again to find herself in conflict with another individual. Evidently, some less drastic means must be found to deal with disagreements between individuals.

The question examined by Le Sang des autres is that of responsibility and its implications. This work describes how Jean Blomart, an individual already responsible for himself, is obliged to deal with the consequences of being responsible for other individuals as well. The exaggerated conclusion of this study is revealed in the quotation from Dostoevsky which opens the book as follows: "Chacun est responsable de tout devant tous." Carried to its logical

end, this proposed solution would have the effect of making action almost impossible since an individual would find it difficult to act if he were responsible for all of the people who might be affected by his action.

In addition to considering the topic of death, Tous les hommes sont mortels also examines the structure of the interdependence of humanity. Desirous of using his immortality to help others, Fosca discovers that most often people wish to attain goals dear to themselves in their own manner. Time and again people refuse Fosca's offers to help them obtain what they yearn for but cannot easily accomplish by themselves. Discouraged by the number of refusals he has received, Fosca is finally forced to admit that: "On ne peut rien pour eux [les hommes] ni contre eux. On ne peut rien." Once again the reader is confronted with a solution to a problem concerning interhuman relationships which is unsatisfactory, due this time, to its pessimistic and defeatist overtones.

If these three solutions to the problems of living with others are all insufficient or disappointing, it remains for us to delve deeper into Beauvoir's work to discover whether in books such as Les Mandarins, Le Deuxième Sexe, and La Vieillesse she has been able to formulate a more acceptable attitude toward others. We realize that the problem of others is actually the problem of human co-existence. Using as a guideline our desire to discover a valid

attitude toward others, we propose in this study to consider how Beauvoir defines and solves the manifold problems of human co-existence.

## CHAPTER I

### THE MEETING WITH OTHERS

The idea of communication, vital to Simone de Beauvoir in both her literature and philosophy, is the subject to be examined in this chapter. The importance of communication starts with the individual.

The individual is examined by Beauvoir in Pyrrhus et Cinéas and is defined as a transcendent being who will find challenge and satisfaction only outside of his immediate being and his situation in time.<sup>1</sup> Since the individual is transcendent, he must constantly seek to surpass that which he has already attained. Rest and inaction (part of the paradise which an individual may claim to seek) represent the stasis that humanity must avoid to reach fulfillment. An environment of striving should be part of human existence.<sup>2</sup>

The idea of striving is necessarily attached to that of goal-realization. Yet the idea of goal is paradoxical since, once attained, each goal becomes the starting point of a new endeavor.<sup>3</sup>

One of the problems the individual encounters is that of limiting the scope of the action taken to reach a certain goal. An action needs to be unique in some ways in order for it to be meaningful to other individuals. Yet, a

person undertaking an enterprise cannot consider himself intimately related to all humanity.<sup>4</sup>

## 1

The acting individual meets with others and is obliged to decide what type of relationship to form. At the first meeting, one human being generally perceives another as a given part of the existing world: an object. Since the role of humanity is to transcend the given, this other person is seen as something to be surpassed or overcome. Two methods exist to achieve this end: the person can be transcended by working with him or by opposing him.<sup>5</sup>

This set of circumstances puts forth perhaps the most important paradox of existentialism: by choosing to help one cause or group, an individual or group of individuals is acting as opposition to another cause or group.<sup>6</sup>

It becomes evident that an individual needs someone to respond to his action in order for it to make an impression upon the world. Other people must either accept or reject a specific action in order for it to bring about change. The change resulting from a particular action is unpredictable and may evolve through the course of time as various individuals interpret the action according to their own thoughts and needs.<sup>7</sup>

The author of an act, his own role completed,

observes as his gesture is projected toward other human beings and the future. Other individuals will use the author's completed act as a basis for their own projects. Consequently, an individual undertaking a certain action must do so with a certain degree of doubt as to the final outcome.<sup>8</sup> (Nobel, in discovering dynamite, was looking to develop its creative rather than its destructive possibilities.)

One of the temptations to which an individual may fall prey, in order to have others appreciate his acts, is to try and devote himself to others. Usually the existence of too many conflicts of interest mitigates against the creation of an atmosphere of true devotion to other individuals. Theoretically, to devote oneself to another, an individual would have to make the other's goal his own. Yet, it is contradictory to suppose that one individual can define another's goal.<sup>9</sup>

It must also be acknowledged that one can occasionally obtain certain ends only through outside intervention. Furthermore, an individual can only help another if this latter person expects something and the former person is able to provide exactly what is desired.<sup>10</sup>

Even though a person states his desires to a helpful individual, he may not, for psychological or other reasons, be disclosing his true wishes. Conceivably, the helpful individual could actually counter the true desires

of a person by trying to fulfill his stated desires. The helper must decide if the person he wishes to help is telling the truth.<sup>11</sup>

In choosing to act for another's "good" one must also realize that in an individual's life there are many "goods" among which to choose and further, that these "goods" change with time.<sup>12</sup>

Satisfaction attainment by another is a justification given for trying to help. Often, help is given without the realization that the satisfaction attained will be only temporary and that one wish fulfilled will simply lead to a new wish. What the person wishing to help must accept is that he is only a tool in the eyes of the other who receives his aid and uses the benefits received as a starting point for other projects.<sup>13</sup>

In trying to help another, an individual acknowledges that the one he chooses to help is free within his situation. It becomes apparent that a person cannot act for or against another. At most, one's acts touch only the exterior of a person, well-exemplified, perhaps, by the concept of violence. The inner being of an individual cannot be reached by external means. His freedom remains untouched and it is up to the person to use his freedom to overcome limitations imposed upon him from without. It becomes evident that an individual can be neither totally fulfilled nor destroyed by another.<sup>14</sup>

Even though his actions are not that vital for others, they still are important for the acting individual as his actions for which he is responsible.<sup>15</sup> Thus, the other remains free, with the acting individual seen as "confondu pour lui avec la scandaleuse existence de tout ce qui n'est pas lui, je suis la facticité de sa situation."<sup>16</sup>

Just as it is acknowledged that one cannot act for or against another, it is also understood that only a person can always see himself as a subject. For all others, a particular individual is just "another person." However, in order "to be" in the existential sense, one must keep for oneself a sense of individuality and uniqueness.<sup>17</sup>

\* \* \*

A concept dependent upon freedom is that of need. The invention of the radio had to satisfy a need, created by individuals other than the inventor, even if this need arose following the invention itself. In order for individuals to create a need, they must be free to recognize and accept a particular product as "good." The opinion of others can therefore justify the inventor. "Seule la liberté d'autrui est capable de nécessiter mon être. . . . nous avons besoin d'autrui pour que notre existence devienne fondée et nécessaire."<sup>18</sup>

The products and acts coming from an individual are a means of communication with others. "Si je ne fais rien exister, il n'y a ni communication, ni justification."<sup>19</sup>

"Et mon être n'entre en communication avec autrui que par ces objets où il s'engage."<sup>20</sup>

An individual appreciates the praise of others since it seems to justify his being. Nevertheless it must be realized that since there are many who judge, the evaluations may not all coincide.<sup>21</sup> At times, in order to avoid an unpleasant opinion an individual may be tempted to destroy the value of an opinion by denying the opinion-giver his freedom and by treating him as an object.<sup>22</sup> In order to remain a human being, one must accept the unfavorable opinions of other free people. A risk must be assumed. An acceptable means of countering a negative judgment would be to attempt to find ways to convince those who are in opposition.<sup>23</sup>

There remains another aspect of the other to be considered. An individual does not want to be accepted by just anyone as he seeks to reach a goal, but contact with others is necessary to goal-realization. In other words, a person does not want to see his own project become useful to his enemies.<sup>24</sup>

Once more, it becomes necessary to stress the importance of the freedom of the other. This freedom is required so that one person can accept another person's action as valuable. However, the other must really be free to judge and accept an action. Freedom cannot be imposed upon an individual.<sup>25</sup>

To be useful to an individual seeking to transcend himself, another free person must be on a similar level. A starving person will be incapable of pursuing scientific data such as examining the solar system.<sup>26</sup>

Sometimes, in the course of attaining a goal, one resorts to violence. This is a very serious step since it involves denying people their freedom and in so doing reduces the number of people to be considered as peers, a source of future help.<sup>27</sup>

Unfortunately violence is necessary for humanity since humanity is often divided against itself. Fighting is necessary to achieve transcendence and to approach "l'être." However, the presence of violence will always add an element of failure to every success.<sup>28</sup>

Humanity must act in an atmosphere of uncertainty and risk which is the very nature of freedom. This freedom looks out upon an infinite future.<sup>29</sup>

Beauvoir examines another facet of the concept of freedom in Pour une morale de l'ambiguïté. She more clearly defines freedom as an abstract concept as well as describes how it relates to interhuman contact.

Et il n'est pas vrai que la reconnaissance de la liberté d'autrui limite ma propre liberté ; être libre, ce n'est pas avoir le pouvoir de faire n'importe quoi ; c'est pouvoir dépasser le donné vers un avenir ouvert ; l'existence d'autrui en tant que liberté définit ma situation et elle est même la condition de ma propre liberté. On m'opprime si l'on me jette en prison ; non si l'on m'empêche d'y jeter mon voisin.<sup>30</sup>

The notion that each action contains a certain element of failure is again examined by Beauvoir. To escape this, people often deny the importance of a sacrifice which has been made to attain a certain goal. "Ainsi on se trouve en présence de ce paradoxe qu'aucune action ne peut se faire pour l'homme sans se faire aussitôt contre des hommes."<sup>31</sup> The quandary faced by an existential being is that of choosing. A person must decide to act although the outcome of the particular endeavor is enmeshed in doubt. One must also evaluate whether the means to be adopted are in the spirit of the ends sought. ". . . l'action ne peut chercher à s'accomplir par des moyens qui détruiraient son sens même. Si bien que dans certaines situations il n'y aura d'autre issue pour l'homme que le refus."<sup>32</sup>

Beauvoir summarizes how one should act with regard to the other:

Ainsi nous pouvons poser un premier point : le bien d'un individu ou d'un groupe d'individus mérite d'être pris comme un but absolu de notre action; mais nous ne sommes pas autorisés à décider à priori de ce bien. A vrai dire, nous ne sommes pas autorisés d'abord à aucune conduite, et une des conséquences concrètes de la morale existentialiste, c'est le refus de toutes les justifications préalables qu'on pourrait tirer de la civilisation, de l'âge, de la culture; c'est le refus de tout principe d'autorité. Positivement, le précepte sera de traiter autrui (dans la mesure où il est seul singulier, ce qui est le moment que nous considérons à inédite.<sup>33</sup> comme une liberté à fin de sa liberté; en utilisant ce fil conducteur on devra, en chaque cas singulier, inventer dans le risque une solution inédite.<sup>33</sup>

Since for existentialists there is no separation between philosophy and literature, it is natural to proceed by examining the application of Beauvoir's philosophical theories in her literary works.

## 2

L'Invitée, Beauvoir's first novel, provides a simple setting to study the relationship of one person, Xavière, with two "others," Françoise and Pierre. The validity of some of the ideas concerning relationships with others is proven as Beauvoir depicts Xavière as someone seeking to alienate herself from the world.

Xavière accepts the invitation of Françoise and Pierre to escape her boring existence in Rouen and come live in Paris, with their financial backing. At first, things go well. However, soon Françoise begins to see Xavière as excluding her from her life. "Il y avait un genre d'intimité qu'on ne pouvait pas avoir avec Xavière; les menues occupations d'une journée, ça lui paraissait aussi indécent d'en parler que de ses fonctions organiques; et comme elle ne quittait guère sa chambre, c'était rare qu'elle eût quelque chose à raconter."<sup>34</sup> We thus see Xavière refusing to communicate any of the banal details of her daily life which form part of the basis of a friendship.

Increasingly, Françoise notices that Xavière criticizes her for not devoting enough time to her. Xavière

hates all others with whom Françoise has any contact and sees them as potential threats to herself.

Xavière is so removed from the real world that she refuses to take any action or exert herself in any way. While speaking of art to Elisabeth she goes as far as to say: " '---Ce que j'appelle précieux, moi, . . . , c'est ce qui vous tombe du ciel comme une manne.' Elle fit la moue. 'Si ça doit s'acheter, c'est de la marchandise comme le reste, ça ne m'intéresse pas.' "35

Following this meeting, Xavière judges Elisabeth and despises her so much as to deprive the latter of part of her humanity.

In spite of the fact that Françoise does not necessarily approve of Xavière's actions and opinions, Xavière's influence in both Françoise's and Pierre's life grows, much to the dismay of Françoise.

Pierre, too, comes to recognize Xavière's disturbing temperament. In the course of a conversation with Françoise, he mentions that he has told Xavière she is like "une petite perle noire."<sup>36</sup> When Françoise wants to know why the pearl is described as black, Pierre answers: " '---A cause de cette espèce de perversité qu'elle a. On dirait que c'est un besoin chez elle par moments de faire du mal, de se faire mal, et de se faire haïr.' "37

As the conversation continues Françoise states exactly why friendship with Xavière is so difficult. " 'Mais

c'est impossible d'avoir une amitié avec elle, . . . Elle est d'un égoïsme trop monstrueux; ce n'est pas même qu'elle se préfère aux autres gens, elle n'a absolument pas le sens de leur existence." "38

Xavière has criticized Elisabeth to her face, snubbed Gerbert (Françoise's friend) and caused him to be lied to by Françoise and Pierre. Yet, in spite of this anti-social behavior, Pierre can still sympathize with her and say " 'ça me touche cette incapacité où elle est d'avoir des rapports humains avec les gens.' "39

Xavière's egotism and indifference mean that her relationship with others will lack reciprocity. Her egotism will permit her to feel justified in asking others to consider her own importance while her indifference will mean that no effort will be made to show appreciation for help given by others and no help will be offered to them. Although Françoise tells Xavière that all people deserve a little indulgence, Xavière inquires: " 'A quoi ça sert d'essayer de comprendre des gens qui n'en valent pas la peine?' "40

It seems that the only joy Xavière knows is when something or somebody is sacrificed for her sake. That is the case when Pierre decides, without first asking Françoise's opinion, that they will not hear Lise's songs, an action which Françoise realizes is very impolite.<sup>41</sup>

Xavière's demands increase as does her perversity.

She becomes jealous if Françoise and Pierre want a few minutes to themselves. "--Elle est jalouse de tout, dit Pierre : d'Eloy, de Berger, du théâtre, de la politique; que nous pensions à la guerre, ça lui semble une infidélité de notre part, nous ne devrions nous soucier de rien d'autre qu'elle."<sup>42</sup>

Solitude and withdrawal are other important manifestations of Xavière's personality. Illustrative of this point is Xavière's room and the amount of time she spends there. Often she does not leave it for days at a time. Entry to this inner sanctum is often denied Françoise whose knock is greeted by Xavière's response that she will be ready soon and will meet Françoise in her room. (This secret nature of the room is also mentioned by Jaccard in her work on Beauvoir.<sup>43</sup>)

Upon seeing the room on one occasion Françoise describes it by saying that "depuis qu'elle avait vu apparaître au coeur de Xavière la jalousie et la haine, cette retraite lui faisait peur. Ce n'était pas seulement un sanctuaire où Xavière célébrait son propre culte : c'était une serre chaude où s'épanouissait une végétation luxuriante et vénéneuse, c'était un cachot d'halluciné dont l'atmosphère moite collait au corps."<sup>44</sup>

The room is tangible evidence of the fact that Xavière has decided to remain isolated from others and derive pleasure from herself. Still a more convincing

example of this decision is the episode of the self-inflicted cigarette burn. The masochistic gesture of burning herself is further indication of Xavière's own self-involvement and another warning for Françoise.

Derrière ce rictus maniaque, un danger menaçait, plus définitif que tous ceux qu'elle avait jamais imaginés. Quelque chose était là, qui s'étreignait soi-même avec avidité, qui existait pour soi-même avec certitude; on ne pouvait pas s'en approcher même en pensée, au moment où elle touchait au but, la pensée se dissolvait; ce n'était aucun objet saisissable, c'était un incessant jaillissement et une fuite incessante, transparente pour soi seule et à jamais impénétrable. On ne pourrait que tourner en rond tout autour dans une exclusion éternelle.<sup>45</sup>

The solitude and egotism which Xavière has chosen for herself have prevented her from communicating with others and establishing meaningful relations with them. Xavière's failure to initiate or accept any reciprocity with others has separated her from them. Her attitudes and actions so enrage Françoise, making Xavière an obstacle to Françoise's happiness, that Françoise feels the only way she can deal with the problem is by killing Xavière.

\* \* \*

Beauvoir examines another character who is alienated when she writes about Sade. Known for his description of and participation in sado-masochistic activities, Sade infers his separation from his society by asking the following question: "Pouvons-nous sans renier notre individualité satisfaire nos aspirations à l'universalité? ou est-ce

seulement par le sacrifice de nos différences que nous pouvons nous intégrer à la collectivité?"<sup>46</sup>

Most of Sade's "aspirations" and "différences" are related to eroticism. Sade sees sexual enjoyment as an egotistical experience. "Que désire-t-on quand on jouit? Que tout ce qui vous entoure ne s'occupe que de vous, ne pense qu'à vous, ne soigne que vous . . . il n'est point d'homme qui ne veuille être despote quand il b..."<sup>47</sup>

Sade finds the joys of eroticism so great that he subordinates his entire life to them.

Even in the realm of psychology, Sade has understood the advantage of giving pleasure to victims before torturing them so that "cela peut être une violence tyrannique; et le bourreau déguisé en amant s'enchanté de voir l'amoureuse crédule, pâmée de volupté et de reconnaissance, confondre la méchanceté avec la tendresse."<sup>48</sup>

One of the more important tenets of the cruelty resorted to by Sade provided that "elle [la cruauté] lui révélat comme conscience et liberté en même temps que comme chair des individus singuliers et sa propre existence. . ."<sup>49</sup>

In other words, the pleasure of cruelty depended upon its being administered in person, by Sade, to someone who knew exactly what was being done to him.

It is interesting to note that Sade saw the guillotine as destructive of his system of evil. The guillotine forces one to consider its victims as objects or things. For Sade, in order for eroticism to be possible,

the flesh must be esteemed. Treating people as things deprives the flesh of its necessary value. If the flesh is without value, no satisfaction can be derived from debasing it.

Although a member of the nobility, Sade finds himself rejected by his peers. Any alliance with the bourgeoisie is difficult since Sade is opposed to despotism. The common people, too far removed from his world, also remain inaccessible to Sade. This "égocentriste forcené" remains alone because "il n'a d'autre semblable que soi."<sup>50</sup>

This solitude experienced by Sade is finally broken, during coitus, usually an act associated with communication with another individual. Sade is at first unable to forget himself and remains so totally conscious of himself that he cannot acknowledge the presence of another. He uses the other to be less conscious of himself. In order to make himself into a flesh and blood being "il faut que dans la passivité de l'autre je reconnaisse ma propre condition, donc qu'une liberté l'habite et une conscience."<sup>51</sup>

Sade's enjoyment is increased in direct ratio to the discomfort and suffering of the victim. Another way to attain pleasure would be to let oneself be molested by others, thus recognizing one's own passivity. (It is for this reason that active and passive sodomy play a great role in Sade's writings.) Eroticism provides still further enjoyment to the extent that it is a criminal rebuff of society's standards.

Sade also likes to be seen by others as he participates in sex and uses this as a means of reconfirming himself as a subject.

"C'est à travers des représentations qu'il espère s'atteindre et pour se voir il faut être vu; tyrannisant une victime. Sade est objet pour ceux qui le regardent, inversement : en contemplant sur une chair qu'il violente les violences qu'il supporte, il se ressaisit comme sujet au sein de sa passivité; la confusion du pour-soi et du pour-autrui s'accomplit."<sup>52</sup>

Whether or not erotic involvement takes place with the presence of others "l'acte érotique idéal ne sera jamais réalisé."<sup>53</sup> The cruelty involved in Sade's erotic life includes two contradictory ideas which explain the impossibility of attaining "l'acte érotique idéal." "Les attraites les plus divins sont nuls quand la soumission et l'obéissance ne viennent pas nous les offrir, et : Il faut violenter l'objet de son désir; plus de plaisir dès qu'il se rend."<sup>54</sup> This contradiction means that all of Sade's erotic activities will have to be based on a compromise between these two ideas.

A final irony concerning Sade needs to be mentioned. Although separated from most of his society, Sade chooses to write to both extol and excuse what he has done. This man who would not communicate with others on a daily, personal level used literature to establish a link with humanity.

\* \* \*

While both Xavière and Sade have actively chosen the alienation and egotism separating them from the world, Elisabeth's (of L'Invitée) estrangement from the world is due to her fear of others. Pierre's sister, Elisabeth, claims to be an aspiring artist who has never shown her work in public and only rarely to Pierre and Françoise. In her private life, Elisabeth loves Claude but is too afraid to accept the reality that he loves Suzanne. Elisabeth has constructed her entire life on appearances which she does not truly feel herself, but which she hopes will satisfy others. This fabricated life is Elisabeth's bid to avoid criticism. "--Le pire chez Elisabeth, reprit Pierre, c'est que même ses sentiments sont faux; au fond, elle se fout de la peinture; elle est communiste et elle avoue qu'elle se fout du prolétariat."<sup>55</sup> Elisabeth lacks the courage to have convictions as well as the courage to express herself.

Françoise realizes that Elisabeth is upset because she sees her own being as not having any substance while seeing others, externally, as concrete and well-defined. Elisabeth has failed to realize that one always sees others through their own words and acts and this outside view makes them seem fulfilled to the observer.

Just as Elisabeth does not realize how to evaluate others, she also cannot really judge herself. The isolation she has imposed upon herself to avoid unfavorable criticism also prevents her from receiving any favorable criticism.

When Françoise, Pierre, and Xavière view her paintings, we hear Beauvoir reflecting on this subject. "Somme toute, pour être un vrai peintre, n'était-ce pas seulement le public qui lui manquait? Est-ce que dans la solitude tout artiste exigeant ne se prend pas pour un barbouilleur? Le vrai peintre, c'est celui dont l'oeuvre est vraie . . . une oeuvre devient vraie en se faisant connaître."<sup>56</sup>

One result of Elisabeth's avoidance of a meeting with the public is that she cannot be considered an artist. She has let herself become so firmly enmeshed in her world of appearances and constructed lies that she is no longer capable of a sincere action.

\* \* \*

Like Elisabeth, Marcel in Le Sang des autres also wishes to avoid the public, but for a different reason. Fear of criticism is no longer the key. Marcel is looking for an absolute art which will exist without a public. "--Il faudrait que je n'aie pas besoin du public, dit Marcel. Il empoigna à deux mains une chaise : Il faudrait que mes tableaux existent comme cette chaise : elle est solide, on peut s'asseoir dessus; quand nous serons partis, elle restera là, plantée sur ses quatre pieds."<sup>57</sup>

In his search for the absolute work of art, Marcel stops creating paintings which need to be looked at in order to exist. He wants to produce something that will exist purely on its own with no need of outside approbation.

Marcel's mania leads him to greatly upset his wife, Denise, by denying the importance of the contact she has with others as well as by trying to convince her of the beauty and intrinsic value of objects, which, to Marcel, represent fulfillment.

For Marcel, contrary to Elisabeth, the outcome is more optimistic. The outbreak of war makes him realize that it is people and not objects which count. It is his imprisonment in a war camp which brings about this change of opinion. After his return to France, Marcel asks if he can help Jean and his friends in their campaign against the Germans. Marcel abandons his cult of objects and returns to paintings which need the presence of others to exist. Marcel relates how the admiration of fellow prisoners of war for some frescoes he has painted convinces him that he must use art to communicate with others. "Je voulais que mon tableau existe tout seul, sans avoir besoin de personne. Pour de vrai, ce sont les autres qui le font exister. Mais c'est passionnant au contraire. Parce que c'est moi qui les force à le faire exister. . . . Comprends-tu? ils sont libres, et moi je viens et je viole leur liberté; je la viole en la laissant libre. C'est bien plus intéressant que de fabriquer des objets."<sup>58</sup>

Sade, Xavière, Elisabeth, and Marcel are people who all depict, in some way, a withdrawal and alienation from humanity. To the extent that they exclude themselves from

normal, daily life, they hurt others as well as themselves. However, alienation is not the only means by which one free individual can threaten another. The glance and the mirror are two devices from the arsenal of weapons actively used by individuals to threaten others.

## 3

In L'Invitée, Françoise finds that her existence is questioned by the looks Xavière directs at her. At first seen as a harmless person, almost the personal property of Françoise, Xavière demonstrates that she too is free and her evaluation grows in significance for Françoise. Xavière's first admiring glances soon take on an air of criticism, disgust, and threat.

Françoise already has intuitive knowledge of the phenomenon of "chosification" by another. Though she has yet to experience it, instinctively it terrifies her. "--On ne peut pas réaliser que les autres gens sont des consciences qui se sentent du dedans comme on se sent soi-même, dit Françoise. Quand on entrevoit ça, je trouve que c'est terrifiant : on a l'impression de ne plus être qu'une image dans la tête de quelqu'un d'autre."<sup>59</sup>

The key word in Françoise's description is "image." Since an individual usually views himself from within, he becomes convinced of his physical presence, his reality. However, this individual is also seen by others, but is, at first, perceived from the exterior and thus loses a certain

degree of reality. To the person observing him, an individual viewed only on the surface, can be looked upon as a picture.

Françoise watches as Xavière becomes increasingly adept at expressing herself by the looks she gives others. Françoise observes Xavière as "sur ses traits se peignait exactement la nuance de confiance ou de réserve qu'elle avait décidé d'exprimer."<sup>60</sup> It is interesting to note that Beauvoir often combines Xavière's remarks with a look that echoes the sentiment she expresses (see note #35 above). Françoise comes to call for Xavière who is not quite ready: " 'Trois minutes', dit Xavière; son regard s'était fixé sur le réveil; le reproche se dissimulait à peine sous le regret . . ." <sup>61</sup>

Eventually Françoise discovers that she has fallen under Xavière's spell and that "elle n'existait plus qu'à travers les sentiments capricieux que Xavière lui portait; cette sorcière s'était emparé [sic] de son image et lui faisait subir à son gré les pires envoûtements. . . . il lui fallait attendre un sourire de Xavière pour retrouver quelque approbation de soi-même."<sup>62</sup>

Françoise resents the fact that she feels "une vraie angoisse de dépendre à ce point dans son bonheur et jusque dans son être même de cette conscience étrangère et rebelle."<sup>63</sup>

More and more Françoise senses her reliance on Xavière's positive judgment of her in order to spend a

satisfactory day. "Elle avait passé la journée à épier chaque froncement de sourcil, chaque intonation de Xavière . . ."64

Françoise loses her individuality and begins to live her life through Xavière. "Elle s'était mise à voir avec les yeux de Xavière les endroits, les gens, les sourires de Pierre; elle en était venue à ne plus se connaître qu'à travers les sentiments que Xavière lui portait, et maintenant elle cherchait à se confondre avec elle : mais dans cet effort impossible, elle ne réussissait qu'à s'anéantir."65

Françoise discovers the true nature of her problem with Xavière. " 'C'est parce que j'ai découvert qu'elle avait une conscience comme la mienne; est-ce que ça t'est déjà arrivé de sentir comme du dedans la conscience d'autrui?' De nouveau elle était tremblante, les mots ne la délivraient pas. 'C'est inacceptable, tu sais.' "66

The solution to which Françoise will resort, the murder of Xavière, is drastic, but philosophically it is a solution which will free Françoise from the influence exerted by Xavière.

\* \* \*

If one free individual can threaten another by the use of the glance and the mirror, he can also threaten another simply by using his freedom. One of the central problems posed by existentialism is having "la force d'imposer sa propre volonté, sans empiéter sur la liberté de personne et tout en demeurant responsable de soi."67

Le Sang des autres is Jean Blomart's analysis of "La faute d'être un autre."<sup>68</sup> In the course of the novel he must decide whether or not to continue his anti-Nazi resistance and risk the lives of more people. Certain courses of action are rejected by Jean because he sees them as being destructive of individual freedom. For example, he has separated himself from the Communists because "--Les communistes regardent les hommes comme des pions sur un échiquier; il s'agit de gagner la partie; les pions par eux-mêmes n'ont pas d'importance."<sup>69</sup>

The guilt felt by Jean following the inadvertent death of Marcel's brother, Jacques, is the immediate reason for his having left the Communist party. Still, wishing to participate in a common life with the workers, Jean sees active union membership as his solution. Union activity appeals to Jean because he sees it as an action that does not let him infringe upon the freedom of others. "Ce travail-là [la vie syndicale] me semblait licite parce qu'il n'avait rien d'un travail politique; il était à une mesure humaine. Je n'avais pas à choisir pour autrui; je ne décidais rien; chaque membre du syndicat reconnaissait sa propre volonté dans la volonté collective; je n'exerçais aucune action sur le groupe auquel j'appartenais; je me bornais à être l'instrument à travers lequel il réalisait son existence . . . Par moi il n'arrivait rien dans ces vies d'inattendu ni d'arbitraire, rien qui ne jaillit d'elles-mêmes."<sup>70</sup>

Jean, like others of Beauvoir's heroes (Jean-Pierre in Les Bouches inutiles, for example) seeks a means of acting so that he will not have "les mains sales" as indicated by the title of one of Sartre's works. Jean does not yet realize that "Prétendre ne pas se compromettre dans l'absurdité universelle, c'était un comble d'absurdité . . ."71

Just as Jean's use of his freedom inadvertently causes the death of Jacques, so it will eventually lead to Hélène's death too. By doing what he has felt to be right both for himself and others, Jean's freedom will have permitted him to bring about the death of other free people. Jean gradually accepts the fact that one's very existence can be an impediment to the existence of others. "Comme si nous n'avions pas occupé chacun une place sur terre; comme si chacun n'avait pas été pour autrui cet obstacle; chacun soi seulement pour soi, existant à côté des autres à jamais séparé d'eux : un autre."72

For Jean, the ideal would be to live "une vie sans compromis, sans privilège, qui ne devait rien à personne, et qui ne pouvait pour personne être une source de malheur."73 He will use his freedom, but only if it does not interfere with the freedom of others.

Jean's refusal to become emotionally involved with Hélène is based on this doctrine of non-involvement. Since he remembers so vividly the gesture which led to Jacques' death, he seeks to avoid other gestures which might have

unforeseen consequences. "Un geste, et quelque chose de neuf apparaît dans le monde, quelque chose que j'ai créé et qui se développe hors de moi, sans moi, entraînant après soi d'imprévisibles avalanches."<sup>74</sup>

However, Jean's plan of non-involvement backfires. Héléne is so distraught by Jean's refusal to be with her that after she gets drunk, she offers herself to a man, and finds herself pregnant following the encounter. Jean realizes it is he who caused her pregnancy and necessitated the abortion. "Je n'avais pas voulu entrer dans sa vie, j'avais fui, et ma fuite avait bouleversé sa vie. Je refusais d'agir sur son destin et j'avais disposé d'elle aussi brutalement que par un viol. Tu souffrais à cause de moi, parce que j'existais."<sup>75</sup>

Following the abortion, Héléne, while asking Jean whether he will see her again, implies that in his actions toward her he has countered his own principles. "Vous m'avez répété si souvent que vous respectiez tant la liberté des gens. Et vous décidez à ma place, vous me traitez comme une chose."<sup>76</sup>

In a discussion with Marcel, Jean realizes that the problem of the freedom of others is complex simply because there is a subject-object relationship. "--Les gens sont libres, dis-je, mais seulement chacun pour soi : nous ne pouvons pas toucher leur liberté, ni la prévoir, ni l'exiger. C'est bien ça qui m'est si pénible; ce qui fait la valeur

d'un homme ça n'existe que pour lui, pas pour moi ; moi, je n'atteins que ses dehors; et je ne suis rien d'autre pour lui qu'un dehors, un donné absurde; un donné que je ne choisis même pas d'être . . ."77

Furthermore, Jean has idealized the life of others and finds himself in conflict with this ideal. "Je souhaitais que toute vie humaine fût une pure liberté transparente ; et je me rencontrais dans la vie des autres comme une barrière opaque . . ."78

Hélène asks Jean to speak with Madeleine and end the relationship between them. But confronted with Madeleine, Jean finds he cannot speak. When he is with Hélène again he regrets the fact that he has not spoken with Madeleine. Yet, he cannot choose to act since any action he takes will mean sorrow for either Hélène or Madeleine. The consequences of his being present render Jean almost powerless to act. "Partout j'apercevais les marques inquiétantes de ma présence. Ou peut-être c'était un sort qui m'avait été jeté ; chacun de mes gestes comme chacun de mes refus entraînait derrière lui un danger mortel. Je croyais simplement embrasser Hélène; et je trahissais Paul, je blessais Madeleine."79

When Madeleine asks Jean to help her cross the Spanish frontier, he hesitates saying he would feel responsible if any harm came to her. The very fact that he exists means that he will affect the lives of others.

Even his own death, of which Jean thinks, would not be a viable solution to the problem of his intrusion upon the lives of others since his death would also entail unknown consequences. "Je serai mort. Ils resteront enchaînés à ma mort et ce creux brusquement apparu sur la terre fera vibrer et craquer mille fibres imprévues. . . . Je serai encore responsable de tous ces actes que mon absence aura rendus possibles."<sup>80</sup>

In attempting to decide whether or not he should order further actions against the Nazis, Jean realizes that: "J'existe, hors de moi et partout dans le monde; il n'est pas un pouce de ma route qui n'empiète sur la route d'un autre; il n'y a aucune manière d'être qui puisse m'empêcher de me déborder moi-même à chaque instant. Cette vie que je tisse avec ma propre substance, elle offre aux autres hommes mille faces inconnues, elle traverse impétueusement leur destin."<sup>81</sup>

Blumenfeld, a member of Jean's group, attempts to persuade him that they cannot stand idly by while others suffer and die. Yet Jean visualizes the problem from a different angle.

Derrière les Pyrénées, les travailleurs d'Espagne tombaient sous les balles fascistes, mais pouvais-je racheter leur sang au prix des vies françaises, au prix d'une seule vie qui ne fût pas la mienne? Les Juifs crevaient comme des mouches dans des camps de concentration, mais avais-je le droit d'échanger leurs cadavres contre les corps innocents des paysans de France? Je pouvais payer avec mon corps, avec mon sang; mais les autres hommes n'étaient pas une monnaie à mon

usage; quelle pensée souveraine se permettrait de les comparer, de les compter, de prétendre connaître leur juste mesure?<sup>82</sup>

For Jean, to make a decision involving the lives of others seems arbitrary, unfair, and distasteful on a personal level. It is repugnant for Jean to think that he may be responsible for the death of another individual. Jean wants to be free and use his freedom but not to "devenir complice de l'absurdité scandaleuse . . ."<sup>83</sup> To other members of his group who object that "--Le sang des autres et le nôtre, c'est le même . . .",<sup>84</sup> Jean replies "Si vous faites si bon marché de la vie des hommes, quel sens ça a-t-il de lutter pour leur bonheur et leur dignité?"<sup>85</sup>

Ironically, Jean is granted a brief reprieve from responsibility when he becomes a soldier. It is his function to follow orders. Thus when he does kill enemy soldiers, he feels no personal agony of responsibility.

"C'est moi", pensa-t-il . . . avec un fusil mitrailleur entre les mains; et il eut envie de rire; là-bas, au milieu du champ labouré, des hommes tombaient sous les balles et son coeur était léger. 'C'est moi qui les tue.' Même cela c'était permis. Parce qu'il savait ce qu'il voulait. Il n'était qu'un soldat et il riait parce qu'il ne pouvait plus rien faire de mal.<sup>86</sup>

An impossible desire to remain pure had been the guiding light of Jean's life, to this point. The wish to avoid war has only served to make the need for war greater and its eventual outbreak more tragic. Because of his unwillingness to become involved before, many more people will die and weigh upon Jean's conscience.

"Nous n'avons pas osé tuer, nous n'avons pas voulu mourir, et cette vermine verte nous dévore vivants. . . . sur ce sol qui n'est déjà plus le nôtre un immense réseau de fer s'est abattu . . . A cause de moi. Chacun est responsable de tout. . . . Maintenant sa vie était derrière lui, sa vie perdue. . . . Parce que j'ai voulu me garder pur alors qu'elle était installée en moi, mêlée à ma chair, à mon souffle, la pourriture originelle."<sup>87</sup>

When Jean decides to form a resistance group with fellow union members, his attitude has changed. Now he says, "Nous ne devons nous soucier que du but à atteindre et faire tout ce qu'il faut pour l'atteindre."<sup>88</sup> When Leclerc then wants to know if Jean feels that all means of achieving his ends are good, Jean answers: "--Au contraire. Tous les moyens sont mauvais . . ."<sup>89</sup> Jean now knows that "Il devait agir sans garantie."<sup>90</sup> and take responsibility for the deaths that would certainly be one of the outcomes of the planned action.

It remains for Jean to think out his position on one other aspect of his resolution to act. As his friend Berthier asks: " 'Comment être sûr que nous ne luttons pas pour le capitalisme bourgeois, pour l'impérialisme anglo-saxon, pour le triomphe des forces réactionnaires?' "<sup>91</sup> Jean's answer is two-fold. Aloud, he says: " 'Tout vaut mieux que le fascisme.' "<sup>92</sup> while to himself he thinks "au moins, on peut savoir ce qu'on veut; il faut agir pour ce qu'on veut."<sup>93</sup>

When Marcel tells Jean he would like to help against the Germans, he agrees to rent a workshop where the resistance group will store its weapons and in so doing gives Jean an important insight into interhuman relationships. Jean wants to verify that Marcel's offer of help is not just in the nature of a favor offered by one friend to another.

--Tu es sûr que ce n'est pas pour me [Jean] rendre service que tu acceptes?

--Qu'est-ce que ça peut te faire? dit Marcel. Il rit : Tu ne dois considérer que l'intérêt de ta cause.

--Non, dis-je. . . . "Je ne voudrais pas me servir de toi comme d'un moyen. . . ."

--Tu es toujours aussi présomptueux. Crois-tu pouvoir me traiter comme un moyen? Je fais ce qui me plaît.<sup>94</sup>

Marcel has shown Jean the other side of the coin. Although it is perhaps most frequent to find the will of individuals in opposition, at times (as is the case with Marcel and Jean), they do coincide.

Finally, Hélène, who has been an observer all her life, comes to Jean and asks to help in his group. Jean agrees that Hélène will help by driving a car. She, too, insists on the fact that she has acted only because she wanted to and that it is not Jean's fault that she is to die. Hélène tries to convince Jean that: "Tu étais tout juste une pierre. Des pierres, il en faut pour faire des routes, sans ça comment pourrait-on se choisir un chemin?"<sup>95</sup>

Following Hélène's death, Jean is able to accept the fact that he did not force her to undertake the mission which led to her death. Furthermore, he accepts the fact

that he will be responsible for the deaths of innocent people whom the Germans plan to kill in retribution for the action of Jean's group. In spite of this, Jean is able to recommend that his group continue their actions against the Germans and he will have "le courage d'accepter à jamais le risque et l'angoisse, de supporter mes crimes et le remords qui me déchirera sans fin."<sup>96</sup>

The question of free consciences in conflict is treated from a slightly different viewpoint in Beauvoir's only play, Les Bouches inutiles. This time, the story is removed several hundred years in the past. A besieged village is assured of military aid from allies the following spring. The only problem is that the food supplies have been greatly depleted and the population will die of starvation before help can arrive.

Jean-Pierre, a man from the village, has been offered the responsibility of overseeing the distribution of the remaining food. Not wishing to inflict harm on others by denying them adequate nourishment, Jean-Pierre refuses to accept the post. His sentiments resemble closely those already cited in Le Sang des autres. Jean-Pierre asks: "Comment mesurer la souffrance et la joie? Peut-on comparer le poids d'une larme au poids d'une goutte de sang? Je souhaite que demain les hommes de Vaucelles soient libres et prospères. Mais ces enfants qui sont morts aujourd'hui, nul ne leur rendra jamais la vie. Je garderai mes mains pures."<sup>97</sup>

Jean-Pierre refutes Louis' (the village's leader) argument to "sacrifier quelques vies pour que désormais la vie ait un sens."<sup>98</sup> by saying that "Je ne veux pas payer avec le sang les larmes et la sueur des autres."<sup>99</sup>

Jean-Pierre, who like Jean Blomart finds that his very existence makes him feel criminal and seeks to erase himself from the world, also discovers that his refusal to accept responsibility can have disastrous consequences.

Catherine, Louis' wife, responsible for Jean-Pierre's upbringing, tries to have him change his mind and accept the food distribution post. Once again Jean-Pierre begs off, basing his refusal on the unpredictable consequences of people's actions and his unwillingness to impose his own will on other people. "Il y a tant de menaces cachées dans chacun de nos gestes, dans chacune de nos paroles; nos actes vont éclater loin de nous sous de figures inconnues; jamais je n'aurai l'audace de jeter en travers d'une vie étrangère le poids de ma volonté."<sup>100</sup>

Catherine retorts that Jean-Pierre, who thinks himself free, cannot in fact be free since he is neither "capable ni d'agir ni d'aimer."<sup>101</sup> Jean-Pierre's fear of consequences encloses him in a limited and pre-defined world from which constructive and innovative movement is excluded.

It is Catherine who is among the first to learn the result of Jean-Pierre's inaction. The village council has voted to save the villagers by ridding itself of all the

"bouches inutiles" : "les infirmes, les vieillards, les enfants, les femmes."<sup>102</sup> All of those mentioned will be chased out of the village to face certain death from starvation, the elements, or the enemy soldiers.

This decision has a particularly profound impact on Catherine since it will forever separate her from her husband Louis (with whom she has shared most of her life) simply by making a common future an impossibility. In addition, Catherine's death will be imposed on her by the council decision. It will not be a gesture of faith in the village freely chosen by her. Thus, Jean-Pierre's inaction has destroyed the freedom of independent action of Catherine and all the other "bouches inutiles." The village council has determined that Vaucelles must be saved to reach the future. To realize this goal, the men of Vaucelles decide that they, the essential substance of the village, must live, while all the non-essentials can be sacrificed.

Jean-Pierre, horrified by the council decision, returns to speak to Catherine. [Jean-Pierre] "Pouvais-je prévoir que mon silence ferait de moi un assassin?" [Catherine] "Un assassin, un bourreau. Du moment que tu te taisais, tu acceptais n'importe quel destin."<sup>103</sup>

Catherine has made the very valid point that while taking concrete action will at least give an individual a hold on a situation and the possibility of bringing about the desired change, taking no action at all means having no

control at all. (This is a lesson that others of Beauvoir's heroes must also learn. i.e. Françoise in L'Invitée and Jean in Le Sang des autres.)

At a council meeting, Jean-Pierre, trying to compensate for the results of his previous inaction, states to the council members that he will not cooperate with them in the killing of the innocent "bouches inutiles" of Vaucelles. Still later, realizing that it is important that all the citizens of Vaucelles act together, Jean-Pierre tells Clarice (Louis' and Catherine's daughter) that he will attempt to persuade the men of Vaucelles to venture one final assault on the enemy.

Like Jean Blomart, who hesitated to declare his love for Héléne but finally did so, Jean-Pierre declares his love for Clarice. This declaration is another manifestation of Jean-Pierre's changed attitude and his new desire to become involved in life. [Jean-Pierre] "Je n'osais pas t'aimer parce que je n'osais pas vivre. Cette terre me semblait impure et je ne voulais pas m'y salir. Quel orgueil stupide."<sup>104</sup>

Jean-Pierre's declaration of love is a political as well as an emotional commitment. [Clarice] "Et comment s'aime-t'on sur terre? [Jean-Pierre] "On lutte ensemble."<sup>105</sup>

Faced with the task of trying to convince the men of Vaucelles not to kill the women and children and to make another effort against the enemy army, Jean-Pierre asks the

men why they are really fighting. Jean-Pierre asks:

"Réveillez-vous. N'est-ce pas pour vos femmes et vos enfants que vous luttez?"<sup>106</sup> He hopes to make the men aware of the irony of the situation. What is the logic of saving Vaucelles for its inhabitants if it is necessary to kill more than half the inhabitants to attain the desired goal?

This irony is developed further in a conversation between Catherine and Louis. Where previously their life and love were based upon action decided upon jointly, now Catherine's individual freedom and humanity have been ignored as a result of the council decision. Catherine, no longer Louis' equal, has been treated like an object, not a person. [Catherine] "Tu me parlais, je répondais, et j'étais devant toi une femme vivante et libre. Et moi, je te parlais, et tu répondais librement; jamais l'un de nous n'accomplissait un acte où l'autre ne reconnût sa propre volonté. Et maintenant, tu as disposé de moi comme on dispose d'une pierre; et tu n'es plus que cette force aveugle qui me broie."<sup>107</sup>

Louis subsequently realizes that the efforts to save Vaucelles have been misdirected. "Nous voulions la [Vaucelles] sauver et il me semble que nous avons tué son âme."<sup>108</sup> The people of Vaucelles were concentrating on saving a thing (the city of Vaucelles) and not other people (the soul of Vaucelles) and therefore, they have worked against their own goal.

Convinced of his error, Louis returns to the council to try and persuade the members that killing the "bouches inutiles" is wrong. Jean-Pierre is given an opportunity to address the council. "Vous aviez décidé : les vieillards, les infirmes sont des bouches inutiles; pourquoi un tyran ne jugerait-il pas vos libertés inutiles et vos vies importunes? Si un seul homme peut-être regardé comme un déchet, cent mille hommes ensemble ne sont qu'un tas d'ordures."<sup>109</sup>

Won over by the arguments of Louis and Jean-Pierre, the council changes its mind. No inhabitants of Vaucelles will intentionally be killed. Instead, the citizens of Vaucelles will risk death together to save their freedom and will attempt one final attack on the enemy. Their action will not only have been freely chosen but will impose no cruel dicta on the "bouches inutiles" of Vaucelles.

In contrast with Jean Blomart in Le Sang des autres and Jean-Pierre in Les Bouches inutiles would be Xavière of L'Invitée and Sade. The two latter individuals both seek to impose their will on others: Xavière on Françoise and Pierre; Sade on his erotic victims and co-participants. However, both of these people reach their goals only by direct infringement upon the freedom of other people.

## 4

To continue our discussion of freedom, we must now consider another concept of existentialism, that of

situation. Each individual exists in his own particular situation. However, while a particular situation forms a basis for an individual, the individual is not responsible for the totality of his situation. It is to a great extent founded by others. This implies an interdependence: an individual in a situation is free only if the other individuals in their situations are free. Greater freedom can be achieved as the situation of each individual is improved. As previously mentioned, a starving person is in a situation that limits his freedom. Therefore he will have no interest in examining the solar system. (See note #26 above) Furthermore, freedom is a concept which implies some sort of communication since freedom can only be experienced in the context of some interpersonal contact, either positive or negative.

The situation of Sade and others around him is perhaps one of the most unique examined by Beauvoir. Sade, a well-educated nobleman, finds himself at odds with society's norms in the gratification of his erotic drives. A conflict arises, with freedom a key issue, as Sade attempts to fulfill his desires, with the help of others. Sade requires almost total devotion (if that term can be used in this sense) of his sexual partners for his fullest enjoyment. He links his contentment with a sense of domination of his partner/victim. "Que désire-t-on quand on jouit? Que tout ce qui vous entoure ne s'occupe que de vous, ne pense qu'à

vous, ne soigne que vous . . . il n'est point d'homme qui ne veuille être despote quand il b..."<sup>110</sup>

Sade used cruelty, but not for its own sake "ce qu'il demandait essentiellement à la cruauté c'est qu'elle lui révélât comme conscience et liberté en même temps que comme chair des individus singuliers et sa propre existence . . ." <sup>111</sup> He uses cruelty to limit but not destroy his own as well as his victim's freedom. Sade is able to recognize his own freedom by the resistance offered by his victims. His freedom simultaneously denies and affirms the freedom of his partner/victims.

Sade's cruelty limits his freedom in still another manner. His ideal is to have attractive partner/victims whom he can mistreat. Yet Sade finds "Les attrait le plus divins sont nuls quand la soumission et l'obéissance ne viennent pas nous les offrir, et : Il faut violenter l'objet de son désir; plus de plaisir dès qu'il se rend."<sup>112</sup> This paradox would seem to demonstrate the fact that consenting to the slavery of others is a means of limiting the fulfillment of our own freedom.

\* \* \*

The trio of Françoise, Pierre, and Xavière in L'Invitée is still another example of the interdependence of situation and freedom. Compared to Xavière, both Françoise and Pierre are in a privileged situation. Both have successful careers, self-confidence, and a good relationship

with others. On the other hand, Xavière has no career nor much experience with other individuals. Their life in Paris which Françoise and Pierre accept so easily is, to begin with, an impossible dream for Xavière.

In a show of good will, Françoise and Pierre volunteer to help Xavière change her situation by enabling her to remain in Paris with them and profit from the richer life that will become available. However, at least for Françoise, the gesture is not without an ulterior motive. Having her in Paris will give Françoise a firmer grip on Xavière, who, like others, Françoise feels that she possesses. "elle aussi, elle était touchée par tout ce clinquant facile, mais ce qui l'enchantait surtout, c'était d'avoir annexé à sa vie cette petite existence triste; car à présent, comme Gerbert, comme Inès, comme Canzetti, Xavière lui appartenait . . ." <sup>113</sup>

But Françoise is in for a disappointment. At first an ardent admirer of Françoise, Xavière soon begins to show a will of her own. The perhaps once pliant and compliant Xavière begins to take on more of the attributes of an obstacle barring the way to Françoise's happiness. Xavière, the adolescent, develops into a woman and takes advantage of her newly expanded situation to exercise her freedom. As Xavière's freedom increases, Françoise sees her own freedom diminish. Introduced to Pierre, Xavière asserts herself and assumes a dominant and domineering role with the group.

From believing Xavière's existence to be dependent upon her own, Françoise has had to conclude that Xavière does exist independently. (Françoise's former attitude would be conducive to the denial of Xavière's freedom while her latter attitude would lead to the acceptance of Xavière's freedom.) Once again, it is interesting to note that Xavière's freedom becomes apparent to Françoise essentially from contact involving conflict.

This conflict exists not only between Françoise and Xavière but also within the trio. Xavière's influence on Pierre becomes so great that she obliges the trio to miss certain social engagements and events in order to slight their friends (such as the incident with Gerbert). Even when she is not with them Xavière is always the subject of conversation. "Ils sortirent du restaurant; il n'avait encore été question que de Xavière; tous les moments qu'on ne passait pas avec elle, on les passait à parler d'elle, ça devenait une obsession . . ."114

Though it is primarily Françoise who finds Xavière's presence a burden, Pierre also senses the infringement upon their lives. The jealousy manifested by Xavière is one way in which she seeks to tighten her grip on the trio. "--Elle est jalouse de tout, dit Pierre : d'Eloy, de Berger, du théâtre, de la politique; que nous pensions à la guerre, ça lui semble une infidélité de notre part, nous ne devrions nous soucier de rien d'autre qu'elle."115

Xavière abuses her situation and her freedom by her lack of concern for the people with whom she associates, even Françoise and Pierre. As Françoise describes her, Xavière is not a person to cherish the freedom of others as much as she cherishes herself. "Belle, solitaire, insouciante. Elle vivait pour son propre compte, avec la douceur ou la cruauté que lui dictait chaque instant . . ." <sup>116</sup>

Later she reaffirms her exclusive attitude toward the trio by expressing great pleasure at the thought that there be " 'Rien que nous trois!' " <sup>117</sup> in the world.

One of the concepts necessary for successful interpersonal relationships is that of reciprocity: a sharing between individuals as well as a mutual acknowledgment of individual importance. This understanding which exists between Françoise and Pierre is not shared by Xavière and means that they cannot interact with her as her equal.

--Et puis entre nous, il y a réciprocité, dit Pierre.

--Comment veux-tu dire?

--Dans le moment où tu me reconnais une conscience, tu sais que je t'en reconnais une aussi. . . .

--Peut-être", dit Françoise . . . En somme, c'est ça l'amitié : chacun renonce à sa propre prépondérance. Mais si l'un des deux refuse d'y renoncer?

--En ce cas-là, l'amitié est impossible, dit Pierre. . . .

Xavière ne se renonçait jamais; si haut qu'elle vous situât, même lorsqu'elle vous chérissait, on restait un objet pour elle. <sup>118</sup>

Thus, for Xavière freedom is a one-sided affair with others doing the giving and herself the receiving. She manifests an almost total lack of respect for the human

being, whether this is shown in her attitude toward Elisabeth, Gerbert, or friends of Françoise and Pierre who "monopolize" their time. Pierre seeks to control Xavière's disrespect of the individual because [regarding his rapport with Françoise] " 'elle [Xavière] ne me demandait rien de moins que de te sacrifier.' "119 notes Pierre.

In L'Invitée the disequilibrium of situation and freedom leads to Xavière's murder. Le Sang des autres examines the question of freedom and situation from another point of view.

\* \* \*

Jean Blomart is the son of a well-to-do bourgeois, owner of a printing shop. As such, he is automatically offered an advantageous position in the shop because of his father. Ill at ease, because he feels he has arbitrarily been given something he has not earned but has received simply as a result of an accident of birth, Jean resolves to quit his higher-level job and start at the bottom of the ladder. He would like to attempt to live with the same advantages and disadvantages as the workers in his father's shop. However, as Marcel points out, "--Il y aura toujours un abîme entre un ouvrier et toi : tu chosis librement une condition qu'il subit."120

There are other factors, beside the element of choice, which differentiate Jean's situation as a worker from those workers who were born into the working class. Jean

has derived all the benefits of his bourgeois past. Marcel reminds Jean of his advantages. You have "ta culture, tes amitiés, ta santé de jeune bourgeois bien nourri."<sup>121</sup> comments Marcel. (This is without mention of something as evident as his bourgeois clothing.) So even though Jean will henceforth live the life of a worker, he will still have advantages over those workers who were poorly educated, undernourished, ill-clothed, and in poor health. In other words, the advantages derived by Jean from his privileged situation have given him greater freedom in his life to this point than to his counterpart, the worker.

In addition to changing his social situation, Jean also changes his political situation by joining the Communist party (which he later quits following Jacques' death since he is opposed to the low esteem the party gives to individual life). This commitment enables Jean to feel greater solidarity with the workers and be encouraged to act. Unfortunately, Jean's first attempt at serious action causes the death of Marcel's brother, Jacques, and consequently places Jean in a different situation by changing his outlook on action. Jean considers himself responsible for Jacques' death and imposes upon himself a policy of non-involvement. Described differently, Jean refuses to use his freedom to act.

Jean's freedom temporarily remains unused as he becomes involved with the union, where he has neither the

authority nor the occasion to make decisions influencing the lives of others. This inaction is also carried over into Jean's emotional life, especially with his relationship with H  l  ne. However, Jean is eventually forced to make a statement to H  l  ne concerning their rapport. In choosing to say that he does not love her and does not wish to see her, he sets in motion the reaction on H  l  ne's part which will lead to an undesired pregnancy. In his meeting with H  l  ne he will have used his freedom not to get involved. Later as Jean explains to his mother why he has not married H  l  ne, he sees how even by leaving H  l  ne free to decide her future he creates a situation for her. " 'C'est    vous de choisir.' Mais quel choix lui avait   t   r  serv  ? Pouvait-elle choisir que je l'aime? que je n'existe pas? qu'elle ne m'ait pas rencontr  ? La laisser libre, c'  tait encore d  cider pour elle; rester inerte, docile devant sa volont  , c'  tait encore cr  er de ma seule autorit   une situation qu'elle ne pouvait que subir."<sup>122</sup>

In both his political and emotional life, Jean tries to refuse to use his freedom but finds that his policy of non-involvement has as many unknown consequences as would a policy of direct action. Jean's point of view finally changes as he realizes that he must take advantage of his situation to act freely because he has a responsibility to himself and others. He and his friends can be free only if other individuals are not the victims of Nazi tyranny.

\* \* \*

The interdependence of freedom and situation is also treated in Les Bouches inutiles. The besieged, but free men of Vaucelles, decide to maintain their freedom in the face of famine by forcing "les bouches inutiles" of the village outside the city walls to face death from cold, starvation, or enemy soldiers. To understand the irony of this gesture we must know that these same men have just won their freedom by overthrowing the tyrant who was ruling their village. The action of the town council is of double impact to "les bouches inutiles" since it deprives them of the freedom they have just won and it does so at the hands of their supposed protectors and benefactors.

The fact that this action has been decided upon is perhaps the main responsibility of Jean-Pierre who was unwilling to accept the post to distribute the remaining food among the citizens of Vaucelles. By refusing to use his own freedom, Jean-Pierre has seen others lose their freedom.

The change in the relationship between husband and wife, Louis and Catherine, well exemplifies what happens when one of two formerly equal individuals is, in effect, enslaved by the will of the other. Together and on an equal footing these two people had built a life and family. Decisions had been made freely and not imposed by one individual upon the other. By condemning Catherine to death, Louis has destroyed their bond of equality and under-

standing. Catherine says: "Tu me parlais, je répondais, et j'étais devant toi une femme vivante et libre. Et moi, je te parlais, et tu répondais librement; jamais l'un de nous n'accomplissait un acte où l'autre ne reconnût sa propre volonté. Et maintenant, tu as disposé de moi comme on dispose d'une pierre; et tu n'es plus que cette force aveugle qui me broie."<sup>123</sup>

Louis and Jean-Pierre, spurred on by the efforts of Catherine and Clarice, prevail upon the council not to deprive "les bouches inutiles" of their freedom and dignity but to join together in a last, all-out effort against the enemy.

\* \* \*

We must examine one other case, unique in the work of Simone de Beauvoir, before concluding our analysis of situation and freedom. The book to be considered is Tous les hommes sont mortels, and the case is unique since the hero, Fosca, has drunk a potion making him immortal. This drastic change in situation greatly modifies the notion of freedom for Fosca and those surrounding him. Since he is immortal, Fosca cannot risk his life like the people he knows (and as do other Beauvoirien characters such as Jean Blomart, Jean-Pierre, Catherine, and Louis). With freedom defined as including the concept of risk, we find that Fosca has essentially lost his freedom. Furthermore, Fosca's immortality severely limits the freedom of those individuals

with whom he comes in contact. Realizing that he is safe from death, Fosca seeks to undertake in their place those tasks which present the most danger to his family and friends. However, in giving them what they wanted to work to get, Fosca deprives them of the freedom to risk their lives which is necessary to all humanity. Indeed, as Fosca discovers if "tous les hommes sont mortels" all those who are immortal are not men and cannot live with mortal man's concept of freedom and situation.

Fosca is trapped in his situation also. Having lived through several centuries, he would like nothing better than to sit back and completely relax. But being immortal in a world of human beings means that he comes in contact with people who oblige him to interact with them. "--Si du moins on pouvait n'être absolument rien. Mais il y a toujours d'autres gens sur terre et ils vous voient. Ils parlent et vous ne pouvez pas les entendre, et vous leur répondez, et vous recommencez à vivre, sachant que vous n'existez pas. Sans fin."<sup>124</sup>

The horror of immortality and the separation it imposes upon Fosca almost immediately becomes apparent to him. Because he is immortal, Fosca denies his son, Tancredi, a chance to rule Carmona. In desperation Tancredi plots his father's overthrow only to be killed by him.

Having learned from his errors with Tancredi, Fosca promises his son, Antoine, that he will be given a chance to

rule. But Antoine wants responsibility and does not find happiness in what his father has given him. Fosca speaks to Antoine:

--Moi, je souhaitais ton bonheur, dis-je. Ne possèdes-tu pas tout ce que peut désirer un homme?

--A quoi bon me l'avoir donné, si vous m'interdisez d'en rien faire? Père dit-il d'une voix pressante, jamais vous n'auriez accepté une telle existence. On m'a appris à raisonner, à réfléchir : à quoi bon si je dois suivre aveuglément vos avis? Ai-je endurci mon corps seulement pour chasser à courre?<sup>125</sup>

It is Béatrice who defines for Fosca the limits of his situation:

--Quand Antoine plongeait dans un lac, quand il montait le premier à l'assaut, je l'admirais parce qu'il risquait sa vie; mais vous, qu'est-ce que votre courage? J'aimais sa générosité : vous donnez sans compter vos richesses, votre temps, vos peines, mais vous avez tant de millions de vies à vivre que ce que vous sacrifiez n'est jamais rien. J'aimais aussi sa fierté; un homme pareil à tous les autres et qui choisit d'être lui-même, c'est beau; vous, vous êtes un être exceptionnel, et vous le savez; cela ne me touche pas. . . .

--Ainsi, dis-je, rien de ce que je fais, rien de ce que je suis n'a de prix à vos yeux parce que je suis immortel?

--Oui, c'est cela, dit-elle.<sup>126</sup>

Frustrated in his attempts to rule Carmona and achieve peace, Fosca abandons the town to offer his services to the Habsbourgs in the hope of conquering the world and seeing it ruled by one unifying force. In the course of this undertaking the king, Charles, is faced with decisions involving the life and death of many individuals whom he sees as human beings who must be respected. Fosca, on the other hand, can easily imagine any prospective victims as already dead and unimportant.

Jamais encore il [Charles] n'avait eu à prendre de décision si grave. Moi je savais combien la vie d'un homme était chose brève et sans importance; de toute façon, dans cent ans, aucun des ces misérables dont Charles s'inquiétait ne se souviendrait plus de ses souffrances : à mes yeux, ils étaient déjà tous morts. Mais lui ne pouvait pas si facilement consentir à les frustrer de leur vie; il mesurait leurs joies et leurs peines selon ses propres mesures.<sup>127</sup>

Being immortal, not only does Fosca appreciate less the value of individual human life, but he holds in highest esteem those things most closely linked with eternity: objects. "Je ne pouvais pas lui dire en mon langage : une vie, un millier de vies ne pèse pas plus qu'un vol d'éphémères; tandis que ces routes, ces villes, ces canaux que nous allons construire demeureront pendant l'éternité sur la surface de la terre . . ." <sup>128</sup>

When Luther begins to preach his doctrine, Fosca sees him as a dangerous person who must be stopped. According to Fosca: "Son arrogance peuplait le monde de mille volontés têtues. . . . Si on lui permettait de poursuivre ses prédications, il enseignerait aux hommes que chacun était juge de ses rapports avec Dieu, juge aussi de ses actes . . ." <sup>129</sup> The teaching of such an attitude would mean that Fosca would find it very difficult to get people to unify and obey him.

He persists in trying to conquer the world for Charles but constantly finds people opposing him. Fosca maintains that he is striving for the happiness of the people but he discovers: "Ce n'est pas le bonheur qu'ils

[le peuple] veulent : ils veulent vivre."<sup>130</sup> Fosca also learns that: "--Ce qui a du prix à leurs yeux, ce n'est jamais ce qu'ils reçoivent : c'est ce qu'ils font."<sup>131</sup>

Perhaps the character who best exemplifies this need to live, which even Fosca's presence seems to destroy, is the explorer Carlier. He refuses to let Fosca look for his river because Carlier wants to find it himself. When Fosca describes the advantages in time and safety in looking for Carlier's river by himself, the explorer tells Fosca he will accompany him because "--Il faut que je me sente vivre, dit-il. Dussé-je en mourir."<sup>132</sup>

By becoming immortal, Fosca has lost his link with humanity. He can do nothing for others since they know what they want and generally want to obtain it by themselves. Others can do nothing for Fosca since he no longer has any true desires.

\* \* \*

In the preceding pages we have given a brief overview of the concept of the other. What we have seen is that the other is undeniably present and influences our life just as we influence his. (For example: Françoise in L'Invitée and Jean in Le Sang des autres.) Through contact with others we find a need and support for our own projects which make us feel a part of the world. The cases of Xavière and Sade have shown us the negative results of trying to live in one's own world denying the presence of others.

It has also been shown that the other possesses a consciousness just as we do, and sees himself as subject and us as object just as we see ourselves as subject and him as object.

Although we are dependent upon others to give our lives meaning, we have seen that a paradox exists. Often two free individuals find that they seek different ends which can cause conflict to arise. On the other hand, we have also seen how an individual seeking a particular end can find help and support in his quest from other individuals without infringing upon their freedom (as did Jean Blomart in Le Sang des autres).

Finally we have seen how our freedom depends on a situation which has at least in part been created by others. It has been shown that our own freedom can be limited by limiting that of others (as with Sade). We have also seen the concept of freedom become reality only as a result of some contact with a situation (Jean-Pierre in Les Bouches inutiles) whether by a meeting with others or by opposition to them. In addition, we found that freedom cannot be without limits (the council decision in Les Bouches inutiles) but must show a respect for the human being. By examining the case of Fosca in Tous les hommes sont mortels we discovered that freedom becomes meaningless if it is not exercised by a human being who is able to risk action in the face of death.

## Chapter I: Footnotes

- <sup>1</sup> Simone de Beauvoir, Pyrrhus et Cinéas (Editions Gallimard, Collection Idées, 1944), p. 256.
- <sup>2</sup> Ibid., p. 257.
- <sup>3</sup> Ibid., p. 260.
- <sup>4</sup> Ibid., p. 264.
- <sup>5</sup> Ibid., p. 282.
- <sup>6</sup> Ibid., p. 282.
- <sup>7</sup> Ibid., p. 285.
- <sup>8</sup> Ibid., pp. 285-6.
- <sup>9</sup> Ibid., p. 312.
- <sup>10</sup> Ibid., p. 314.
- <sup>11</sup> Ibid., p. 315.
- <sup>12</sup> Ibid., p. 317.
- <sup>13</sup> Ibid., pp. 318-19.
- <sup>14</sup> Ibid., pp. 325-7.
- <sup>15</sup> Ibid., pp. 328-9.
- <sup>16</sup> Ibid., p. 331.
- <sup>17</sup> Ibid., pp. 336-7.
- <sup>18</sup> Ibid., pp. 338-9.
- <sup>19</sup> Ibid., p. 339.
- <sup>20</sup> Ibid., p. 341.
- <sup>21</sup> Ibid., p. 344.
- <sup>22</sup> Ibid., p. 347.
- <sup>23</sup> Ibid., pp. 348-9.
- <sup>24</sup> Ibid., p. 350.
- <sup>25</sup> Ibid., p. 358.

## Chapter I: Footnotes

- <sup>1</sup>Simone de Beauvoir, Pyrrhus et Cinéas (Editions Gallimard, Collection Idées, 1944), p. 256.
- <sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 257.
- <sup>3</sup>Ibid., p. 260.
- <sup>4</sup>Ibid., p. 264.
- <sup>5</sup>Ibid., p. 282.
- <sup>6</sup>Ibid., p. 282.
- <sup>7</sup>Ibid., p. 285.
- <sup>8</sup>Ibid., pp. 285-6.
- <sup>9</sup>Ibid., p. 312.
- <sup>10</sup>Ibid., p. 314.
- <sup>11</sup>Ibid., p. 315.
- <sup>12</sup>Ibid., p. 317.
- <sup>13</sup>Ibid., pp. 318-19.
- <sup>14</sup>Ibid., pp. 325-7.
- <sup>15</sup>Ibid., pp. 328-9.
- <sup>16</sup>Ibid., p. 331.
- <sup>17</sup>Ibid., pp. 336-7.
- <sup>18</sup>Ibid., pp. 338-9.
- <sup>19</sup>Ibid., p. 339.
- <sup>20</sup>Ibid., p. 341.
- <sup>21</sup>Ibid., p. 344.
- <sup>22</sup>Ibid., p. 347.
- <sup>23</sup>Ibid., pp. 348-9.
- <sup>24</sup>Ibid., p. 350.
- <sup>25</sup>Ibid., p. 358.

- <sup>26</sup>Ibid., pp. 359-60.
- <sup>27</sup>Ibid., pp. 361-3.
- <sup>28</sup>Ibid., pp. 363-4.
- <sup>29</sup>Ibid., p. 365.
- <sup>30</sup>Simone de Beauvoir, Pour une morale de l'ambiguïté (Editions Gallimard, Collection Idées, 1947), p. 131.
- <sup>31</sup>Ibid., p. 143.
- <sup>32</sup>Ibid., p. 189.
- <sup>33</sup>Ibid., pp. 205-6.
- <sup>34</sup>Simone de Beauvoir, L'Invitée (Editions Gallimard, Collection livres de Poche, 1943), p. 47.
- <sup>35</sup>Ibid., p. 62.
- <sup>36</sup>Ibid., p. 166.
- <sup>37</sup>Ibid., p. 166.
- <sup>38</sup>Ibid., pp. 166-7.
- <sup>39</sup>Ibid., p. 167.
- <sup>40</sup>Ibid., p. 173.
- <sup>41</sup>Ibid., p. 195.
- <sup>42</sup>Ibid., p. 299.
- <sup>43</sup>Annie-Claire Jaccard, Beauvoir, Diss. Zurich, 1968 (Juris-Verlag, 1968), p. 146.
- <sup>44</sup>Beauvoir, L'Invitée, p. 347.
- <sup>45</sup>Ibid., p. 359.
- <sup>46</sup>Simone de Beauvoir, "Faut-il brûler Sade," Privilèges (Editions Gallimard, 1955), p. 13.
- <sup>47</sup>Ibid., p. 17. (Underlining used throughout text to indicate italics.)
- <sup>48</sup>Ibid., p. 21.
- <sup>49</sup>Ibid., p. 27.

- 50 Ibid., p. 31.
- 51 Ibid., p. 36.
- 52 Ibid., p. 47.
- 53 Ibid., p. 48.
- 54 Ibid., p. 48.
- 55 Beauvoir, L'Invitée, p. 68.
- 56 Ibid., p. 275.
- 57 Simone de Beauvoir, Le Sang des autres (Editions Gallimard, 1945), p. 32.
- 58 Ibid., p. 208.
- 59 Beauvoir, L'Invitée, p. 14.
- 60 Ibid., p. 69.
- 61 Ibid., p. 215.
- 62 Ibid., p. 300.
- 63 Ibid., p. 300.
- 64 Ibid., p. 302.
- 65 Ibid., p. 369.
- 66 Ibid., p. 373.
- 67 Beauvoir, Le Sang des autres, p. 55.
- 68 Ibid., p. 14.
- 69 Ibid., p. 57.
- 70 Ibid., pp. 57-8.
- 71 Ibid., p. 59.
- 72 Ibid., p. 63.
- 73 Ibid., p. 65.
- 74 Ibid., p. 72.
- 75 Ibid., p. 93.

- <sup>76</sup>Ibid., p. 97.
- <sup>77</sup>Ibid., p. 103.
- <sup>78</sup>Ibid., p. 103.
- <sup>79</sup>Ibid., p. 108
- <sup>80</sup>Ibid., p. 110.
- <sup>81</sup>Ibid., p. 110.
- <sup>82</sup>Ibid., pp. 114-15.
- <sup>83</sup>Ibid., p. 115.
- <sup>84</sup>Ibid., p. 125.
- <sup>85</sup>Ibid., pp. 125-6.
- <sup>86</sup>Ibid., p. 174.
- <sup>87</sup>Ibid., p. 175.
- <sup>88</sup>Ibid., p. 180
- <sup>89</sup>Ibid., p. 180.
- <sup>90</sup>Ibid., p. 180.
- <sup>91</sup>Ibid., p. 180.
- <sup>92</sup>Ibid., p. 180.
- <sup>93</sup>Ibid., pp. 180-1.
- <sup>94</sup>Ibid., p. 206.
- <sup>95</sup>Ibid., p. 224.
- <sup>96</sup>Ibid., p. 226.
- <sup>97</sup>Simone de Beauvoir, Les Bouches inutiles (Librairie Gallimard, 1945), p. 40-1.
- <sup>98</sup>Ibid., p. 41.
- <sup>99</sup>Ibid., p. 41.
- <sup>100</sup>Ibid., p. 55.
- <sup>101</sup>Ibid., p. 56.

- 102 Ibid., p. 71.
- 103 Ibid., pp. 91-2.
- 104 Ibid., p. 100.
- 105 Ibid., p. 101.
- 106 Ibid., p. 103.
- 107 Ibid., p. 113.
- 108 Ibid., p. 116.
- 109 Ibid., pp. 131-2.
- 110 Beauvoir, Privilèges, p. 17.
- 111 Ibid., p. 27.
- 112 Ibid., p. 48.
- 113 Beauvoir, L'Invitée, p. 21.
- 114 Ibid., p. 167.
- 115 Ibid., p. 299.
- 116 Ibid., p. 315.
- 117 Ibid., p. 363.
- 118 Ibid., p. 381.
- 119 Ibid., p. 440.
- 120 Beauvoir, Le Sang des autres, p. 28.
- 121 Ibid., p. 28.
- 122 Ibid., p. 124.
- 123 Beauvoir, Les Bouches inutiles, p. 113.
- 124 Simone de Beauvoir, Tous les hommes sont mortels  
(Editions Gallimard, 1946), p. 35.
- 125 Ibid., p. 135.
- 126 Ibid., p. 147.
- 127 Ibid., pp. 170-1.

<sup>128</sup>Ibid., p. 171.

<sup>129</sup>Ibid., p. 175.

<sup>130</sup>Ibid., p. 213.

<sup>131</sup>Ibid., p. 214.

<sup>132</sup>Ibid., p. 239.

## CHAPTER II

## DIFFICULTIES OF INTERHUMAN RELATIONSHIPS

The meeting with others described in the previous chapter is usually followed by the development of relationships involving two or more individuals. This interaction starts early with the individual most likely forming meaningful (non-family) relationships at about the time he enters school. By the time the individual has reached adulthood it is probable that many different types of interhuman links have been established by him: friend to friend, administrator to employee, club member to club member, girlfriend to boyfriend, etc.

Many of the difficulties arising in interhuman relationships do so because of the subject-object link. Stated succinctly, this means that the individual is a subject for himself and an object for others. What we seek to discover is how the existence of others affects us.

## 1

In the course of L'Invitée, Françoise comes face to face with the problems caused by the existence of others (and specifically that of Xavière). It is an aspect of life which, until Xavière's arrival, Françoise has been basically unaware of because she has established an all-encompassing

relationship with Pierre. However, Xavière's presence begins to create difficulties for Françoise. Françoise finds that where previously "sa présence arrachait les choses à leur inconscience, elle leur donnait leur couleur, leur odeur"<sup>1</sup> in a fairly self-centered and independent world, this is no longer so. No longer can Françoise say " 'Je suis tranquille à présent, parce que je me suis persuadée que, où que j'aïlle, le reste du monde se déplace avec moi.' "<sup>2</sup> because the center of the world is now wherever Xavière is.

The feeling of displacement and isolation experienced by Françoise is further magnified by the fact of Xavière's growing closeness to Pierre. At present, when Françoise is alone in the course of the day, she feels left out of the world. This sentiment is further exaggerated when Françoise knows that Pierre and Xavière are together. "Françoise s'arrêta sur le bord du trottoir : elle avait la pénible impression d'être en exil. D'ordinaire, le centre de Paris, c'était juste l'endroit où elle se trouvait. Aujourd'hui, tout était changé. Le centre de Paris, c'était le café où Pierre et Xavière étaient attablés et Françoise errait dans de vagues banlieues."<sup>3</sup> We must realize that what Françoise is experiencing at this time is a certain lack of autonomy rather than jealousy (which will be discussed later and is, in part, caused by this feeling).

Françoise begins to see Xavière as the Other, who as

much as possible lives her life as if Françoise did not exist. This impression, comprised of a vague fear and a sense of estrangement, is evoked in the earliest pages of L'Invitée by Gerbert. " 'Moi, ce qui me dérange, c'est les autres gens, dit-il; j'ai horreur qu'on me parle d'un type que je ne connais pas, surtout si on m'en parle avec estime : un type qui vit là, de son côté et qui ne sait même pas que j'existe.' "4

Françoise sees her entire way of life start to crumble. As a successful writer living in a fairly secure relationship with Pierre, Françoise has never before been required to question what she felt to be her "independent" existence. The problem is that Françoise has come to take Pierre and her relationship with him for granted. In so doing, Françoise has failed to accept full responsibility, be self-assertive, and in general act on her own initiative.

Françoise reprit sa lime. Le tort qu'elle avait, c'était de reposer sur Pierre de tout son poids; il y avait là une véritable faute, elle ne devait pas faire supporter à un autre la responsabilité d'elle-même. . . . Pour devenir totalement responsable d'elle-même, il lui aurait suffi de vouloir; mais elle ne voulait pas réellement. Ce blâme même qu'elle s'adressait, elle demanderait encore à Pierre de l'approuver; tout ce qu'elle pensait, c'était avec lui et pour lui; un acte qu'elle tirât de soi seule et qu'elle accomplît absolument sans aucun rapport avec lui, un acte qui affirmât une authentique indépendance, elle ne pourrait même pas en imaginer. Ce n'était pas gênant, d'ailleurs, elle n'aurait jamais besoin de recours à soi contre Pierre.

It is Françoise's lack of experience in truly managing her life which is responsible for the dramatic

impact Xavière's presence has on her. As noted in the above quotation, Françoise is quite dependent upon Pierre in her everyday life. How can this relationship be disrupted by the arrival of Xavière? The answer is based on the fact that Françoise alternately feels obliged to compete for attention and approval from Pierre and Xavière. However, while Pierre is basically a well-meaning and open individual ready to give of himself to Françoise, Xavière is an evasive, closed, and selfish person. Thus, in order to gain approval, Françoise finds that she becomes most dependent upon Xavière since more effort must be made by Françoise in order to maintain their relationship. Françoise wants to control Xavière's will so that she can feel that Xavière belongs to her.

"Il faut que je la persuade", pensa Françoise. Jusqu'ici, la discussion avec Pierre, les vagues rêveries de la nuit, le début même de cette conversation, ce n'était que du jeu; brusquement, tout était devenu réel : la résistance de Xavière était réelle et Françoise voulait la vaincre. C'était scandaleux : elle avait tellement l'impression de dominer Xavière, de la posséder jusque dans son passé et dans les détours encore imprévus de son avenir! et cependant il y avait cette volonté butée contre laquelle sa propre volonté se brisait.

The reader of L'Invitée is privy to an evolution of Françoise's personality. Before Xavière's presence takes on great importance, Françoise describes herself while she is at a dance hall. "Au centre du dancing, impersonnelle et libre, moi je suis là. Je contemple à la fois toutes ces vies, tous ces visages. Si je me détournais d'eux, ils se

déferaient aussitôt comme un paysage délaissé."<sup>7</sup> Françoise is so entirely self-assured and independent that she understands the world as being comprised only of what she sees. Françoise looks upon herself as a subject and therefore is able to assert her independence.

But Xavière succeeds in making herself the ultimate subject and thus obliges Françoise to feel like an object. Françoise starts to see herself only as Xavière sees her and eventually comes to depend upon Xavière for her happiness. "Mais c'était une vraie angoisse de dépendre à ce point dans son bonheur et jusque dans son être même de cette conscience [Xavière's] étrangère et rebelle."<sup>8</sup>

Xavière's domination of Françoise becomes so complete that Françoise feels the need to live as if she were Xavière. This enterprise is doomed to failure and only serves to further diminish Françoise's being: "Elle s'était mise à voir avec les yeux de Xavière les endroits, les gens, les sourires de Pierre; elle en était venue à ne plus se connaître qu'à travers les sentiments que Xavière lui portait, et maintenant elle cherchait à se confondre avec elle ; mais dans cet effort impossible, elle ne réussissait qu'à s'anéantir."<sup>9</sup>

In examining the relationship between Françoise and Xavière, we see the former become increasingly dependent upon the latter. Françoise's dependence on Xavière is simultaneously caused and fostered by the former's ignorance

of the subject-object relationship. This can be clearly demonstrated by examining the attitudes of the three individuals comprising the triangle: Pierre, Françoise, and Xavière.

In his relationship with Françoise, Pierre attempts to establish a reciprocity which enables Françoise to be both a subject and an object. This bond of mutual consideration so effectively shelters Françoise that she is able to avoid seeing herself as an object for Pierre.

On the other hand, the relationship between Françoise and Xavière lacks reciprocity. Françoise's ignorance of the subject-object relationship leads her to try to possess Xavière, as one would possess an object. Françoise fails to acknowledge that Xavière has a consciousness of her own. Xavière's self-centered attitudes set the stage for conflict as she treats all individuals as objects and considers herself to be the only subject. Whereas Pierre is able to ward off Xavière's attacks on his subjectivity because he is aware of the subject-object conflict, Françoise falls victim to these attacks and finds that Xavière has transformed her into an object almost totally dependent upon Xavière for approval.

The destruction of Françoise's subjectivity at the hands of Xavière serves to warn individuals that there is a subject-object conflict with which they must learn to contend. The key to resolving this conflict is the adoption of an attitude of reciprocity which provides security to individuals by re-affirming their subjectivity.

\* \* \*

Le Sang des autres presents us with other aspects of dependence caused by the existence of others. The first of these can be highlighted by examining the relationship between Jean and H el ene. The involvement here is essentially emotional with H el ene loving Jean and seeking reciprocity of affection or at least acceptance of her affection.

Chance is responsible for the meeting of Jean and H el ene but as a result of this meeting, H el ene falls in love with Jean and comes to need him. Unfortunately, Jean rejects H el ene and her love because he wishes to retain his independence. "Moi non plus, je n' tais pas seul; mais j'avais r ussi   rassembler autour de moi une vie sans compromis, sans privil ge, qui ne devait rien   personne . . ."10 Jean tries to live as if H el ene and others did not exist, avoiding contacts which will entail his giving or receiving. Jean is a subject who refuses to acknowledge that another human being can be made to lose his or her own subjectivity by Jean's refusal to interact.

Eventually, Jean somewhat modifies his stand and lets H el ene see him, but with the firm understanding that he does not love her and that their attachment is only temporary. Jean has made a concession to H el ene's need for him but refuses to admit a need for her. "Clairement elle [H el ene] apercevait ma tendresse et mon indiff rence; et elle tra nait comme un fardeau sans douceur cet amour qui ne m' tait pas n cessaire."11

Jean finally does have an emotional awakening and realizes that he loves and needs H  l  ne as much as she loves and needs him. However, this realization comes to Jean only after he has caused H  l  ne much pain and suffering.

The theme of Jean's emotional growth is paralleled by the theme of his political growth. Jean's problem is that he cannot accept the consequences of the fact that he is an object for others. Jean tends to forget his own subjectivity and the motivating forces behind his actions. Instead, he lets himself be guided by the unpredictable effects his actions have on others. Therefore, his response to Jacques' death is to withdraw from the Communist party and active political life.

The atrocities accompanying the outbreak of World War II compel Jean to change his mind. His leadership of a group of resistance fighters is an indication that he is willing to depend on others and have others depend on him. Jean comes to believe in and act according to the quotation from Dostoevsky which opens Le Sang des autres: "Chacun est responsable de tout devant tous."<sup>12</sup>

Throughout the book Jean has been faced with a decision. As leader of his resistance group, should he send his comrades on anti-Nazi missions (during which they risk death) and, can he send these people knowing that the Nazis will kill innocent French citizens in retaliation for all anti-Nazi action? To further complicate the situation, Jean

must make this decision while he sits with H  l  ne, who is on her deathbed as a result of an injury received on a resistance mission.

In his capacity as a resistance leader Jean has depended upon H  l  ne who has faithfully rendered service to the group and to the cause of freedom. Having accepted the idea of the interdependence of people working toward a common goal, Jean must deal with a ramification of his goal-oriented work, the idea of sacrifice. If the sacrifice involved were that of his own life, Jean could accept it more easily. However, it is the lives of others which must be sacrificed. As head of the resistance group, one of Jean's responsibilities is to remain alive to direct the group. Therefore, he must not participate actively in the missions. The question of Jean's participation is raised when Laurent is scheduled to go on a mission requiring two people and Jean wants to go:

--Comment? vous n'allez pas avec Laurent!

--Bien s  r que si.

--Mais vous ne devez pas, dit-elle. Qu'est-ce que deviendra le mouvement s'il vous arrive quelque chose?

--Je sais. Les g  n  raux meurent dans leur lit. Je n'ai pas une   me de g  n  ral.

--Il faut en acheter une, dit Denise. Vous savez bien que personne n'est capable de vous remplacer.

--Vous voulez que j'envoie les copains risquer leur peau et que je reste    siroter mon caf  ? J'aurais du mal    me supporter. . . .

--Vos scrupules personnels ne nous int  ressent pas, reprend-elle durement. Nous nous sommes confi  s    vous comme    un chef qui fait passer le parti ayant tout : vous n'avez pas le droit de nous trahir.<sup>13</sup>

The dependence of the group upon Jean's leadership

is again the issue when Jean is forced to accept H  l  ne's argument that he not accompany her on a dangerous mission:

--Non. Le moindre accident, si tu es seule, tu es perdue. Il   crasa sa cigarette sous son talon : Je t'accompagnerai.

--Toi? tu ne dois participer    aucune exp  dition; c'est une r  gle absolue.

--Je sais, dit Jean. J'envoie des gens se faire tuer, et je ne partage m  me pas leur sort.

--Si tu le partageais,   a ne changerait rien, dit-elle.

Accepting the inevitability and the reality of H  l  ne's death enables Jean to make his decision.

He opts for the interdependence and sacrifice present when one is fighting for a common cause with other individuals.

Jean's experience differs from that of Fran  oise. While the latter's difficulty is a result of ignorance of the subject-object conflict, the former's problem stems from a misconception of the subject-object conflict. Fran  oise does not realize the cause of her conflict with Xavi  re. But Jean, although he realizes that a subject-object conflict does exist, is unwilling to accept this knowledge. It is for this reason that he refuses to interact with H  l  ne or to take a prompt stand against Fascism and Nazism. Non-involvement and inaction are the methods Jean consciously employs to avoid the dependence necessitated by the subject-object conflict.

Whereas Fran  oise's experience shows the reader that ignorance of its existence will not cause the subject-object conflict to disappear, Jean's experience further

demonstrates that this conflict will persist in the face of all efforts to banish or belittle it. The subject-object conflict is an aspect of life which must be accepted and dealt with.

\* \* \*

In Les Mandarins it is once again in the context of world politics that we see how the existence of others creates a necessity for dependence. Two men, Henri Perron and Robert Dubreuilh, have decided to prolong and enrich their long-term association by organizing a leftist-oriented group to combat the rising capitalist influence in France and in the world. Henri is the man whose primary interest is writing while Robert's first thought is of politics. The two are the closest of friends and have helped each other for many years.

L'Espoir, the newspaper edited by Henri is the reason that some problems arise. Henri has made it a point of honor to make L'Espoir a neutral newspaper supporting no particular view. Because of this policy, Henri obtains the support of an American, Preston, who is able to obtain the paper necessary to print L'Espoir. However, when Henri, in his constant desire to reveal the truth, tells Preston that he will print an article which could be critical of America, Preston accuses Henri of not remaining neutral and implies that the paper supplies might be withdrawn.

Henri evaluates the situation and realizes that he can no longer maintain a policy of political neutrality which

only serves his readers negatively by failing to direct them. "Henri ne voulait pas perdre ce public d'intellectuels qui aimaient L'Espoir pour son impartialité; il ne voulait pas non plus indisposer ses lecteurs communistes; cependant, en ménageant tout le monde il se condamnait à l'insignifiance, et par là il contribuait à endormir les gens."<sup>15</sup>

Following this incident, Dubreuilh tries to persuade Henri that the S.R.L. group would benefit greatly if it were supported by a newspaper. Henri is taken aback by the thought that he should use L'Espoir to support a political ideology. However, further reflection on Henri's part reveals to him that as a newspaper publisher he has certain obligations to the public.

Le S.R.L. avait besoin d'un journal et il représentait une chance qu'on n'avait pas le droit de refuser. . . . L'Espoir, il l'avait jusqu'ici considéré comme une espèce de jouet : l'attirail complet du petit imprimeur, grandeur nature, un joujou magnifique; et c'était un instrument, une arme; on avait le droit de lui demander compte de l'usage qu'il en faisait. . . . il s'agitait beaucoup à propos de ce journal; mais tout de même il pensait n'avoir de compte à rendre qu'à lui-même. Il se trompait bien. "C'est drôle, se dit-il. Dès qu'on fait un truc convenable, au lieu de vous conférer des droits, ça vous crée des devoirs." Il avait fondé L'Espoir et ça l'amenait à se jeter corps et âme dans la foire politique.<sup>16</sup>

However, Henri's public is not the only entity dependent upon Henri and upon which he depends. Henri has to consider his friendship with Dubreuilh. At this point Henri must resolve a conflict between friendship and politics. Henri is obliged to ask himself just what will happen to his friendship with Dubreuilh if he does not agree

to lend L'Espoir to the S.R.L. cause. Henri mulls over these ideas when he sees Dubreuilh. "Un allié, ce n'est pas nécessairement un ami : 'D'ailleurs, qu'est-ce qu'un ami?' se demanda-t-il, en serrant la main de Dubreuilh. Amis : jusqu'à quel point? A quel prix? Si je ne cède pas, que deviendra cette amitié?"<sup>17</sup>

Henri agonizes over the decision to commit L'Espoir to a political point of view. He realizes that the paper could be used to influence people. "Dubreuilh et Samazelle croyaient pouvoir l'utiliser, ce journal; ils croyaient aussi que la France aurait encore un rôle à jouer si elle ne restait pas isolée : tous les espoirs étaient de leur côté; en face, rien que du vide."<sup>18</sup>

Taking another tack, Henri knows that he will find satisfaction if he is able to participate in concrete action as he did during the war. Unified action in particular should be his guideline, a guideline which should lead Henri to lend his backing to the S.R.L. "Une seule consigne : agir. Agir en équipe, sans s'occuper de soi, semer, encore semer, ne jamais récolter. Agir, s'unir, servir, obéir à Dubreuilh, sourire à Samazelle. Il téléphonerait : 'Le journal est à vous.' Servir, s'unir, agir."<sup>19</sup>

It is the multi-faceted relationship between Henri and Dubreuilh which contributes to the formation of a problem and consequently Henri's dilemma on the subject of L'Espoir. Since both men have been very good friends for

fifteen years, we can assume that there is an atmosphere of mutual respect between them. The fact that Henri is a leftist-leaning journalist taking no concrete action and that Dubreuilh is an action-oriented leftist who has also written to support his political convictions is not originally a source of conflict. However, when Dubreuilh attempts to persuade Henri to affiliate L'Espoir with the S.R.L. a conflict arises. Henri begins to doubt the genuineness of Dubreuilh's friendship. Henri sees Dubreuilh using him and their friendship as a means of attaining an end. Since Dubreuilh feels he needs L'Espoir for the S.R.L. to succeed, Henri wonders if their friendship is being sacrificed to the idea of utility. Henri sees himself becoming an object useful to Dubreuilh and his cause. After having given the S.R.L. the backing of L'Espoir, Henri expresses his thoughts on Dubreuilh to Dubreuilh's wife, Anne:

--A l'heure qu'il est, Dubreuilh est si totalement engagé dans ce qu'il fait que sa sympathie pour les gens se mesure à leur utilité, ni plus ni moins. . . .  
 "Je me demande bien quelle amitié il aurait encore pour moi si je n'avais pas ouvert L'Espoir au S.R.L. . . .  
 Je [Anne] me demandais si Robert lui avait donné l'impression de lui mettre le marché en main; il peut être brutal quand il veut arriver à tout prix à ses fins; ça m'aurait désolée qu'il eût blessé Henri; et lui, il était déjà bien assez seul, il ne fallait surtout pas qu'il perde cette amitié.<sup>20</sup>

Anne attempts to show Henri that his opinion of Dubreuilh's method of action may be harsh. She wants Henri to see that if Dubreuilh appeared too forceful in his approach, it was based only on a feeling of friendship and esteem for Henri:

--Plus Robert tient aux gens plus il exige d'eux, dis-je. . . .

--Ah! mais ce n'est pas du tout pareil d'être si exigeant dans l'intérêt d'autrui ou dans le sien à soi; au premier cas, oui, c'est une preuve d'affection. . .

--Mais pour Robert les deux se confondent!" dis-je.

D'ordinaire, je répugne à parler de Robert; mais je voulais absolument dissiper cette espèce de rancune que je pressentais chez Henri : "La liaison de L'Espoir et du S.R.L. c'était à ses yeux une nécessité, vous deviez donc la reconnaître." J'interrogeai Henri du regard : "Vous pensez qu'il a disposé trop facilement de vous? mais c'était par estime.

--Je sais, dit Henri en souriant ; il prête volontiers aux autres ses propres évidences ; avouez que c'est une forme d'estime un peu impérialiste.<sup>21</sup>

The thought that Henri has been used or manipulated by Dubreuilh continues to irk him. Henri resents the fact that Dubreuilh has been so stubborn in trying to convince him to align L'Espoir with the S.R.L. and has failed to consider the difficulty of the decision he has imposed upon Henri. The reader better understands Henri's anger with Dubreuilh as he explains it to Anne: " 'Vous savez, quand on accepte à contrecœur de faire un truc, on en veut un peu à celui qui vous y a poussé ; je conviens que ce n'est pas bien honnête.' "22

Most likely, Henri's discontent with Dubreuilh could have been avoided if, in one of their meetings, Dubreuilh not only spoke of how much he and the S.R.L. needed L'Espoir and Henri, but what the probable advantages and disadvantages of such an association would be for Henri. In this manner, Henri would have been able to see that his status as a "subject" in Dubreuilh's eyes was not threatened. Henri

needed to be reassured that he was depended on by Dubreuilh as a colleague and valid individual and not only as the editor of L'Espoir.

However, Dubreuilh has taken none of these precautions. Further, he has let Trarieux give funds to L'Espoir to prevent its bankruptcy without totally explaining the arrangements to Henri. When Henri is faced with the knowledge that Trarieux wants to replace Luc with Samazelle (the Communist), he feels that Dubreuilh has tricked him and may have even suggested the substitution himself, feeling that Henri would rather see Samazelle at L'Espoir than have no newspaper at all because of bankruptcy. In order to pacify Henri, Dubreuilh asks for a couple of days to work on the problem.

However, another situation arises in which Henri and Dubreuilh once again are of opposite opinions. It becomes apparent that the Soviet Union has a system of concentration camps. Henri strives to find out all he can about these camps so that he can give an accurate and true account of them in L'Espoir. Dubreuilh, on the other hand, is firmly opposed to any mention of the camps in L'Espoir. He thinks that it will be sufficient for the rightist newspapers to cover the story so that the left will not be further weakened. Both men are adamant in their opinions and this serves to cause a rupture between them.

Following the rupture, both men feel regret. In

addition, the interdependence between them is still evident. It is Anne who acts as a sort of mediator, trying to convince Dubreuilh that his approach to Henri might have sounded too much like an ultimatum:

--Tu as l'air de croire que j'ai chassé Henri à coups de pied, dit Robert. Je ne demandais qu'à régler les choses à l'amiable. C'est lui qui est parti en claquant la porte.

--Êtes-vous sûr de ne pas l'avoir mis en demeure de vous céder ou de rompre? dis-je. Quand vous avez demandé que L'Espoir devienne le journal du S.R.L., il était convaincu qu'en cas de refus il aurait perdu votre amitié. Cette fois, comme il ne voulait pas céder, il a sans doute préféré en finir tout de suite.<sup>23</sup>

Anne realizes and wants to make Dubreuilh realize that the two men's emotional and social need for each other is strong enough to cope with and supersede their political diversity of opinion. At first, Dubreuilh finds pretenses to support a continued rupture with Henri, criticizing him for lack of discretion in his affair with Josette and saying that he is completely self-involved. Later, Dubreuilh finds cause to admire Henri for not becoming anti-Communist. He is again able to consider Henri as a separate, thinking individual as he tries to understand just why Henri acted as he did with regard to the Russian camps. Anne is the person with whom Dubreuilh is speaking as his outlook on Henri becomes more understanding:

"Je n'arriverai jamais à comprendre pourquoi il s'est brouillé avec vous de cette façon, dis-je. Je suis sûre qu'aujourd'hui il s'en mord les doigts.

--J'y ai repensé souvent, dit Robert. Au début je lui reprochais de s'être trop soulié de lui-même, dans

cette affaire. Maintenant je dis qu'il n'avait pas tellement tort. Au fond nous avons à décider ce que peut et doit être le rôle d'un intellectuel aujourd'hui. Se taire, c'était choisir une solution bien pessimiste ; à son âge c'est naturel qu'il ait renâclé.

--Le paradoxe, c'est qu'Henri tenait beaucoup moins que vous à jouer un rôle politique, dis-je.

--Il a peut-être compris que d'autres choses<sup>24</sup> étaient en question, dit Robert.

Henri too, thinks of trying to get back on good terms with Dubreuilh. As Dubreuilh formerly needed Henri's support for the S.R.L., Henri may now need Dubreuilh's support after perjuring himself to save Josette. (Henri has falsely testified that a Nazi informer, Mercier, was with him the day he was supposed to have turned two girls over to the Germans.) Dubreuilh's memory of what occurred on the day in question might serve to endanger both himself and Henri.

Dubreuilh is the first to make an offer of reconciliation and in so doing also expresses his concern for Henri's well-being. Although Henri is eager to once again be friendly with Dubreuilh, he is unsure of how to handle the situation of the perjury committed to save Josette. Since Dubreuilh does not believe the perjury story he has been told, the question that Henri must answer is, can he recommence his friendship with Dubreuilh based on deception or should he risk destroying himself in Dubreuilh's eyes by telling him the truth? :

"Je vais y aller tout de suite", se dit Henri ; et il lui sembla qu'on venait de lâcher dans sa poitrine une armée de fourmis rouges. Qu'avait dit Sézenac? S'il avait fait naître en Dubreuilh des soupçons, comment

mentir avec assez de passion pour les anéantir? Il n'était sans doute pas trop tard pour le mensonge puisque Dubreuilh lui offrait son amitié; mais c'était odieux de répondre à une telle offre par un abus de confiance. Pourtant que faire d'autre? Même Dubreuilh serait scandalisé par un aveu, et alors Henri se sentirait en faute. Il monta dans sa voiture. Pour la première fois, ça lui pensait d'avoir un secret : ça exige qu'on trompe l'autre ou qu'on se trahisse soi-même, l'amitié n'est plus guère possible. Il hésita longtemps devant la porte de Dubreuilh sans se décider à sonner.<sup>25</sup>

Dubreuilh confronts Henri with the perjury story Sézenac has told him but Henri realizes that Dubreuilh has not believed Sézenac. Perhaps it is Dubreuilh's apparent confidence in Henri that enables him to attest to the veracity of Sézenac's claim. It is important that Henri chooses to be perfectly honest with Dubreuilh and re-establish reciprocity between them. Henri is no longer intimidated by what Dubreuilh might think of him (fear of being an object) but can now accept and live with the consequences of his action (reassurance of being a subject), Henri reflects on the admission he has just made to Dubreuilh:

Ça l'humiliait soudain, l'idée de mentir. Après tout, puisqu'il s'arrangeait de la vérité, les autres n'avaient pas à faire les dégoûtés ; ce qui était assez bon pour lui l'était aussi pour eux. Il reprit avec un peu de défi : "J'ai fait un faux témoignage pour sauver Josette qui avait couché avec un Allemand. Vous qui m'avez si souvent reproché mon moralisme, vous voyez que je suis en progrès, ajouta-t-il."<sup>26</sup>

In this case Henri has discovered that to lie is to be disrespected (to be an object) while to tell the truth is to be respected (to be a subject), not for acting as he did

but for accepting the consequences of his action. Henri's frankness enables him to form a new foundation upon which to build his friendship with Dubreuilh.

The new project of starting a successful weekly newspaper serves to indicate the presence of a spirit of interdependence between Henri and Dubreuilh. It is also the occasion for Dubreuilh to express his respect for Henri's individual competence and to reveal to Henri that he is totally confident in him. This explanation by Dubreuilh fills a need that Henri has felt to know that Dubreuilh holds Henri in as high esteem as Henri holds Dubreuilh. Knowledge of the reciprocity of feelings between the two men will enable Henri to more easily accept the consequences of the interdependence of their relationship.

Dubreuilh has just told Henri that a man named Manheim would be willing to give financial backing to a weekly leftist newspaper to be directed by Dubreuilh.

Henri haussa les épaules : "Vous vous rendez compte du travail que ça représente, un grand hebdo à succès? Rien à voir avec Vigilance. Il faut s'en occuper nuit et jour, surtout la première année.

--Je sais", dit Dubreuilh. Il chercha le regard d'Henri : "C'est pourquoi je ne peux penser à accepter que si vous marchez aussi.

--Vous savez bien que je pars en Italie, dit Henri avec un peu d'impatience. Mais si vraiment cette histoire vous intéresse, vous n'aurez pas de mal à trouver des collaborateurs", ajouta-t-il.

Dubreuilh secoua la tête : "Je n'ai aucune expérience du journalisme, dit-il; si cet hebdo se fait, j'ai besoin d'un spécialiste à côté de moi; et vous savez comment les choses se passent ; pratiquement ce sera lui qui aura la haute main sur tout. Il faut que je puisse me fier à lui comme à moi-même ; il n'y a que vous."<sup>27</sup>

Based on Dubreuilh's stated high opinion of Henri as well as an evaluation of his current life, Henri will decide to participate more directly in political life and begin to think more positively about directing the newspaper with Dubreuilh.

The treatment of the subject-object conflict as it affects the relationship between Henri and Dubreuilh differs from the two examples previously discussed. In the case of these two men, the subject-object conflict has already been accepted and dealt with on a social level. Henri and Dubreuilh have succeeded in establishing and maintaining a friendship based on the principles of reciprocity and interdependence. However, this same understanding has not been reached on the political level.

Dubreuilh imposes the urgency of his political goals on Henri in such a manner as to make the latter feel like an object. Henri is somewhat baffled by Dubreuilh's treatment since the reciprocity that is lacking in their political relationship is highly evident in their friendship.

A reconciliation between the two men becomes possible when Dubreuilh acknowledges Henri's right to hold different political opinions. The plans to form a new weekly newspaper further demonstrate Dubreuilh's intention to create an atmosphere of reciprocity and interdependence on a political level and to transcend the political difference of opinion which has separated the two friends.

\* \* \*

The question of dependence is also examined by Beauvoir in Tous les hommes sont mortels. In this book the true scope of the interdependence of people is seen through the eyes of Fosca, who has become an outsider by drinking a potion that has made him immortal. The theory of dependence is examined from two points of view. First, there is the desire of Fosca to have people depend on him (which is a factor contributing to his drinking of the immortality potion). Second, there is the thwarted desire of others to depend upon Fosca; a thwarted desire because Fosca's immortality is not compatible with dependence of others. (As an immortal being, Fosca is an absolute subject. By depending upon him, individuals would lose their subject status.)

A citizen of the town of Carmona, Fosca strives to see his home become prosperous under a fair and stable government. It is with this aim in mind that once he has become ruler of Carmona, Fosca drinks the potion of immortality. Fosca fights many of Carmona's enemies in an attempt to achieve the peace desired by all; but he does so at the cost of many lives and over an extended period of time. However, Fosca has made a fundamental error. He believes he is fighting for the good of Carmona, but it is his personal idea of "good" for which he fights. The dependence which Fosca obtains from the inhabitants of Carmona is self-serving and shows little reciprocity between him and the people.

Fosca will leave Carmona to offer his services to the Habsbourgs but not before he has experienced a sense of failure in helping others. One example would be Fosca's attempts to gratify his son, Antoine, and Antoine's friend, Béatrice, with material offerings. The two are forced to accept Fosca's gifts but derive pleasure only from what they obtain for themselves. Fosca reflects: "Je leur donnai des jours de soleil, de fête, de rires, des jouets, des bonbons, des images, et ils conspiraient pour goûter en secret la douceur des nuits que je ne leur donnais pas."<sup>28</sup> Fosca is also faced with Antoine's discontent at having received good training but not being allowed to use it (see Chapter I note #125 above).

Béatrice teaches Fosca that he cannot expect people to depend on him. She also makes it clear that he cannot help her. "Elle [Béatrice] lissa du plat de la main la page du manuscrit. Elle attendait que je m'éloigne et je ne trouvais rien à lui dire. Pourtant elle avait besoin de secours, et j'aurais pu l'aider mieux que tous ces livres inachevés. Mais comment lui donner ce qu'elle s'obstinait à ne pas demander?"<sup>29</sup> In this, as in other cases, Fosca's giving help which was needed, but not desired, would be seen as evil.

Having left Carmona, Fosca tries a new approach to life. He no longer tries to have people depend on him to

obtain what he wants. Now, he encourages people to depend on him to obtain what they want.

However, Fosca's immortality has changed him in ways which make it difficult for people to elicit his help. Since he will live forever, Fosca puts less value on human life (which will cease to exist) and greater value on objects, which have a life-span approaching eternity. Since people strive to perfect life for themselves and other people, Fosca's interest in the creation of objects holds less importance for them. Therefore, Fosca's desire to build things in the New World is not too appealing to the governor with whom he speaks.

Je ne pouvais pas lui dire en mon langage : une vie, un millier de vies ne pèse pas plus qu'un vol d'éphémères; tandis que ces routes, ces villes, ces canaux que nous allons construire demeureront pendant l'éternité sur la surface de la terre; pour l'éternité nous aurons arraché un continent aux ténèbres des forêts vierges et des superstitions stupides.<sup>30</sup>

In the course of fighting for the emperor, Charles, Fosca learns another lesson which explains why his efforts to help people are doomed to failure. An individual, in order to remain "alive" must do something and do it by himself. In order to live, people need a purpose to their lives. Would-be helpers, like Fosca, can really do nothing for people, neither helping nor hindering them. Fosca mentions this while talking with Charles.

--Je les comprends, dis-je. Maintenant je les comprends. Ce qui a du prix à leurs yeux, ce n'est jamais ce qu'ils reçoivent : c'est ce qu'ils font. S'ils ne peuvent pas créer, il faut qu'ils détruisent,

mais de toute façon ils doivent refuser ce qui est, sinon ils ne seraient pas des hommes. Et nous qui prétendons forger le monde à leur place et les y emprisonner, ils ne peuvent que nous haïr. Cet ordre, ce repos dont nous rêvons pour eux serait la pire malédiction. . . .

Charles avait mis la tête dans ses mains, et il n'écoutait pas ce langage étranger. Il priait. Je repris :

--On ne peut rien pour eux ni contre eux. On ne peut rien.<sup>31</sup>

Fosca's association with the explorer, Carlier, provides him with a rich experience and also gives him the opportunity to confirm the above evaluation of humanity. When Carlier finally does discover a great body of water, he feels that much, if not all, of the credit is due Fosca for the help he has given. This sentiment detracts from the satisfaction Carlier might otherwise feel.

--C'est une grande découverte, dis-je.

--Ta découverte, dit-il.

--Comment?

--C'est toi qui m'as sauvé la vie dans la Prairie. C'est toi qui as été chercher du secours à Montréal : c'est toi qui m'as persuadé de<sup>32</sup> poursuivre mon chemin. Sans toi je ne serais pas ici.

Later, when Fosca offers to go alone to find the river again, Carlier refuses. Even though Fosca could locate the river faster and with greater safety, it would be a blow to Carlier's pride not to go. Carlier's reaction reveals to Fosca just how unimportant and useless one feels in his immortal presence. This is seen as Carlier tells Fosca that he intends to look for the river himself, and will go either with or without Fosca.

--Je partirai avec toi, ou je partirai sans toi, dit-il d'une voix dure. Je partirai.

Je le regardai. Un mot que j'avais dit il y avait des siècles me revient aux lèvres :

--Quel orgueil!

Il se mit à rire; je n'aimais pas ce rire.

--Pourquoi ris-tu?

--Crois-tu qu'on puisse vivre à côté de toi et garder quelque orgueil? dit-il.

--Laisse-moi aller seul, dis-je.

--Tu ne comprends pas! dit-il. Tu ne comprends rien! Je ne peux pas rester ici. Si je pouvais rester en place, je serais resté à Montréal; je serais resté à Saint-Malo; je vivrais dans une maison tranquille avec une femme et des enfants.

Il serra les lèvres.

--Il faut que je me sente vivre, dit-il. Dussé-je en mourir.

The idea that his immortality causes Fosca to be rejected by normal human beings leads him to hide this information which he now considers to be a curse. Thus, it is only by accident that Marianne, one of Fosca's wives, learns the truth. The knowledge of Fosca's immortality is repulsive to Marianne who sees it as a factor invalidating their love. Marianne's love for Fosca is a total commitment of her life and being while Fosca's love for Marianne can be considered as only a temporary commitment. Marianne is angered by the fact that her devotion to Fosca is total while his commitment is only partial.

--Ah! dit-elle avec violence, pourquoi m'as-tu caché la vérité?

--M'aurais-tu aimé alors?

--Jamais!

--Pourquoi? dis-je. Me crois-tu maudit? Est-ce qu'un démon m'habite?

--Je me suis donnée à toi tout entière, dit-elle. Je croyais que toi aussi tu te donnais pour la vie, pour la mort. Et tu te prêtait pour quelques années.

After Marianne's death, Fosca strives to follow her advice to "rester un homme parmi les hommes. . ." and her

request that he "Aide-les. Mets à leur service ton expérience."<sup>35</sup> Fosca saves the life of Armand (who is unaware that he is Fosca's grandson). Aware of the negative effects of his immortality on mortals, Fosca issues a warning to Armand. The warning contains, in essence, an explanation of why immortality is a curse. Most individuals coming in contact with Fosca are forced to see themselves as mere objects, with Fosca being the only subject. Fosca explains his condition to Armand after having saved his life :  
 "--Ne vous réjouissez pas, dis-je. Il est dangereux pour les hommes mortels de vivre à mes côtés. Leur existence leur semble brusquement trop courte, leurs entreprises vaines."<sup>36</sup>

There exists one other element which prevents the establishment of a subject-to-subject reciprocity needed for Fosca to help others. He sees the world, its people, and its events as a series of repetitions. Though there are many resemblances between individuals, mortals have the power to see each other as being unique.

Je me penchai sur Armand, je regardai le jeune visage rongé de mousse noire : à quoi rêvait-il? Il dormait comme avaient dormis Tancrède, Antoine, Charles, Carlier; ils se ressemblaient tous; et cependant pour chacun la vie avait un goût unique qu'il était seul à connaître ; elle ne se recommençait jamais, <sup>37</sup> chacun elle était tout entière, tout entière neuve.

It is Régine, the last major character in the book to meet Fosca who is most horrified by this loss of uniqueness. Régine is an actress who, at first, sees her associa-

tion with Fosca as a way to attain immortality. She will be remembered by a man who will never die. This is the manner in which Régine hopes to depend on Fosca.

Régine recognizes the problem when Fosca, who loves Régine, tries to explain how he can also love Annie. For Fosca there is no reason to distinguish between these two women. Régine, who wanted to be "different" in Fosca's mind will only be one more person in a series of many. Régine asks Fosca:

--Ne m'aimez-vous plus? dit-elle.

--Je l'aime aussi, dit-il doucement.

--Mais pas de la même manière.

--Comment pourrais-je faire une différence? dit-il.

Pauvre Annie!

Une horrible nausée monta aux lèvres de Régine : dans la prairie, des million de brins d'herbe, tous égaux, tous semblables . . .

--Il y a eu un temps où moi seule existais pour vous . . .

--Oui. Et puis vous m'avez ouvert les yeux . . .

Elle cacha son visage dans ses mains. Un brin d'herbe, rien qu'un brin d'herbe. Chacun se croyait différent des autres; chacun se préférait; et tous se trompaient; elle s'était trompée comme les autres.

Fosca's inability to see and appreciate the uniqueness of people obliges them to feel like objects in his eyes. This feeling demoralizes Régine, Marianne, and Béatrice while it destroys others like Tancredi and Antoine.

We have seen in L'Invitée, Le Sang des autres, and Les Mandarins that the existence of others places individuals in a role of dependence. This dependence can be detrimental, as in the case of Françoise and Xavière, or it can be beneficial, as with Dubreuilh and Henri (in a social and

political context) and as with Jean and H el ene (in an emotional and political context). What these cases all have in common is that the individuals involved are functioning human beings, alternately seeing themselves as subjects or objects.

However, Tous les hommes sont mortels presents us with a different premise. No true dependence is possible between Fosca and others. Fosca cannot help others because he is immortal and appears as a constant subject. Likewise, others cannot successfully depend on Fosca because he makes them feel like unimportant objects.

## 2

While "chosification" is essentially a physical means of aggravating the subject-object conflict, the same result can be achieved by psychological means. An analysis of masochism and sadism as well as a discussion of the phenomenon of jealousy will enable us to illustrate some other difficulties of interhuman relationships.

We stated at the beginning of this chapter that the individual is a subject for himself and an object for others. Before going further, let us delve deeper into this statement. In L' tre et le n ant Sartre develops a philosophy upon which Beauvoir has based some of her fiction. Sartre's third part entitled "Le Pour-Autru" provides us with some necessary background. In sections entitled "Le Regard," "Le corps comme  tre-pour-soi : la facticit ," and "Le

corps-pour-autrui,"<sup>39</sup> . two important terms are presented and defined for us: "l'être-pour-soi" and "l'être-pour-autrui." Essentially "l'être-pour-soi" is that part of a being seen by the self. "L'être-pour-soi" enables an individual to see his consciousness and to consider himself a subject. On the other hand "l'être-pour-autrui" is how the self is seen by others. The person observing the self is not necessarily aware of the self's consciousness and therefore, the self first appears to him as an object.

The nature of "l'être-pour-autrui" is further clarified by Sartre's description of the role of "le regard." Since our first knowledge of another individual is generally dependent upon our seeing him, it is not surprising to understand why he initially appears as an object. "Ainsi est-il vrai qu'une, au moins, des modalités de la présence à moi d'autrui est l'objectivité."<sup>40</sup> However, in addition to simply being there, an individual, in some manner, refers back to something other than himself and establishes his probability of being.

Unlike an object, an individual must be considered in relation to the objects surrounding him, a relationship from which the self is, at least partially, excluded. "Autrui, c'est d'abord la fuite permanente des choses vers un terme que je saisis à la fois comme objet à une certaine distance de moi, et qui m'échappe en tant qu'il déplie autour de lui ses propres distances."<sup>41</sup>

Another aspect to be considered is the fact that while the self can look at another individual, this other individual can also look at the self. Being looked at is something which an individual first experiences with regard to his inner self. "Ainsi, le regard est d'abord un intermédiaire qui renvoie de moi à moi-même."<sup>42</sup> The person being looked at feels limited because he is being observed. "Ainsi, être vu me constitue comme un être sans défense pour une liberté qui n'est pas ma liberté."<sup>43</sup> What occurs, is that the self feels itself transformed into an object by the other's glance. However, the self is an object only for others, not for itself. Furthermore, it becomes evident to the self that the other person observing him also possesses a consciousness. (The existence of the other's consciousness is the basis for reciprocity.) Sartre summarizes the role of the glance as follows:

Nous avons appris que l'existence d'autrui était éprouvée avec évidence dans et par le fait de mon objectivité. Et nous avons vu aussi que ma réaction à ma propre aliénation pour autrui se traduisait par l'appréhension d'autrui comme objet. En bref, autrui peut exister pour nous sous deux formes : si je l'éprouve avec évidence, je manque à le connaître; si je le connais, j'agis sur lui, je n'atteins que son être-objet et son existence probable du monde; aucune synthèse de ces deux formes n'est possible.<sup>44</sup>

Usually this first perception of another individual is modified as individuals become acquainted. They acknowledge the presence of the other's consciousness and can also see the other as a subject. However, there are instances when

this acceptance of another's "subject" does not take place. This is the problem that Beauvoir examines.

\* \* \*

Both Françoise and Xavière of L'Invitée are well aware of the power of the glance. At the beginning of the novel, when Françoise is still self-assured and can consider herself the center of the world, she is able to feel that people need her glance in order to exist. This shows that the glance can make people seem like things. "Au centre du dancing, impersonnelle et libre, moi je suis là. Je contemple à la fois toutes ces vies, tous ces visages. Si je me détournais d'eux, ils se déferaient aussitôt comme un paysage délaissé."<sup>45</sup>

Although Françoise had not yet experienced "chosification," she is aware of the phenomenon and its nature as she explains in an early conversation with Gerbert. Françoise realizes that the cause of the problem is the fact that people see others from the outside, not from the inside as they do with themselves. As a result, an individual will feel like an object when looked upon by another. "--On ne peut pas réaliser que les autres gens sont des consciences qui se sentent du dedans comme on se sent soi-même, dit Françoise. Quand on entrevoit ça, je trouve que c'est terrifiant : on a l'impression de ne plus être qu'une image dans la tête de quelqu'un d'autre. Mais ça n'arrive presque jamais, et jamais tout à fait."<sup>46</sup> Françoise's analysis is

correct except for her remarks on the frequency and the totality of "chosification." Françoise will discover her error as her relationship with Xavière develops.

Françoise realizes, however, that everyone has the power of the glance. This helps her maintain a more realistic perspective on life. Françoise knows that since her look can make others into objects, others can make her into an object in the same manner. Such is the case when Françoise watches her friend Paule.

. . . Françoise ne voyait ni les bielles, ni les rouleaux, ni tous ces mouvements d'acier; c'était Paule qu'elle voyait. Une femme de son âge; une femme qui avait elle aussi son histoire, son travail, sa vie; une femme qui dansait sans se soucier de Françoise et quand tout à l'heure elle lui souriait ce serait comme à une spectatrice parmi d'autres, Françoise n'était pour elle qu'un morceau du décor.

Whereas the glance is used by Françoise, Paule, and others without intentional malevolence, Xavière consciously uses it as a weapon, an accessory to her actions. As mentioned in Chapter I (see Chapter I note #60 above) Beauvoir will describe Xavière's actions and will often back them up with an appropriate facial contortion. Xavière often displays her aptitude for making people feel like objects. A pertinent example would be when Xavière's look is used to judge both Françoise and Elisabeth.

"Claude est faible, c'est tout, mais il a donné mille preuves qu'il tenait à toi." Elle releva la tête; Xavière était debout à côté de la table et considérait la scène avec un drôle de sourire.

"Asseyez-vous, dit Françoise gênée.

--Non, je retourne danser", dit Xavière; il y avait

sur son visage du mépris et presque de la méchanceté, Françoise reçut avec un choc désagréable ce jugement malveillant.

It is interesting to note that "thosification" does not necessarily require a negative look to be effective. Xavière uses "un drôle de sourire" as well as "mépris" and "méchanceté" to achieve the desired effect. We further note that the dialogue plays almost no part in the "thosification." Xavière's facial expressions "speak" to convey the message of disapproval.

\* \* \*

The glance also plays a role in Les Mandarins. Both Anne and Robert Dubreuilh understand the power of the glance. As a well-known political figure, Dubreuilh is often in public view. Circumstances have made him into a type of idol whom people put on a pedestal to either worship or destroy. In his capacity as a public being, people are unable to acknowledge that Dubreuilh is a living being. When people see Dubreuilh act in some human manner, by eating or speaking, he is no longer an object of their hate or admiration, but a human being. Anne realizes how the public thinks of her husband and it is her thoughts which Dubreuilh now cites. " 'La nudité commence au visage, et l'obscénité avec la parole, reprit-il. On décrète que nous devons être des statues ou des spectres; et dès qu'on nous surprend à exister en chair et en os on nous accuse d'imposture. C'est

pour ça que le moindre geste prend si facilement une allure de scandale : rire, parler, manger, autant de flagrants délits.' "49

As a psychiatrist, Anne is acutely aware of the use of the glance to "chosifier" others whether it is Dubreuilh or her friend Paule who is the victim.

Paule has become progressively unsure of herself with the passage of time. When she is invited to Lucie Belhomme's, she feels the need to obtain Anne's help in selecting the clothes she will wear. Paule's fear of being considered ridiculous eventually causes Anne to look at her through the eyes of a stranger. Although the evaluation is made in silence, Anne effectively sees Paule as an object.

Elle [Paule] se regardait d'un air hostile et soudain, pour la première fois depuis bien des années, je la vis moi aussi avec des yeux étrangers; elle avait l'air fatiguée; ses pommettes avaient pris une nuance violacée, et le menton s'empâtait; les deux entailles profondes qui cernaient sa bouche accusaient la virilité de ses traits. Naguère, le teint crémeux de Paule, son regard velouté, le noir éclat de ses cheveux adoucissaient sa beauté : privé de ce banal attrait, son visage devenait insolite; il était construit d'une manière trop volontaire pour qu'on excusât l'indécision d'une courbe, l'hésitation d'une couleur; au lieu de s'y inscrire sournoisement, le temps marquait d'un signe brutal ce masque noble et baroque qui méritait encore l'admiration, mais qui aurait été<sup>50</sup> à sa place dans un musée plutôt que dans un salon.

In considering Paule as an object (having its place in a museum), Anne has also drawn a moral portrait of Paule. The adjectives used by Anne to describe Paule's physical characteristics also describe her mental state.

We have seen that the glance can be used to "chosifier" a person whether this is done with no malice, as with Françoise and Anne, or with the evil determination of Xavière. In either case, the result is negative, though the effect is more intense when the desire is to hurt. An individual, in order to maintain full confidence in himself must not only see himself as a subject, but feel that others share his opinion.

\* \* \*

The subject-object relationship can be examined in still another manner. The psychological aspects of this relationship gain greater clarity from the analysis of masochism and sadism.

To clarify these two concepts, we again turn to L'Être et le néant, Chapter III on "Les relations concrètes avec autrui." The first two subdivision titles present us the subject to be examined. They are: "La première attitude envers autrui : l'amour, le langage, le masochisme" and "Deuxième attitude envers autrui : l'indifférence, le désir, la haine, le sadisme."<sup>51</sup>

In order to proceed, we must understand that the subject-object relationship is one of conflict and that it is this conflict which is at the basis of "l'être-pour-autrui." This means that the attitudes of sadism and masochism must be considered as being formulated as a response to the subject-object concept. They are a means of

interacting with others. We should also accept the fact that this concept of conflict is mutual, affecting the self as it affects the other. With this knowledge, we can appreciate Sartre's approach to the existence of others.

Tout ce qui vaut pour moi vaut pour autrui. Pendant que je tente de me libérer de l'emprise d'autrui, autrui tente de se libérer de la mienne; pendant que je cherche à asservir autrui, autrui cherche à m'asservir. Il ne s'agit nullement ici de relations unilatérales avec un objet-en-soi, mais de rapports réciproques et mouvants. Les descriptions qui vont suivre doivent donc être envisagées dans la perspective du conflit. Le conflit est le sens original de l'être-pour-autrui.<sup>52</sup>

Masochism is an attempt to resolve the subject-object conflict. Essentially, an individual rejects his transcendence and sees himself as the other sees him: as an object. The individual also suffers from a feeling of guilt since he has let himself become an object. Ironically, however, the individual savors the failure he inflicts upon himself. Sartre sums up masochism as follows: "Il nous suffit de signaler que le masochisme est un perpétuel effort pour anéantir la subjectivité du sujet en la faisant réassimiler par l'autre et que cet effort est accompagné de l'épuisante et délicieuse conscience de l'échec, au point que c'est l'échec lui-même que le sujet finit par rechercher comme son but principal."<sup>53</sup>

Sadism is another attempt to resolve the subject-object conflict. An individual seeks to make the other see himself as an object by using the other as an instrument to place the body of the other in an obscene position. However,

physical domination is not the only goal of the sadist. He also wants to feel in control of the other's freedom and derives pleasure from seeing the victim use his freedom to beg or to humiliate himself.

Le sadique vise donc à faire paraître la chair brusquement et par la contrainte, c'est-à-dire par le concours non de sa propre chair, mais de son corps comme instrument. . . . Ainsi l'effort du sadique est pour engluer Autrui dans sa chair par la violence et par la douleur, en s'appropriant le corps de l'Autre par le fait qu'il le traite comme chair à faire naître de la chair; mais cette appropriation dépasse le corps qu'elle s'approprie, car elle ne veut le posséder qu'en tant qu'il a englué en lui la liberté de l'Autre. C'est pourquoi le sadique voudra des preuves manifestes de cet asservissement par la chair de la liberté de l'Autre : il visera à faire demander pardon, il obligera par la torture et la menace de l'Autre à s'humilier, à renier ce qu'il a de plus cher.<sup>54</sup>

While the sadist wants to control the other's freedom, he does not seek its destruction. The other's freedom must remain so that it can associate with the tortured body. "Pareillement le sadisme ne cherche pas à supprimer la liberté de celui qu'il torture mais à contraindre cette liberté à s'identifier librement à la chair torturée. C'est pourquoi le moment du plaisir est, pour le bourreau, celui où la victime renie ou s'humilie."<sup>55</sup>

Both sadism and masochism can be viewed as attempts to define a relationship between the body of the self and the body of the other. The sadist concentrates on using the other's body to fulfill his desires, while the masochist essentially uses his own. "Ainsi le sadisme et le masochisme sont-ils les deux écueils du désir, soit que je dépasse le

trouble vers une appropriation de la chair de l'Autre, soit que, enivré de mon propre trouble, je ne fasse plus attention qu'à ma chair et que je ne demande plus rien à l'Autre, sinon d'être le regard qui m'aide à réaliser ma chair."<sup>56</sup>

Relationships based on sadism or masochism cannot be considered ideal because of the fact that they avoid the reciprocity between people needed for valid interhuman contact.

\* \* \*

Paule in Les Mandarins displays masochistic tendencies in her relationship with Henri. Difficulties begin to arise since Henri realizes that he no longer loves Paule and wants to let go gently, while Paule ignores Henri's hints and clings to him even more.

Paule's masochistic tendencies become apparent when we examine her past and learn that once involved with Henri, she refused to continue with her career in singing. The rejection of the career in singing constitutes a rejection of Paule's transcendence. Paule wants only to be known as Henri's lover (which is her object function).

Henri attempts to stir Paule out of her inaction. We note his choice of words.

Je trouve criminel que tu passes tes journées à végéter entre ces quatre murs.  
 --Tu appelles ça végéter!" dit Paule. Elle sourit avec douceur et comme autrefois il y avait toute la sagesse du monde dans son sourire : "Quand on aime, on ne végète pas.  
 --Mais aimer, ce n'est pas une occupation".<sup>57</sup>

Anne also tries to convince Paule to resume her singing and make something of herself. "Tu ne sais pas ce que je pense depuis que je t'ai entendue à Noël? c'est que tu devrais faire quelque chose de ta voix. C'est bien beau de te dévouer à Henri, mais enfin, tu comptes toi aussi."<sup>58</sup>

However, Paule has chosen martyrdom for herself. She sees singing as a betrayal of Henri. " 'Pourquoi penses-tu que j'ai renoncé au chant, il y a dix ans? parce que j'ai compris qu'Henri m'exigeait tout entière . . . ' "<sup>59</sup>

We must note that Paule's masochism is not total since she does not seem to feel that she is an object and therefore does not feel any guilt.

\* \* \*

Paule's display of masochistic tendencies would find an opposite in the behavior of Xavière in L'Invitée. However, just as Paule is not a true masochist, Xavière is not a true sadist.

Xavière's most pronounced sadistic tendency is that of inflicting discomfort on others. The first such display occurs whenever people approach Françoise while Xavière is with her. Although Xavière does not take concrete action against Françoise's friends, she makes it evident that she hates them.

As Xavière becomes more secure in her surrounding, Françoise becomes her primary victim, not so much by Xavière's

choice as by Françoise's weakness. Françoise acknowledges the power of Xavière's influence. "A tort ou à raison, elle ne regardait plus les paroles de Xavière comme des boutades; il y avait là tout un système de valeurs qui s'opposait au sien; elle avait beau ne pas le reconnaître, c'était gênant qu'il existât."<sup>60</sup>

Although Françoise may be Xavière's primary victim, she is not the only victim. Pierre has seen that Xavière's evil-doing is almost constant. " 'On dirait que c'est un besoin chez elle par moments de faire du mal, de se faire mal, et de se faire haïr.' "<sup>61</sup> Pierre's theory is proved many times over, and at one point is even confirmed by Xavière. After Xavière has just forced Pierre and Françoise to be impolite to Lise, we see the following comment. "Xavière lui sourit; chaque fois qu'on lui sacrifiait quelque chose et surtout quelqu'un, un air de douceur angélique se répandait sur son visage."<sup>62</sup>

In spite of the fact that Xavière continues to victimize others, her actions cannot be considered entirely sadistic. Perhaps the main reason Xavière's actions are not genuinely sadistic is because as a rule she does not acknowledge the freedom of individuals but rather sees individuals as obstacles to be overcome.

\* \* \*

Whereas Paule and Xavière only partially fulfill the roles of masochist and sadist, Sade meets all the necessary

criteria and succeeds in being a sadist and occasionally a masochist. (Beauvoir devotes an entire essay to Sade where she summarizes her thoughts on sadism and masochism as illustrated by her fiction.)

Sade is true to Sartre's definitions in his sadistic pursuits. Although Sade seeks to inflict violence upon another, he realizes that the other must be free, for it is the pleading of a free victim which contributes to Sade's pleasure. ". . . mais ce qu'il demandait essentiellement à la cruauté c'est qu'elle lui révélât comme conscience et liberté en même temps que comme chair des individus singuliers et sa propre existence . . ."63

Sade also experiments with masochistic activities, having himself whipped or sodomized. However, while Sade does embark on these activities to emphasize the "flesh" side of himself, he does not seek to lose himself in his flesh and become an object. "Ce qui le [Sade] caractérise singulièrement, c'est la tension d'une volonté qui s'applique à réaliser la chair sans se perdre en elle."64

Sade often resorts to group sex as a presentation to be watched by others. In this manner he combines both sadistic and masochistic activity. In these presentations "Sade est objet pour ceux qui le regardent; inversement : en contemplant sur une chair qu'il violente les violences qu'il supporte, il se ressaisit comme sujet au sein de sa passivité, la confusion du pour-soi et du pour-autrui s'accomplit."65

While Sade is faithful to the tenets of sadism, he realizes that cruelty has its limits. He will never be able to attain total satisfaction from his sadistic pursuits since that entails two contradictory ideas: submission and resistance. "Les attraites les plus divins sont nuls quand la soumission et l'obéissance ne viennent pas nous les offrir, et : Il faut violenter l'objet de son désir; plus de plaisir dès qu'il se rend."<sup>66</sup>

The means by which Sade tries to compensate for this disappointment is by using his imagination. What he cannot experience in reality, he tries to experience in his mind. "La jouissance des sens est toujours réglée sur l'imagination. L'homme ne peut prétendre à la félicité qu'en servant tous les caprices de son imagination."<sup>67</sup> It is Sade's dependence on imagination which eventually leads him to literature.

What Paule, Xavière, and Sade all have in common in their sadism and masochism, is the failure of their lifestyles. Each finds it difficult to conduct relationships with others based on reciprocity. Of the three, it is perhaps Sade whose way of life has a positive effect on society since he has left us his literature.

\* \* \*

Beauvoir uses her literature as a means of examining another difficulty caused by the existence of others: the phenomenon of jealousy. The theme of jealousy can be treated from two points of view: material and emotional.

Envy, which could be considered jealousy of material goods such as another's wealth or power does not play a predominant role in Beauvoir's writing. However, emotional jealousy, most often connected to the theme of love (which we will discuss shortly), is well-analyzed by Beauvoir.

The theme of jealousy predominates in L'Invitée when Beauvoir examines the changes that take place in the relationship between Françoise and Pierre following Xavière's arrival. We discover that jealousy is a complex sentiment.

Xavière's jealousy is the first of which the reader becomes aware. At this time, Xavière is portrayed as the nice young girl who envies the apparent fullness of Françoise's life. The degree of Xavière's feeling is made apparent when we learn that she is jealous of Elisabeth, a character with whom the reader does not strongly identify himself.

Xavière la regarda d'un air tendre et confiant.  
 "Vous avez une vie si remplie, dit-elle. Tant d'amis, tant d'occupations : je me suis sentie un atome.  
 --C'est stupide", dit Françoise. C'était étonnant de penser que Xavière avait pu être jalouse d'Elisabeth.

At first, Xavière's jealousy is directed only against those who deprive her of being with either Françoise or Pierre. However, after Xavière has become a member of the trio, she becomes jealous of both Françoise and Pierre for spending time together without her. In addition, Xavière reserves a special jealousy for Françoise who deprives her

of the attention of Pierre. These jealousies become evident when Françoise and Pierre attempt to have private conversations.

Son coeur restait serré de souffrance et de colère; c'était par jalousie que Xavière haïssait ces conversations de grandes personnes auxquelles elle ne pouvait pas prendre part; le fond de toute cette histoire, c'est qu'elle n'avait pu supporter que pendant un moment Pierre ne fût plus tourné vers elle.<sup>69</sup>

Françoise, who has become increasingly aware of Xavière's jealousy is unsure whether Pierre will agree with her evaluation. But he too has discovered the extent of Xavière's feelings. Xavière's jealousy comes not only from her love for Françoise and more especially Pierre but from her egotistical self-love. Françoise and Pierre discuss the extent of Xavière's jealousy.

"Je [Françoise] crois qu'elle est un peu jalouse.

--Elle est terriblement jalouse, dit Pierre, tu t'en aperçois seulement? . . .

"Elle est jalouse de moi, reprit-elle.

--Elle est jalouse de tout, dit Pierre : d'Eloy, de Berger, du théâtre, de la politique; que nous pensions à la guerre, ça lui semble une infidélité de notre part, nous ne devrions nous soucier de rien d'autre qu'elle.<sup>70</sup>

\* \* \*

Xavière's acceptance by the couple, Françoise and Pierre, and her integration into the trio eventually causes jealousy on the part of Françoise. The presence of jealousy in Françoise is noteworthy since we learn that previously she has never been jealous, not even of Pierre. "--De moi, je sais bien que tu n'es jamais jalouse, dit Pierre en souriant. Quand même si ça t'arrivait une fois, il faudrait me le dire."<sup>71</sup>

This statement by Pierre makes it all the more difficult for Françoise to acknowledge the true nature of her uneasiness regarding the attention Pierre and Xavière give each other. Françoise's refusal to name her reaction jealousy is further based on the desire to avoid giving importance to such a sentiment.

Elle [Françoise] hésita, le malaise de ce soir, peut-être il fallait appeler ça de la jalousie; elle n'avait pas aimé que Pierre prit Xavière au sérieux, elle avait été gênée des sourires que Xavière adressait à Pierre; c'était une morosité passagère dans laquelle il entrait beaucoup de fatigue. Si elle en parlait à Pierre, au lieu d'une humeur fugitive ça deviendrait une réalité inquiétante et tenace; il serait obligé d'en tenir compte désormais alors qu'elle n'en tenait compte elle-même. Ça n'existait pas; elle n'était pas jalouse.

Gradually, the "humeur fugitive" becomes an almost constant companion for Françoise. Although Françoise is annoyed by some of Xavière's actions and attitudes, it is at first because of Pierre that she feels jealousy. Françoise feels that Pierre is violating the mutual trust and understanding upon which she believed their love to be based. Françoise is outraged when Pierre takes it upon himself to console Xavière, in her behalf as well as his, without first having asked Françoise whether she was in agreement. It is as if Pierre felt he could take Françoise and her agreement with him for granted. This incident occurs when Pierre tries to reassure Xavière.

"Vous ne devez pas, dit Pierre. Nous qui vous estimons tant . . .  
--Pas maintenant, dit Xavière faiblement.

--Mais si, dit Pierre, je sens bien ce vertige qui vous a prise."

Françoise eut un sursaut de révolte; elle n'estimait pas tant Xavière; elle n'excusait pas ce vertige; Pierre n'avait pas le droit de parler en son nom. Il allait son chemin sans même se retourner vers elle et après ça il affirmait, qu'elle l'avait suivi; c'était trop d'outrecuidance.

Françoise's concern and jealousy grow as Pierre's attachment to Xavière becomes stronger. Even when she is with Gerbert, Françoise finds herself thinking of where Pierre and Xavière are and what they are doing. In an ill-conceived attempt to insure Xavière's happiness, Pierre tries to tell Françoise to be nice to Xavière. This only serves to increase Françoise's resentment of Pierre and to make seeing Xavière seem like an obligation. Françoise discovers that Pierre is totally wrapped up with Xavière and no longer seems interested in what she has been doing. The reader is aware that Françoise and Pierre's relationship is becoming increasingly one-sided.

Ils sortirent du restaurant; il n'avait encore été question que de Xavière; tous les moments qu'on ne passait pas avec elle, on les passait à parler d'elle, ça devenait une obsession. Françoise dévisagea Pierre avec tristesse : il n'avait posé aucune question, il était parfaitement indifférent à tout ce que Françoise avait bien pu penser dans la journée; quand il l'écoutait avec un air d'intérêt, n'était-ce que par politesse? 74

As Pierre and Xavière spend more time together, Françoise's judgment of their activities makes them seem like a couple. Françoise's impression is confirmed when Pierre tells her that he and Xavière love each other. Françoise attempts to remedy the feeling of loss by establishing

the trio of three individuals who all love each other. However, the arrangement will not work because of the internal and external conflicts involved.

\* \* \*

We have already examined the internal conflicts (within the trio) involving Xavière's and Françoise's jealousy. The external conflict is Pierre's jealousy. We can term this conflict external since Pierre is jealous of Xavière's relationship with Gerbert.

Even before Xavière becomes involved with Gerbert, Pierre finds security only when he is in control of her. "Il avait besoin de la sentir en son pouvoir pour être en paix avec lui-même. Lorsque des gens s'interposaient entre elle et lui, il était toujours inquiet et irritable."<sup>75</sup>

Once Xavière has started to see Gerbert, Pierre becomes upset and fears that Xavière is in love with Gerbert. This thought is unbearable to Pierre since he is afraid that Gerbert might receive more from Xavière than he has. This would be a severe blow to Pierre's pride. " 'Remarque que je ne désire rien de plus de Xavière que ce que j'en ai; mais ça me serait insupportable que quelqu'un d'autre pût en avoir davantage.' "<sup>76</sup>

As Xavière's interest in Gerbert seems to grow, so does Pierre's jealousy. Pierre is afraid that he is losing the battle for Xavière. He shows his feelings when he sarcastically asks Françoise: "Tu ne voudrais pas que

j'accroche au dos de Xavière un écriteau avec les mots : 'chasse gardée', dit Pierre d'une voix cinglante. Il se mordit un ongle."<sup>77</sup> Françoise realizes that this is an over-reaction on the part of Pierre to the fact that Xavière has enjoyed dancing with Gerbert.

Pierre's jealousy reaches the ridiculous on one occasion when he hears voices in Xavière's room and eaves-drops to find out who is there. He is reduced to taking off his shoes, listening at the door, and tip-toeing back to Françoise to voice his discovery to her. Gerbert is in the room with Xavière.

Realizing that Xavière has slept with Gerbert, Pierre gets angry. Françoise tries to show Pierre his anger is foolish.

"Après tout, ce n'était pas un tel crime de coucher avec Gerbert, elle était libre, elle ne t'avait rien promis. Ça t'a été pénible mais tu sais bien que tu en prendrais ton parti, si tu voulais." Elle se jeta dans un fauteuil. "Je trouve que c'est sexuel et mesquin, cette rancune que tu lui gardes. Tu fais type qui en veut à une femme qu'il n'a pas eue. Ça ne me semble pas digne de toi."<sup>78</sup>

Finally, Pierre feels he can take no more. While Françoise and Gerbert are on vacation together, he will get Xavière to break up with Gerbert.

Pierre se tut un instant et il reprit, de ce ton fat et nerveux qui avait toujours été pénible à Françoise : "J'ai l'impression qu'il ne faudrait pas en faire beaucoup pour qu'elle laisse tomber Gerbert.

--Tu lui as demandé de rompre? dit Françoise.

--Je ne veux pas être la cinquième roue du carosse", dit Pierre. . . .

"Quand tu seras partie en voyage, reprit Pierre, je prendrai Xavière en main et au bout de la semaine, si la question ne s'est pas réglée d'elle-même, je la mettrai en demeure de choisir."

In addition to being unfair to Xavière, this action will be upsetting to Gerbert since he only continued seeing Xavière after having received Pierre's assurance that he and Xavière were not seriously involved.

The jealousy relationships described here all have disruptive emotions as their basis. In the case of Xavière, her jealousy destroys her as well as her relationships. Pierre's jealousy reveals a weakness of character of which Françoise was unaware. Françoise's jealousy reveals her own weakness and enables her to reconstruct her relationship with Pierre. In all of these cases, we have seen jealousy as mutually antagonistic consciousnesses seeking their own ends.

### 3

At the other end of the spectrum of feeling is love. While jealousy involves two mutually antagonistic consciousnesses, love involves two consciousnesses in harmony. Although love plays a role in most of Beauvoir's fiction, we will limit our discussion to two works: L'Invitée and Les Mandarins where love is not only portrayed, but is also analyzed in detail.

It seems logical to begin our analysis with L'Invitée since it provides us with an opportunity to examine Beauvoir's

theory of love. The basic love relationship in L'Invitée is centered around Françoise and Pierre, with other relationships between Françoise and Gerbert, Pierre and Xavière, Xavière and Gerbert, and Elisabeth and Claude also developed. Beauvoir presents us with the positive aspects of love using the couple formed by Françoise and Pierre, and Françoise and Gerbert. The other three couples manifest one or more characteristics which make their relationship unsatisfactory.

Before proceeding, we should clarify the fact that a positive love relationship does not mean a perfect relationship. One minor difficulty faced by Françoise is that since meeting Pierre she has not really felt any of the pleasures of being alone. This realization comes to her one day when Pierre is not with her. "En cet instant, elle ne regrettait pas que Pierre ne fût pas auprès d'elle, il y avait des joies qu'elle ne pouvait pas connaître en sa présence : toutes les joies de la solitude; elle les avait perdues depuis huit ans, et parfois elle en éprouvait comme un remords."<sup>80</sup>

Actually a more fundamental problem is the cause of Françoise's loss of solitary enjoyment. Françoise and Pierre have based their love upon the faulty assumption that because they are in love they are **one** and not two individuals. Pierre says this to Françoise in the course of a conversation about involvements outside of their relationship. " '--On ne peut pas parler de fidélité, ou d'infidélité entre nous',

dit Pierre; il attira Françoise contre lui. 'Toi et moi, on ne fait qu'un; c'est vrai, tu sais, on ne peut nous définir l'un sans l'autre.' "81

Françoise has learned to base her life upon this assumption, feeling that what Pierre does not know about her simply has no real existence.

"On ne fait qu'un", se répéta-t-elle. Tant qu'elle ne l'avait pas raconté à Pierre, aucun événement n'était tout à fait vrai : il flottait, immobile, incertain, dans des espèces de limbes. Autrefois, quand Pierre l'intimidait, il y avait pas mal de choses qu'elle laissait comme ça de côté : des pensées louches, des gestes irréfléchis; si on n'en parlait pas, c'était presque comme si ça n'avait pas été; ça faisait en dessous de la véritable existence une végétation souterraine et honteuse où l'on se retrouvait seule et où l'on étouffait; et puis, peu à peu, elle avait tout livré; elle ne connaissait plus la solitude, mais elle était purifiée de ces grouillements confus. Tous les moments de sa vie qu'elle lui confiait, Pierre les lui rendait clairs, polis, achevés, et ils devenaient des moments de leur vie. Elle savait qu'elle jouait le même rôle auprès de lui . . . 82

Although Françoise and Pierre have defined themselves as one, they both staunchly maintain that they should be free within their relationship. Neither partner will get upset if the other decides to have an outside liaison. It is precisely this freedom which enables Pierre to form a relationship with Xavière, and enables Françoise to form a relationship with Gerbert. The conventional notions of fidelity and infidelity are not criteria upon which Françoise and Pierre base their relationship.

However, the arrival of Xavière alters the stability of the relationship between Françoise and Pierre by causing

them to act in their own interest before that of the couple of which they are part. In effect, Xavière's influence on the couple makes Françoise realize that although she and Pierre may be one couple, they are two individuals. This realization comes to Françoise as she watches Pierre.

Elle le regarda disparaître par la petite porte du théâtre et une souffrance aiguë la déchira. Derrière les phrases et les gestes, qu'y avait-il? "Nous ne faisons qu'un." A la faveur de cette confusion commode elle s'était toujours dispensée de s'inquiéter de Pierre; mais ce n'était que des mots; ils étaient deux. Elle l'avait senti un soir au Pôle Nord; c'est de cela que quelques jours plus tard elle avait fait grief à Pierre. Elle n'avait pas voulu approfondir sa gêne, elle s'était réfugiée dans la colère pour ne pas voir la vérité; mais Pierre n'était pas en faute, il n'avait pas changé. C'était elle qui pendant des années avait commis l'erreur de ne le regarder que comme une justification d'elle-même; elle s'avisait aujourd'hui qu'il vivait pour son propre compte, et la rançon de sa confiance étourdie, de <sup>83</sup>ge qu'elle se trouvait soudain en présence d'un inconnu.

Françoise, in her reflections, discovers the idea which weakens her relationship with Pierre. Their love has been based upon certain rigidly conceived notions of love and each other. These notions have been accepted by both partners as unchangeable and have been taken for granted. The fault lies in the fact that no room is given for Françoise and Pierre to change and redefine their love as they undergo various changes. Françoise finds that although the structure of their love remains, much of its significance has been lost.

Dans la tête de Françoise, le brouillard se déchira; elle voyait avec lucidité ce qu'il y avait entre Pierre et elle; ils avaient édifié de belles constructions impeccables et ils s'arbrtaient à leur ombre, sans plus

s'inquiéter de ce qu'elles pourraient bien contenir; Pierre répétait encore ; "Nous ne faisons qu'un" et pourtant elle avait découvert qu'il vivait pour lui-même; sans perdre sa forme parfaite, leur amour, leur vie se vidait lentement de leur substance; comme ces grandes chenilles à la coque invulnérable mais qui portent dans leur chair molle de minuscules vermisseaux qui les récurent avec soin.

Realizing that their relationship is in danger, Françoise warns Pierre that they must change their way of living. Nothing must be taken for granted. Their lives and their love must be the result of constant choice which will restore true freedom to their relationship:

"Je suis ta vie, dit Françoise, mais vois-tu ce que je sens si fort ce soir, c'est que nos vies, elles sont là autour de nous, presque malgré nous, sans qu'on les choisisse. Moi non plus, tu ne me choisis plus jamais. Tu n'es plus libre de ne pas m'aimer.

--Le fait est que je t'aime, dit Pierre. Penses-tu vraiment que la liberté, ça consiste à remettre les choses en question à chaque minute? Nous avons dit si souvent à propos de Xavière qu'alors on devenait esclave de ses moindres humeurs.

--Oui", dit Françoise.

One of the factors helpful to Françoise and Pierre in redefining their relationship is the reciprocity between them. Essentially each person recognizes his own consciousness and accepts the other person's consciousness. As between equals, love is possible.

--Et puis entre nous, il y a réciprocité, dit Pierre.

--Comment veux-tu dire?

--Dans le moment où tu me reconnais une conscience, tu sais que je t'en reconnais une aussi. Ça change tout.

It is during this time that Françoise's relationship with Gerbert is transformed from one of friendship to one of

tenderness and love. Although this new relationship has less importance than the one between Françoise and Pierre, we note that both Françoise and Gerbert take their rapport seriously. Françoise has already assured Gerbert that she could not take their relationship lightly. Gerbert's devotion to Françoise is perhaps more significant since he has told Françoise that he has no intention of settling down. "Gerbert ne s'en-racinerait nulle part, il n'appartiendrait jamais à personne. Mais il lui [à Françoise] donnait, sans réserve, tout ce qu'il pouvait donner de lui."<sup>87</sup> Although her rapport with Gerbert is not as profound as with Pierre, it is as if this new experience helps Françoise see how she can improve her relationship with Pierre. The freedom which Françoise and Pierre have lost through taking their relationship for granted is an integral part of the relationship between Françoise and Gerbert. Gerbert realizes that:

"Ce qui est fameux entre nous, c'est qu'il y a une telle amitié. Jamais je ne suis gêné devant vous, je peux vous dire n'importe quoi, et je me sens libre.  
--Oui, c'est bien de s'aimer<sup>88</sup> si fort tout en restant libres", dit Françoise.

Whereas the relationships between Françoise and Pierre and Françoise and Gerbert succeed because they are based on freedom and reciprocity, the relationships between Xavière and Pierre, Xavière and Gerbert, and Elisabeth and Claude fail because one or both of these qualities is missing.

\* \* \*

Beauvoir explores these qualities and the love relationship in even greater detail in Les Mandarins. As in

L'Invitée several relationships are examined and more or less run the gamut of romantic possibilities. We shall confine our discussion to three relationships: Anne and Robert, Paule and Henri, and Anne and Lewis.

The relationship between Anne and Robert has already existed for twenty years. Robert, Anne's former teacher, is deeply involved in politics and has become very influential. Since Anne has no intention of limiting herself to the role of housewife, she has prepared herself for a career in psychoanalysis. Thus both individuals, although united by their love, are free to lead lives in which they are interested. Each individual encourages the other in his or her pursuits. Anne reflects upon how she and Robert have succeeded in creating an ideal love for themselves.

Si j'avais mis la vie en question, c'était surtout parce que je m'ennuyais à la maison : et maintenant je ne m'ennuyais plus. Robert avait tiré du chaos un monde plein, ordonné, purifié par cet avenir qu'il produisait : ce monde était le mien. La seule question, c'était de m'y tailler ma place à moi. Être la femme de Robert, ça ne me suffisait pas; jamais avant de l'épouser je n'avais envisagé de faire une carrière d'épouse. . . . C'est pour ça que ce métier me tentait. Oh! je n'ai jamais pensé qu'on pût du dehors apporter à quelqu'un un salut préfabriqué, mais souvent ce sont des niaiseries qui séparent les gens de leur bonheur, et je voulais les en débarrasser. . . . Mes journées étaient aussi pleines que la terre autour de moi. . . . C'est une grande chose à vingt ans de recevoir le monde de la main qu'on aime! c'est une grande chance d'y occuper exactement sa place! Robert a aussi réussi ce tour de force : il m'a protégée de l'isolement sans me priver de la solitude. Tout nous était commun : pourtant j'avais mes amitiés, mes plaisirs, mon travail, mes soucis à moi.

The one thing that has not remained after the passage

of twenty years is physical desire. But as Anne realizes "nous étions trop étroitement unis pour que l'union de nos corps pût avoir une grande importance; en y renonçant, nous n'avons pas pour ainsi dire rien perdu."<sup>90</sup>

The reader notes the important role of change in the relationship between Anne and Robert (a missing quality that originally weakened the relationship between Françoise and Pierre, as previously mentioned). Where physical love once predominated, a deep sense of mutual commitment has taken its place. Robert has Anne's support for his continuing political endeavors just as Anne has Robert's support for her work in psychoanalysis. The flexibility of their relationship is what enables Anne to go to the United States for a professional conference where she will eventually meet Lewis.

The couple formed by Paule and Henri is almost a complete opposite of that formed by Anne and Robert. Paule and Henri were very much in love during the war. Although Henri has a career as a journalist, Paule has none. Upon meeting Henri she has abandoned her singing in order to devote all her time to Henri. Paule lives for love and refuses to admit the possibility of change. When Henri attempts to show Paule that he no longer loves her, Paule refuses to see the truth. Unable to face the thought of living alone, Paule goes mad. Perhaps this madness is Beauvoir's commentary on the wisdom of living only for love. (This same theme is also treated by Beauvoir in La Femme rompue.)

As Paule's friend, Anne is aware of Paule's attitude toward love. "Elle [Paule] était prête à nier l'espace et le temps avant d'admettre que l'amour pût n'être pas éternel."<sup>91</sup>

Henri tries to let Paule down gently but finds that she clings to him and his "love."

--S'aimer, ne pas s'aimer ; ça n'est pas la seule question, dit-il.

--Pour moi, c'est la seule.

--Pas pour moi; tu le sais; d'autres choses comptent.

--Oui, je sais : ton travail, les voyages; je ne t'en ai jamais détourné.

--Il y a autre chose à quoi je tiens, je te l'ai dit souvent : ma liberté."<sup>92</sup>

When Henri reveals to Paule that he intends to travel with Nadine, Paule doesn't want him to go and "trahir notre amour" to which Henri replies: "--Autrement dit, je suis libre de faire ce que tu veux . . ."<sup>93</sup> The conversation continues as Henri attempts to show Paule how limited her definition of freedom is as far as he is concerned. " 'Si tu [Paule] décides que tu souffres quand je [Henri] fais ce que j'ai envie de faire, il faut que je choisisse entre ma liberté et toi.' "<sup>94</sup>

One of the other misconceptions contributing to Paule's unhappiness is the conviction that she and Henri are "un seul être."<sup>95</sup> With this as her justification, Paule can foist all of her responsibilities on Henri and not have to face up to making her own way in the world.

Paule's attitude toward love hurts her and Henri, separates her from reality, and destroys the friendship that she and Henri could have had.

When Anne meets and falls in love with Lewis, she draws upon both her relationship with Robert and her knowledge of the relationship between Paule and Henri. The freedom Anne and Robert have given each other enables Anne to love Lewis without feeling of guilt. However, Anne discovers that there is a problem. Anne is too devoted to Robert not to return to France, so she prolongs her visit with Lewis to make the most of their happiness together. After she has returned to France, Anne tries to analyze what has happened to her.

Je ne me comprenais plus. "Je pleure, pensais-je, et cependant je suis ici : n'aimé-je pas assez Lewis? Je suis ici, et voilà que je pleure : est-ce que je n'aime pas assez Robert?" J'admire les gens qui enferment la vie en formules définitives. "L'amour physique n'est rien", disent-ils; ou "Un amour qui n'est pas physique n'est rien". Mais je n'en tenais pas moins à Robert pour avoir rencontré Lewis; et la présence de Robert, <sup>96</sup>si immense fût-elle, ne comblait pas l'absence de Lewis.

Anne returns to see Lewis the following summer and travels with him to Mexico. During this second summer together, it becomes evident that Lewis resents the fact that he and Anne must live apart for most of the year. Anne realizes that Lewis has his own manner of seeing their love and perhaps dwells more on the impact of Anne's departure rather than the certainty of her return.

Lewis me regarda : "Vous ne vous débrouillez pas si mal, dit-il avec un petit sourire.

--Comment ça?

--Vous vous arrangez pour avoir deux vies, il me semble."

Le sang me monta aux joues. La voix de Lewis n'était pas hostile, mais pas très affectueuse non plus. . . .

Brusquement je m'avisai que je n'étais pas seule à penser notre histoire : il la pensait aussi, à sa manière à lui. Je me disais : je suis revenue, je reviendrai toujours. Mais il se disait peut-être : elle repartira toujours. Que lui répondre?" J'étais prise de court.

The situation comes to a head when Lewis asks Anne to stay with him, even if they do not marry. Anne refuses, hoping that this will not make her lose Lewis. To show Lewis what she is feeling, Anne asks him if he would come to Paris if she asked. He replies that he could not go because he would not be able to write in a foreign country. The point that Anne wants to make is that although her love for Lewis is not all there is, she needs it.

"Lewis, je peux revenir tous les ans. Si nous sommes sûrs de nous revoir tous les ans, il n'y aura plus de séparation; seulement des attentes. On peut s'attendre dans le bonheur quand on s'aime assez fort.

--Si vous m'aimez comme je vous aime, pourquoi perdre les trois quarts de notre vie à attendre?" dit Lewis.

J'hésitai : "Parce que l'amour n'est pas tout, dis-je. Vous devriez me comprendre : pour vous non plus il n'est pas tout."

Ma voix tremblait et mon regard suppliait Lewis : qu'il comprenne! qu'il me garde cet amour qui<sup>98</sup> était pas tout mais sans lequel je ne serais plus rien.

However, Lewis still feels that he is getting a lesser share of their bargain. After all, Anne is able to divide her time between two people whom she loves while Lewis must spend most of his time waiting for Anne to return. Lewis reveals his feelings to Anne. " '--J'aurais dit qu'on ne peut pas aimer de ma même manière quelqu'un qui est tout à vous et quelqu'un qui ne l'est pas." <sup>99</sup>

Hoping to convince Lewis that his situation is not so bad, Anne tries to make him feel freer in their relationship. Anne tells Lewis: "Du moment qu'on aime, on n'est pas libre. Mais ce n'est tout de même pas pareil d'aimer quelqu'un qui se croit des droits sur vous ou quelqu'un qui ne s'en croit aucun."<sup>100</sup>

When Anne returns to see Lewis the following summer, she discovers that their rapport has changed with the passage of time. Although she still loves Lewis, his love for her has changed to a strong affection. Anne is now faced with circumstances similar to those presented to Paule. However, her reaction is different. Anne accepts the fact that Lewis' feelings have changed and tries to make the best of the situation. She struggles to establish an atmosphere of friendship and to convince Lewis that she is not angry with him because he no longer loves her. This action shows that Anne can recognize Lewis' freedom even when it is used against her. (This quality was not demonstrated by Paule.)

Although Anne has had difficulty in accepting the change in Lewis, as she returns to France at the end of the summer, she realizes that this is an experience she will have to get over. She will have to re-establish her subjectivity in a world without Lewis.

\* \* \*

At this point we will briefly mention two categories of humanity which are actively engaged in the struggle to

resolve the subject-object conflict: women and the aged. Since man has been the central figure upon which modern society is based, woman is seen as the perpetual other, and therefore is apt to be seen and treated primarily as an object.

The same fate befalls the aged for a different but parallel reason. In this case, the aged are left out because society is based on an ideal of youth and work. As retired, and therefore non-working members of society, the aged are seen as others and are often treated as objects. (We will examine both of these cases in greater detail in a later chapter.)

\* \* \*

Whether the setting is one of love or friendship, what we have seen in this chapter is that the existence of others creates difficulties. The reason that difficulties exist stems from the subject-object relationship. Once the self comes in contact with the other it is forced to accept the fact that in the eyes of the other it is an object. The problem for the self is to create a relationship with the other so that the self can accept the subjectivity of the other and the other can accept the subjectivity of the self.

A solution to the subject-object conflict is not always easy or even possible to reach. As seen in the case of Françoise, it is first necessary for the individuals involved to discover the nature of their conflict and to

work together for its resolution. Françoise is unable to resolve her conflict with Xavière since the latter is unwilling to establish a relationship based on reciprocity. The experience of Jean and Hélène provides us with further knowledge of the nature of reciprocity. It is a concept which requires active participation of the concerned individuals. The relationship between Henri and Dubreuilh expands the concept of reciprocity by stressing that it must exist on all of the different levels upon which a relationship is based. Therefore, in the case of these two men, reciprocity must exist on both a social and a political plane. It is the establishment of full reciprocity which enables people to depend on each other without losing their subjectivity.

Our examination of "chosification" by the glance permits us to see one mechanism by which an individual can aggravate the subject-object conflict. Both Françoise and Paule are victims of this tactic. In the former case, the attempted "chosification" fails as Françoise discovers the subject-object conflict and contends (but does not really solve it) with it by murdering Xavière. However, the "chosification" of Paule succeeds since it is directed against an individual who sees herself more as an object rather than as a subject.

The relationship of masochism and sadism to the subject-object conflict is somewhat unique since these two modes of behavior are often premeditated in order to make the sadist or masochist into an absolute subject or object.

We again discover that these two attitudes fail to solve the subject-object conflict since the behavior inherent to sadism and masochism excludes the concept of reciprocity. Paule, Xavière, and Sade all live in a manner which prevents them from interacting on an equal basis with others.

Jealousy is a behavior which also prevents resolution of the subject-object conflict. The distrust and possessiveness resulting from expressions of jealousy destroy any atmosphere of reciprocity that might have existed or prevent reciprocity from being established. Françoise and Pierre discover that their jealousy of Xavière and of each other disrupts the relationship they had formed.

The love relationship is the one mode of behavior discussed in this chapter which provides for the possibility of the successful resolution of the subject-object conflict. In its ideal form, love is a relationship which is based on the freedom of both individuals involved. The acknowledgment of individual freedom is needed to permit one individual to interact with another and maintain his subject status. Relationships such as those between Françoise and Pierre, Anne and Robert, and Anne and Lewis demonstrate love in its ideal form where in an atmosphere of reciprocity two individuals are able to depend upon each other while maintaining their own subjectivity and acknowledging that of their partner.

The key to the success or failure of resolving the subject-object conflict is in the word reciprocity. Where

reciprocity is lacking, there is failure, where it is present, there is success. This success does not necessarily come without a struggle. It will be the result of two free consciousnesses interacting responsibly to find a solution to the problems posed by their existence as separate, thinking individuals.

## Chapter II: Footnotes

- <sup>1</sup>Simone de Beauvoir, L'invitée (Editions Gallimard, Collection livres de Poche, 1943), p. 8.
- <sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 13.
- <sup>3</sup>Ibid., p. 147.
- <sup>4</sup>Ibid., pp. 13-14.
- <sup>5</sup>Ibid., p. 139.
- <sup>6</sup>Ibid., pp. 38-9.
- <sup>7</sup>Ibid., p. 32.
- <sup>8</sup>Ibid., p. 300.
- <sup>9</sup>Ibid., p. 369.
- <sup>10</sup>Simone de Beauvoir, Le Sang des autres (Editions Gallimard, 1945), p. 65.
- <sup>11</sup>Ibid., p. 117.
- <sup>12</sup>Ibid., p. 7.
- <sup>13</sup>Ibid., p. 209.
- <sup>14</sup>Ibid., p. 221.
- <sup>15</sup>Simone de Beauvoir, Les Mandarins, 2 vols. (Editions Gallimard, Collection livres de Poche, 1954), 1:219-20.
- <sup>16</sup>Ibid., 1:239.
- <sup>17</sup>Ibid., 1:248.
- <sup>18</sup>Ibid., 1:258.
- <sup>19</sup>Ibid., 1:270.
- <sup>20</sup>Ibid., 1:320-1.
- <sup>21</sup>Ibid., 1:321.
- <sup>22</sup>Ibid., 1:322.
- <sup>23</sup>Ibid., 2:186-7.

- <sup>24</sup>Ibid., 2:199.
- <sup>25</sup>Ibid., 2:336-7.
- <sup>26</sup>Ibid., 2:345.
- <sup>27</sup>Ibid., 2:444-5.
- <sup>28</sup>Simone de Beauvoir, Tous les hommes sont mortels (Editions Gallimard, 1946), p. 131.
- <sup>29</sup>Ibid., p. 136.
- <sup>30</sup>Ibid., p. 171.
- <sup>31</sup>Ibid., p. 214.
- <sup>32</sup>Ibid., p. 235.
- <sup>33</sup>Ibid., pp. 238-9.
- <sup>34</sup>Ibid., p. 290.
- <sup>35</sup>Ibid., p. 294.
- <sup>36</sup>Ibid., p. 308.
- <sup>37</sup>Ibid., p. 310.
- <sup>38</sup>Ibid., p. 78.
- <sup>39</sup>Jean-Paule Sartre, L'Être et le néant (Editions Gallimard, 1943), pp. 310-431.
- <sup>40</sup>Ibid., p. 310.
- <sup>41</sup>Ibid., pp. 312-13.
- <sup>42</sup>Ibid., p. 316.
- <sup>43</sup>Ibid., p. 326..
- <sup>44</sup>Ibid., p. 363-4.
- <sup>45</sup>Beauvoir, L'Invitée, p. 32.
- <sup>46</sup>Ibid., p. 14.
- <sup>47</sup>Ibid., p. 186.
- <sup>48</sup>Ibid., p. 34.

- <sup>49</sup> Beauvoir, Les Mandarins, 1:275-6.
- <sup>50</sup> Ibid., 2:76-7.
- <sup>51</sup> Sartre, L'Être et le néant, pp. 431-84.
- <sup>52</sup> Ibid., p. 431.
- <sup>53</sup> Ibid., p. 447.
- <sup>54</sup> Ibid., pp. 472-3.
- <sup>55</sup> Ibid., pp. 473-4.
- <sup>56</sup> Ibid., p. 475.
- <sup>57</sup> Beauvoir, Les Mandarins, 1:197.
- <sup>58</sup> Ibid., 1:297.
- <sup>59</sup> Ibid., 1:298.
- <sup>60</sup> Beauvoir, L'Invitée, p. 123.
- <sup>61</sup> Ibid., p. 166.
- <sup>62</sup> Ibid., p. 195.
- <sup>63</sup> Simone de Beauvoir, "Faut-il brûler Sade," Privilèges (Editions Gallimard, 1955), p. 27.
- <sup>64</sup> Ibid., p. 42.
- <sup>65</sup> Ibid., p. 47.
- <sup>66</sup> Ibid., p. 48.
- <sup>67</sup> Ibid., p. 49.
- <sup>68</sup> Beauvoir, L'Invitée, p. 42.
- <sup>69</sup> Ibid., p. 297.
- <sup>70</sup> Ibid., p. 299.
- <sup>71</sup> Ibid., p. 81.
- <sup>72</sup> Ibid., pp. 81-2.
- <sup>73</sup> Ibid., pp. 131-2.

- <sup>74</sup>Ibid., p. 167.  
<sup>75</sup>Ibid., p. 182.  
<sup>76</sup>Ibid., p. 250.  
<sup>77</sup>Ibid., p. 349.  
<sup>78</sup>Ibid., pp. 439-40.  
<sup>79</sup>Ibid., pp. 447-8.  
<sup>80</sup>Ibid., p. 9.  
<sup>81</sup>Ibid., p. 27.  
<sup>82</sup>Ibid., p. 28.  
<sup>83</sup>Ibid., p. 168.  
<sup>84</sup>Ibid., p. 197.  
<sup>85</sup>Ibid., pp. 205-6.  
<sup>86</sup>Ibid., p. 381.  
<sup>87</sup>Ibid., p. 470.  
<sup>88</sup>Ibid., pp. 494-5.  
<sup>89</sup>Beauvoir, Les Mandarins, 1:74-5.  
<sup>90</sup>Ibid., 1:75.  
<sup>91</sup>Ibid., 1:48.  
<sup>92</sup>Ibid., 1:131.  
<sup>93</sup>Ibid., 1:135.  
<sup>94</sup>Ibid., 1:135.  
<sup>95</sup>Ibid., 1:302.  
<sup>96</sup>Ibid., 2:60.  
<sup>97</sup>Ibid., 2:228-9.  
<sup>98</sup>Ibid., 2:246.  
<sup>99</sup>Ibid., 2:267.  
<sup>100</sup>Ibid., 2:270.

## CHAPTER III

## HUMAN RESPONSIBILITY AND SOLIDARITY

The first two chapters of this study have treated the more easily noticed aspects of interhuman relationships. The last two chapters will attempt to treat the philosophical ramifications (both in theory and in practice) of interhuman relationships.

As relationships develop on both a group and an individual basis we see a couple of important ideas emerge. The individual becomes deeply involved with another group or individual and forms a strong sense of identification or oneness which we can term solidarity. The development of the concept of responsibility is also noted as the individual interacts with others. The individual becomes aware of the fact that he is responsible for others as well as for himself. These ideas of responsibility and solidarity entail both theoretical and practical applications. What we hope to do in this chapter is to examine the concepts of responsibility and solidarity to determine the role they play in the work of Simone de Beauvoir.

## 1

From past discussion, we have seen that the individual is interdependent with other members of humanity. This

interdependence exists on several levels: material, emotional, and political.

Material interdependence is part of daily life but is not spoken of in detail by Beauvoir, perhaps because it is a concept based primarily upon objects and physical need rather than on the development and use of ideas. The provision of food, clothing, and shelter are some of the material needs met by interdependence. What the reader will sometimes find is that certain aspects of material interdependence are used as a platform or background to discuss an example of emotional and/or political interdependence. Such an example might be found in Les Bouches inutiles. In this play, the citizens of Vaucelles who are faced with famine (a situation necessitating material interdependence) join together to fight the surrounding army to assure their freedom (a situation of political interdependence).

\* \* \*

While Beauvoir does not closely examine material interdependence, she does place both emotional and political interdependence under closer scrutiny. Two of the most important emotional commitments examined by Beauvoir are friendship and love.

Les Mandarins provides us with an example of the emotional interdependence necessary for friendship. The relationship between Henri Perron and Robert Dubreuilh shows us the need for mutuality. Having previously described the

basis upon which this friendship is founded, we can now concentrate on examining the concept of mutuality.

The admiration of Henri for Robert is obvious to the reader. It is based on admiration of Robert's work as well as on a certain degree of awe inspired perhaps, in part, by Robert's greater age. (This speculation might be confirmed by the fact that Henri refers to Robert by his last name, thus acknowledging the existence of a certain distance, while the reverse is not so.)

Henri le regarda gaiement ; vingt ans ou quatre-vingts, Dubreuilh aurait toujours l'air aussi jeune à cause de ces yeux énormes et rieurs qui dévoraient tout. Quel fanatique! Par comparaison Henri était tenté souvent de se juger dissipé, paresseux, inconsistant; mais c'était inutile de se forcer. A vingt ans, il admirait tant Dubreuilh qu'il s'était cru obligé de le singer . . .

The feelings of Robert for Henri are of a lesser intensity and are not that readily apparent. This failure of Robert to demonstrate concretely his friendship and esteem for Henri causes the latter to doubt the former's sincerity when they have a political difference of opinion. Robert's wife, Anne, intercedes on his behalf and tries to convince Henri that he is not being used or deceived. She tries to reassure Henri that "--Plus Robert tient aux gens, plus il exige d'eux . . ." <sup>2</sup> Anne further explains that if Robert has seemed to take Henri's cooperation for granted "c'était par estime". <sup>3</sup>

As a result of Robert's failure to manifest his feelings for Henri, the latter becomes convinced that

friendship with the former is impossible. "Dubreuilh avait des alliés, des disciples, des instruments; pas un ami."<sup>4</sup>

Just as Anne has tried to assure Henri of Robert's friendship, she tries to help Robert see that he should resume his friendship with Henri following their quarrel. She suggests that Robert could have avoided a misunderstanding in the first place simply by separating Henri's friendship from his politics. "Dans un cas pareil, vous pouviez donner politiquement tort à Henri sans lui retirer votre amitié."<sup>5</sup> Anne stresses the fact that Henri valued Robert's friendship so much that he agreed to affiliate L'Espoir with the S.R.L. because "il était convaincu qu'en cas de refus il aurait perdu votre amitié."<sup>6</sup>

Following their reconciliation, Robert is able to demonstrate his high opinion of Henri. The two men are speaking of starting a new leftist weekly. Robert explains to Henri why he wants Henri's help. Aside from experience, Robert tells Henri that he is the only candidate to help him because "Il faut que je puisse me fier à lui comme à moi-même : il n'y a que vous."<sup>7</sup> This show of confidence and friendship for Henri by Robert fosters the possibility of cooperation between the two men. Their reciprocal commitment to each other means that they will be able to depend on each other and also turn outward to help others.

Another aspect of emotional interdependence discussed

by Beauvoir is that of love. Like friendship, love is another manner in which an individual moves toward another.

In Les Mandarins, Beauvoir describes two love relationships illustrative of different aspects of emotional interdependence. Part of the love between Anne and Robert is based on the mutual desire to help. On several occasions Anne discusses with Robert the pros and cons of his political actions concerning possible dissolution of the S.R.L., or a decision to reveal or not to reveal the existence of Russian work camps.

Robert helps Anne as she helps him. After their marriage, he encourages her when she decides to become a psychoanalyst. When the opportunity to go to the United States for a professional conference presents itself, Robert helps Anne see how it would be to her advantage to go.

While the love of Robert and Anne is based, in part, on mutual help, the love of Lewis and Anne is based, in part, on mutual need. Anne appreciates Lewis' need for her because, in contrast, Robert seems to need her less. After her return to France following a summer with Lewis, Anne speaks to Robert about her feelings with regard to leaving Lewis who really needs her.

Il [Robert] est venu derrière ma chaise et il a posé ses mains sur mes épaules : "Tu regrettes d'être rentrée?"

--Je ne sais pas, dis-je. Par moments ça me semble absurde de ne pas être là où quelqu'un a besoin de moi; un vrai besoin, comme personne n'en a jamais eu de moi. Et je n'y suis pas.

--Tu crois que tu pourrais vivre là-bas, si loin de

tout? tu crois que tu serais heureuse?

--Si vous n'existiez pas, j'essaierais, dis-je. Sûrement, j'essaierais."

Although Lewis is rather free with his time spent with Anne, in contrast, Robert's work appears to require most, if not all, of his time. Anne feels that Robert must make a special effort to make room for her in his life. This thought occurs to Anne as she watches Robert at work in his home office.

Quelle plénitude dans ce bureau où je n'étais pas! L'air était saturé de fumée et de travail; une pensée omnipotente convoquait ici à son gré le passé, l'avenir, le monde entier; tout était présent; aucune absence. Sur une étagère ma photographie souriait, une photo déjà vieille et qui ne vieillirait jamais; elle était à sa place; mais moi, Robert avait dû veiller toute la nuit pour me faire une place dans ces journées remplies à ras bord; et il y avait quelque chose qu'il n'avait pas fini parce que j'étais revenue trop tôt.

The reader understands how Anne can appreciate Lewis' need for her, especially when it is contrasted with Robert's self-sufficiency. Lewis' need for Anne is so great that he begs her to stay with him and marry him. Although Anne's love for Lewis seems to be completely sincere, we can wonder if some part of that love is based on Anne's need to be needed. In any case, both Anne and Lewis derive happiness from their love, while it lasts.

\* \* \*

Political interdependence is perhaps the most important level of interdependence from an existential point of view. Political interdependence entails individuals and groups working toward a common goal. This type of political involvement is treated by Beauvoir in many of her works,

especially in Les Bouches inutiles, Le Sang des autres, and Les Mandarins.

In Les Bouches inutiles the political interdependence of the citizens of Vaucelles is opposed to the concept of sacrifice. What Beauvoir attempts to show here is that if an action purports to help an entire group (maintaining the freedom of the citizens of Vaucelles) no segment of the group is to be sacrificed (the women, the aged, and the children) in order to attain the goal. Another way of phrasing this would be to say that the risk of political action must be shared by all. The men of Vaucelles learn that they need "les bouches inutiles" as much as "les bouches inutiles" need the men.

Le Sang des autres presents us with a different interpretation of political interdependence. Here the themes of guilt and responsibility are developed. (We remember how Jean feels guilty and responsible after the death of Jacques.) In the course of this book Jean learns that he must accept the deaths of members of his resistance group without feeling guilty. These individuals have freely chosen to accept Jean's leadership in the fight against the Nazis. Jean must accept the responsibility of the group's anti-Nazi actions, and this includes the death of some partisans.

While the enemies fought in Les Bouches inutiles and Le Sang des autres are readily identifiable, those

fought in Les Mandarins are more philosophical in nature. Whereas the people involved in political action in Les Bouches inutiles and Le Sang des autres are average individuals, Les Mandarins describes the political involvement of intellectuals (especially of the Left). Instead of using force to combat the enemy (which is the growing capitalist society) as in the two other books mentioned, the characters in Les Mandarins unite and fight by using words. The two main weapons used in this combat are L'Espoir, a newspaper affiliated with the Left, and the S.R.L., an organization whose meetings allow the expression of opinions and the suggestion of action to be taken. The action taken in Les Mandarins once again contrasts with that described in the other two books since it is non-violent (consisting of holding rallies or writing articles) while the other action is violent (the anti-Nazi sabotage in Le Sang des autres).

What these three books all demonstrate is that political action involves the interdependence of individuals. While the political interdependence described usually takes place on a large scale, the emotional interdependence of friendship and love, described earlier, takes place on a smaller scale. In all these instances we see that the individual, just because he exists, is more or less interdependent with others and does not remain by himself but moves outward to others.

## 2

The interdependence of which we have just spoken entails cooperative action. However, the efficacy of all action can be threatened by a dual danger: the presence of bad faith and the fear of responsibility.

As Beauvoir explains in Pour une morale de l'ambiguïté, the existence of bad faith is due to the fact that each adult is, at first, a child. For a child, the realities of the world are imposed from the outside. The child is basically reliant on others and has no true responsibilities. A moment of change arrives with adolescence as the individual realizes that the world in which he lives is not the rigid structure he thought it was. He learns that he is now expected to act on his own. This transfer from dependence to independence is difficult for the adolescent and is sometimes the beginning of bad faith actions.

Et lorsqu'il arrive à l'âge de l'adolescence, tout son univers se met à vaciller parce qu'il aperçoit les contradictions qui opposent les uns aux autres les adultes, et aussi leurs hésitations, leurs faiblesses. Les hommes cessent de lui apparaître comme des dieux, et en même temps l'adolescent découvre le caractère humain des réalités qui l'entourent : le langage, les coutumes, la morale, les valeurs ont leur source dans ces créatures incertaines; le moment est venu où il va être appelé à participer lui aussi à leur opération; ses actes pèsent sur terre autant que ceux des autres hommes, il va lui falloir choisir et décider. On comprend qu'il ait peine à vivre ce moment de son histoire, et c'est là sans doute la cause la plus profonde de la crise de l'adolescence : c'est que l'individu doit enfin assumer sa subjectivité.<sup>10</sup>

In essence, the adolescent is confronted with the

existence of his liberty and must decide how to cope with it. Some form of bad faith action will be the result of this confrontation if the individual somehow fails to accept his liberty and the responsibility that goes with it.

Beauvoir describes several types of bad faith behavior which we will mention and briefly describe. There is the apathetic "sous homme" who "réduit à néant le sens de son dépassement par l'incohérence de ses projets, ses caprices désordonnés ou son indifférence; ses actes ne sont jamais des choix positifs ; seulement des fuites."<sup>11</sup>

"L'homme sérieux" bases his existence on objects and pre-established values thus eliminating the need for decision making. "L'homme sérieux se débarrasse de sa liberté en prétendant la subordonner à des valeurs qui seraient inconditionnées; il imagine que l'accession à ces valeurs le valorise lui-même d'une manière permanente . . ."<sup>12</sup>

The attitude of nihilism is still another way of acting in bad faith. The nihilist "veut n'être rien et ce néant qu'il rêve est encore une sorte d'être . . ."<sup>13</sup>

For the individual who wants his life to be more enjoyable, the attitude of the adventurer is appropriate. Emphasis will be placed on action for its own sake with no particular goals in mind. "Il [the adventurer] se jette avec ardeur dans des entreprises : exploration, conquête, guerre, spéculation, amour, politique, mais il ne s'attache pas à la fin visée; seulement à sa conquête."<sup>14</sup>

What we note from these descriptions of some possible bad faith attitudes is that in one way or another all are failures as far as the acceptance of individual liberty and its consequences is concerned.

\* \* \*

In her fiction, Beauvoir seems to treat bad faith mainly from the point of view of the fear of responsibility. One exception comes to mind, that of Marcel in Le Sang des autres. Marcel is the artist who decides to look for the absolute. He wants his paintings to be able to exist without having to depend on the public.

In his search for the absolute work of art, Marcel abandons his painting and tries working with wood and marble. His desire is to have something that truly "is," an absolute. Yet, he always finds that someone must make his work exist. In a moment of desperation he destroys all he has created.

Depuis des années déjà Marcel avait cessé de peindre ces images qui réclamaient pour vivre la complaisance d'un regard étranger. Il voulait créer pour de bon. Il avait taillé du bois, modelé de la glaise, travaillé à même le marbre; il caressait avec satisfaction la dure matière où sa main avait coulé une forme parlante; ça tenait debout tout seul, on pouvait tourner autour, ça ne semblait rien avoir à envier à une chaise, à une table. Mais bientôt, il s'était mis à regarder ses oeuvres d'un air sombre. Le marbre existait, la lourde pierre nue. "Mais le visage, où est le visage?" disait Marcel avec fureur. Il pointait deux doigts vers moi. "Il est dans tes yeux, pas ailleurs." Un matin, il avait chargé ses oeuvres sur une charrette à bras, il s'était attelé aux brancards et il avait traîné la voiture jusqu'aux entrepôts de Bercy, il avait fait basculer la charrette dans la Seine.<sup>15</sup>

Marcel has given up in his efforts to create something because, as he says: "--On ne peut pas créer. Il y avait toujours quelque chose qui existait avant."<sup>16</sup> For Marcel, creation is a means of expressing his "being" prior to which he must "be." The sense of this "being" is being like God, which is impossible for man. Therefore, Marcel's efforts to create will be in vain. "Créer, c'est un effort pour exprimer son être; mais d'abord il faut être. C'est déjà toute une affaire. Il faut trouver un moyen de se mettre en contact avec l'être. Il tourna la tête à droite et à gauche : Regarder, palper, c'est déjà un contact."<sup>17</sup>

Marcel's actions serve to severely upset his wife, Denise. Since Marcel looks for his life only in objects, he cruelly criticizes Denise's social involvements. Jean suggests that Marcel should be more considerate of Denise.

--Tu es quand même trop vache avec Denise, dis-je.  
 --Qu'est-ce que tu veux? Nous ne parlons pas la même langue. Denise, c'est une sociale. Ce que pensent les gens, ce que disent les gens, ce qu'approuvent les gens, voilà ce qui compte pour elle. Il frappa sa large poitrine : Et que moi, pauvre petit individu unique, je m'inquiète de mon propre sort, ça lui semble simplement fou. Il hocha la tête : Je te dis que c'est une espèce dangereuse.<sup>18</sup>

Marcel has sought to impose his ethic of objects on Denise and is not justified in having done so. However, as with others of Beauvoir's heroes, Marcel undergoes a change and decides that people are more important than objects. He resumes his painting and asks to help Jean with the resistance movement. The reason for the change in Marcel's

attitude lies in the failure of his bad faith behavior. Objects have not enabled him to attain "being." Furthermore, his experience of painting frescoes in the prisoner-of-war camp has shown him the satisfaction to be derived from an appreciative public.

Marcel's bad faith is based on his futile search for "being." Jean Blomart's bad faith is based on his fear of acting. As exemplified by Jacques' death, which we have previously discussed, Jean has found that he is unable to predict who will be influenced by his actions. To compensate for this fact, Jean denies his freedom and refuses to act.

However, just as Marcel's bad faith actions fail, Jean's do also. Although Jean's action brought undesired consequences, he finds that his inaction brings other equally undesired consequences. Jean realizes for himself that "chacun de mes gestes comme chacun de mes refus entraînaît derrière lui un danger mortel."<sup>19</sup> Since both action and inaction have undesired consequences, Jean thinks about removing himself from the world by suicide but realizes that even his death will have an effect on those he knows.

M'effacer. Ne plus être. Mais même si je me tue je continuerai à être. Je serai mort. Ils resteront enchaînés à ma mort et ce creux brusquement apparu sur la terre fera vibrer et craquer mille fibres imprévues. Berthier prendra ma place; ou Lenfant. Je serai encore responsable de tous ces actes que mon absence aura rendus possibles. . . . Je ne peux pas m'effacer. Je ne peux pas me retirer en moi. J'existe, hors de moi et partout dans le monde; il n'est pas un pouce de ma route qui n'empiète sur la route d'un autre; il n'y a aucune manière d'être qui puisse m'empêcher de me déborder moi-même à chaque instant.

Eventually the facts that H  l  ne had to abort an unwanted child, that Jean's inattention made H  l  ne unhappy, and that because of the inaction of Jean and others a war is starting, combine to make Jean realize that his bad faith strategy of inaction is a failure. Jean decides that it is necessary to act and to accept the consequences, both good and bad, of his actions.

Another character acting in bad faith is Jean-Pierre in Les Bouches inutiles. Here, the fear of responsibility is evident. Jean-Pierre refuses to accept the responsibility of distributing the remaining food to a town facing famine because he is aware of the fact that his action will cause the discomfort and maybe even the death of some individuals. (It is interesting to note that Jean-Pierre tries to avoid an action whose negative impact is known beforehand while Jean Blomart avoids action whose negative impact is not known in advance.) He is under the erroneous impression that by not accepting this responsibility he will keep his "mains pures."<sup>21</sup>

Keeping in mind the fact that Jean-Pierre has already risked his life by crossing the lines of the army besieging Vaucelles, we observe the language used by Catherine (who has been responsible for Jean-Pierre's upbringing) when she attempts to convince Jean-Pierre to accept the food distribution post. After establishing the fact that Jean-Pierre has indeed refused the post, Catherine asks: "Veux-tu

rester toujours un aventurier? Est-ce pour cela que je t'ai élevé avec tant de soin?"<sup>22</sup> The reader will recall the previous description of the bad faith adventurer who loves action for its own sake without concern for goals. By her words, Catherine implies that Jean-Pierre should now live his life so that it has a concrete goal: helping the people of Vaucelles.

Like Jean, Jean-Pierre refuses to accept responsibility because of the risks involved in action. As he tells Catherine: "Il y a tant de menaces cachées dans chacun de nos gestes, dans chacune de nos paroles; nos actes vont éclater loin de nous sous des figures inconnues; jamais je n'aurai l'audace de jeter en travers d'une vie étrangère le poids de ma volonté."<sup>23</sup>

Failure of the bad faith strategy of Jean-Pierre is once again the key to his change in attitude. However, he is able to act to persuade the council members that the planned sacrifice of "les bouches inutiles" is illogical and harmful. His final decision is to act responsibly and to accept the risks involved.

As we have seen, there are several types of bad faith action. What they all seem to have in common is the inability of an individual to accept his freedom. Nevertheless, this attitude need not be permanent. It is often changed to a good faith attitude when the only results experienced by the individual have been those of failure.

\* \* \*

While bad faith actions are portrayed by Beauvoir as negative, good faith actions are not always portrayed as totally positive. This is due in part to one of the ideas we have partially discussed in our analysis of bad faith and which is a central theme in Le Sang des autres. Stated simply, we can say that we are all assassins responsible for "le sang des autres" by our silence as well as by the position we take.

This thought is noteworthy because of the pessimism it seems to imply. Upon closer examination, what we find is that this thought is only an accurate description of reality. It serves to dispel any notion that one can avoid responsibility simply by not acting. We discover that it is impossible to live and maintain "les mains pures." The very fact that an individual exists means that he might, even inadvertently, harm or cause harm to come to others. This thought of the potential harm one can cause without so desiring is pessimistic. However, it is to some extent mitigated by the acceptance of responsibility and by the knowledge that no harm is intended.

The problem posed by this thought is: how can one take action knowing that it will harm others? Our previous examination of Le Sang des autres has acquainted us with the fact that simply by existing we can do others harm. When an individual exists, he becomes a given part of the situation

within which others must exist. Thus we have seen that Jean exists and is part of H el ene's situation. Because Jean exists, it is possible for H el ene to meet and fall in love with him. However, as Jean realizes, H el ene is not able to choose that Jean does not exist. This lack of choice is part of the absurdity of existence. "Mais quel choix lui avait  t e r serv ? Pouvait-elle choisir que je l'aime? que je n'existe pas? qu'elle ne m'ait pas rencontr ?"<sup>24</sup>

Jean sees his existence as being absurd not only because he is a given for the situation of others but also because he has not chosen to be.

. . . ce qui fait la valeur d'un homme  a n'existe que pour lui, pas pour moi ; moi, je n'atteins que ses dehors; et je ne suis rien d'autre pour lui qu'un dehors, un donn  absurde; un donn  que je ne choisis m me pas d' tre . . .

--Alors, calme-toi dit Marcel; si tu ne choisis m me pas, tu n'as pas besoin de te frapper.

--Je ne choisis pas d' tre, mais je suis. Une absurdit  responsable d'elle-m me, voil  ce que je suis.<sup>25</sup>

Having established the fact that he exists without having chosen to, and that his actions have harmed people, Jean decides to adopt a policy of non-action encompassing both his political and social life. When Jean's plan backfires and he discovers that people are also being hurt by his inaction he will accept the truth of a statement made by Marcel. "--C'est pourtant vrai ce qu'ils objectent, dit Marcel. Ne pas faire de politique, c'est encore en faire."<sup>26</sup> In other words, the choice not to act is as much of an action as the choice to act and, as such, involves just as many unpredictable consequences.

Marcel once says while speaking of Jean: "--Il a toujours été persuadé que chacun de ses gestes était un assassinat . . ." <sup>27</sup> Instead of trying to escape this fact, Jean will accept it and work with it realizing that it is part of the human condition.

Because we are human beings, all of our gestures, whether active or passive, are a result of our personal choice, and as these gestures are made by us, they have an effect on other individuals. Since we are only human beings and not gods, we cannot predict the ultimate outcome of our gestures, but must assume the element of risk involved knowing that we harm others by whatever we do or do not do.

## 3

The nature of actions and their consequences is another topic considered by Beauvoir. An action meets with change because even though it may be performed by one individual it is directed to and acted upon by many individuals.

L'acte ne s'arrête pas à l'instant où nous l'accomplissons, il nous échappe vers l'avenir; mais il y est aussitôt ressaisi par des consciences étrangères; il n'est jamais pour autrui une contrainte aveugle, mais un donné à dépasser et c'est autrui qui le dépasse, non pas moi. A partir de cet acte figé, autrui se jette lui-même dans un avenir que je ne lui ai pas tracé. Mon action n'est pour autrui que ce qu'il en fait lui-même; comment donc saurais-je d'avance ce que je fais? et si je ne le sais pas, comment puis-je me proposer d'agir pour l'humanité? Je construis une maison pour les hommes de demain; ils s'y abriteront peut-être; mais elle peut aussi les gêner dans leurs constructions futures; peut-être la subiront-ils, peut-être la démoliront-ils, <sup>28</sup> peut-être l'habiteront-ils et elle s'écroulera sur eux.

The unpredictability of actions and their results is discussed in Tous les hommes sont mortels. Fosca's immortality permits many actions and consequences to be considered.

To put Fosca's experience in perspective, we recall how, in her philosophy, Beauvoir has depicted the relationship between action and transcendence. A person chooses to reach a certain goal. Once this goal is attained, the person uses it as a starting point to reach the next goal he sets for himself. This is a continuing process. However, sometimes an action does not have the predicted or desired effect, so the person is obliged to expend more time and effort than was originally intended.

Fosca's desire to help his town of Carmona enables him to make his first commitment to better the town. When Vezzani takes the power from Rienzi and then does nothing with it, he incurs Fosca's criticism. For Fosca, power is something to be used to take action and not just something to be held onto for its own sake. Fosca speaks to Vezzani about taking some action:

--Qu'attends-tu pour agir?  
 --N'ai-je pas agi? dit-il.  
 --Pourquoi as-tu pris le pouvoir si c'est pour n'en rien faire?  
 --Je l'ai pris, je l'ai; cela me suffit.  
 --Ah, dis-je avec passion. Si j'étais à ta place!  
 --Eh bien?  
 --Je négocierais pour Carmona de puissantes alliances, j'entreprendrais des guerres, j'agrandirais son territoire, je bâtirais des palais . . .  
 --Tout cela demanderait bien du temps, dit Vezzani.

--Tu as le temps.  
 Son visage devint grave, soudain :  
 --Tu sais bien que non.<sup>29</sup>

Fosca is very ambitious and is acutely aware of the short time which will be at his disposal when he wishes to help Carmona. Once Fosca has become ruler of Carmona it is the combination of these factors which leads him to drink the potion of immortality. He does not want to see his actions uncompleted because of a lack of time. After having saved Carmona for a first time, Fosca thinks of the future and the relationship linking action, time, and death. "Je pensai : 'Ils mourront tous, et Carmona sera sauvée. Et alors, je mourrai et la ville sauvée tombera aux mains des Florentins ou de Milan. J'aurai sauvé Carmona, et je n'aurai rien fait.'"<sup>30</sup>

Fosca drinks the potion without fully realizing all the implications of this action. While others celebrate Carmona's recent victory, Fosca cannot fully savor the joy of the moment but looks toward the future and further action.

Le soir, il y eut un immense festin; assis à la droite de Catherine, Malatesta buvait et riait comme un homme qui a touché au but. Moi aussi je sentais la chaleur du vin qui coulait dans mes veines et la joie était en moi; mais elle ne ressemblait pas à celle des autres, elle était dure et noir, elle écrasait mon coeur comme une pierre : Je pensais : "ceci n'est qu'un commencement."<sup>31</sup>

Almost immediately Fosca undertakes more conquests. He sees to it that Carmona grows by advocating early marriage and the raising of many children. However, as his son Tancredi points out, Fosca is sacrificing the happiness of those

living in the present to insure some, as yet, unrealized future. Tancredi speaks to Fosca.

--Nous sommes aussi riches que Sienne et que Pise, et nous ne connaissons d'autres fêtes que les noces et les baptêmes. Nous sommes vêtus comme des moines et nous habitons des couvents. Je suis votre fils et il me faut faire l'exercice matin et soir sous les ordres d'un grossier capitaine. Moi et mes camarades nous vieillirons sans avoir eu de jeunesse.

--L'avenir nous récompensera de nos peines, dis-je.

--Et qui nous rendra les années que vous nous volez? dit-il.

Il me regarda :

--Moi je n'ai qu'une vie.

Je haussai les épaules. Qu'était-ce qu'une vie?<sup>32</sup>

Unable to accept Tancredi's complaint, Fosca continues to work for Carmona. However, his actions soon have the first unforeseen consequence. Eager to assume the power promised to him by his father, Tancredi tries to take power by force and is killed by Fosca.

Fosca is filled with loneliness and indifference with both his wife and son dead. Carmona and its welfare, once the prime concerns of Fosca, become unimportant for him. In a search to find action which will give him large enough goals, Fosca makes the decision to leave Carmona and conquer the world with the Habsbourgs.

Fosca's original commitment to help Carmona has lost its appeal. Although he has saved the town many times, Fosca feels that his life is repetitious and lacks challenges. However, he will make the same discovery on a larger scale as he attempts to help the Habsbourgs with their conquests.

Discouraged with his adventures in Europe, Fosca persuades the emperor that he should possess holdings in the New World. However, here too, Fosca is forced to come to the same conclusion. Fosca, who originally set himself the task of working for the good of Carmona is faced with the evidence that the actions of humanity will prevent him from ever achieving its "good." This realization comes to Fosca as he reflects upon the progress made by humanity.

Le monde s'élargissait, les hommes devenaient plus nombreux, leurs villes plus vastes, ils conquéraient sur les forêts et sur les marécages des terrains fertiles, ils inventaient de nouveaux outils; mais leurs luttes se faisaient plus sauvages, dans les massacres les victimes périssaient par milliers : ils apprenaient à détruire en même temps qu'à construire. On aurait dit qu'un dieu buté s'appliquait à maintenir entre la vie et la mort, entre la prospérité et la misère, un immuable et absurde équilibre.<sup>33</sup>

Upset with the fact that the New World Indians have been cruelly exterminated as part of the conquest Fosca encouraged, he asks himself: "Quel homme peut prévoir les conséquences de ses actes?"<sup>34</sup>

One of the reasons that this action-consequence relationship is more apparent to Fosca is because of his immortality. A normal human being might not live long enough to see the consequences of a specific action. What proves especially discouraging to Fosca is seeing his actions undone by the efforts of those people he wanted to help. Also, mortals look forward to a future in which they achieve their ends, but for Fosca, the future is something to be avoided because he will not achieve his ends. He says:

"C'était peut-être cela qui me séparait d'eux [mortals] le plus irrémédiablement : ils vivaient tendus vers un avenir où s'accompliraient tous leurs efforts présents. Et pour moi l'avenir était un temps étranger, détesté . . ."35

However, while mortals can act with faith in the future, they cannot afford to wait for a future time that would be compatible with their acts. People must act in the present in order to form the future they desire. This thought is expressed by Garnier who is fighting for "la République" with Fosca. "--Nous n'avons pas à attendre que l'avenir donne un sens à nos actes; sinon toute action serait impossible. Il faut mener notre combat comme nous avons décidé de le mener, c'est tout."36

The thought of seeing their actions undone by future generations does not upset Armand, Fosca's grandson by his marriage to Marianne, and his friends. For Armand and his friends, the answer to Fosca's despair over the unpredictable consequences of his action is that life is what is important. Fosca speaks to Armand:

--J'ai voulu jadis que Carmona fût libre, dis-je. Et parce que je l'ai sauvée du joug de Florence et de Gênes, elle a été perdue avec Florence et Gênes. Vous voulez la République, la liberté; qui vous dit que cette réussite ne vous achemine pas vers les pires tyrannies? Si l'on vit assez longtemps, on voit que toute victoire se change un jour en défaite . . .

Sans doute mon accent l'agaça car il dit vivement :  
--Oh! j'ai quelque teinture d'histoire; vous ne m'apprenez rien. Tout ce qu'on fait finit par se défaire, je sais. Et dès l'heure où l'on naît on commence à mourir. Mais entre la naissance et la mort il y a la vie.

Armand is able to further justify his relationship with the future in the eyes of Fosca. Since he is mortal, his acts concern themselves with a rather limited future while Fosca's actions seek to encompass a much more extensive future. Armand tells Fosca that although the future for which he is working is limited, it is still capable of providing satisfaction.

--Un avenir limité; une vie limitée : c'est notre lot d'homme, c'est assez, dit-il. Si je pensais que dans cinquante ans il sera défendu d'employer les enfants dans les manufactures, défendu de faire travailler des hommes plus de dix heures, que le peuple choisira ses représentants, que la presse sera libre, je serais satisfait.<sup>38</sup>

What the reader understands after having read Tous les hommes sont mortels is that for Fosca the act of drinking the potion of immortality was the one act for which he could not see the consequences. Because of the infinity of time allotted to Fosca, he would not be able to set goals and transcend them as mortals do. Instead, he would see time undo his acts. On the other hand, Fosca sees that an action undertaken by a responsible person can bring joy even if the attainment and transcendence of a goal means that new action might have to be initiated. Fosca describes the attitude of Armand's people who realize that "sa victoire était une vraie victoire, et l'avenir ne pouvait rien contre elle; il [the people] savait que demain il faudrait recommencer à vouloir, à refuser, à combattre; demain il recommencerait; aujourd'hui il était vainqueur."<sup>39</sup>

Fosca is forced to go further than he wanted in his action because he did not see the consequences of becoming immortal. In addition, his actions are different from those of others because part of the element of responsibility is destroyed since Fosca acts without any personal risk and because Fosca cannot act with genuine solidarity since his immortality separates him from other human beings.

\* \* \*

We have seen that responsibility is an integral part of good faith action. What remains to be seen is how far this responsibility extends. We must keep in mind that an action, even if performed by one individual, affects the lives of others. Also, as we have seen in the case of Fosca, a particular action may have unforeseen consequences. An explanation of the link of the self with the other as it concerns action and responsibility is found in Pyrrhus et Cinéas.

Je dis que je ne peux rien ni pour autrui, ni contre autrui ; mais cela ne me délivre pas du souci de mon rapport avec lui. Car quoi que je fasse, j'existe devant lui. Je suis là, confondu pour lui avec la scandaleuse existence de tout ce qui n'est pas lui, je suis la facticité de sa situation. Autrui est libre, à partir de là ; à partir de là seulement; totalement libre ; mais libre en face de ceci et non de cela, en face de moi. La fatalité qui pèse sur autrui. C'est toujours nous ; la fatalité, c'est le visage figé que tourne vers chacun la liberté de tous les autres. C'est en ce sens que Dostoïevski disait que "chacun est responsable de tout, devant tous". Immobile ou agissant, nous pesons toujours sur la terre; tout refus est choix, tout silence a une voix. Notre passivité même est voulue; pour ne pas choisir, il faut encore choisir de ne pas choisir; il est impossible d'échapper.<sup>40</sup>

It is suitable that this same quotation from Dostoevsky serves to open Le Sang des autres for it is in this book that the implications of responsibility are examined by Beauvoir.

Jean is still a child when he encounters an incident which makes him feel a sense of responsibility to another. Louise, the family servant, has just suffered the death of her child. Jean, upset with the news, is crying. Jean's father is unhappy that his son's crying will prevent him from eating so he tells his son to stop crying. "--Écoute, dit mon père. C'est très triste que le petit de Louise soit mort, j'en suis navré pour elle, mais nous n'allons pas le pleurer toute notre vie."<sup>41</sup>

Jean is baffled by his father's reaction. If he is not to grieve over Louise's baby for his whole life, how long a time is it appropriate for him to grieve? How close a relationship must there be to merit sustained grieving by Jean? M. Blomart has in effect told Jean that Louise's unhappiness is none of his business. However, Jean disagrees and feels a certain guilt.

Le petit de Louise est mort. Il se forçait à contempler l'image : Louise assise au bord du lit, qui pleurerait. Lui ne pleurerait plus. . . . Le petit de Louise est mort. En vain. Ce n'est pas mon malheur. . . . Je me suis faufilé sous le piano, et dans mon lit j'ai pleuré jusqu'au sommeil à cause de cette chose qui avait coulé dans ma gorge avec le potage tiède, plus âcre que le remords : ma faute. La faute de sourire pendant que Louise pleurait, la faute de pleurer mes larmes et non les siennes.<sup>42</sup>

As a child, Jean, in spite of his sympathy, remains outside of this event. However, as an adult, Jean and his friends react with increased concern to other events of greater impact.

The Spanish civil war is one of the events of which Jean and his friends become aware. As a former Communist, Jean objects to the fascist oppression in Spain as well as to the killing of Spanish workers. However, Jean is in France while this is taking place. Therefore, is this of any concern to him? The answer has to be yes, because innocent people are dying. Nevertheless, Jean hesitates taking action because he feels that in good conscience he could not see others lose their lives to pay for the loss of Spanish liberties: "Derrière les Pyrénées, les travailleurs d'Espagne tombaient sous les balles fascistes, mais pouvais-je racheter leur sang au prix de vies françaises, au prix d'une seule vie qui ne fût pas la mienne?"<sup>43</sup>

Added to the sentiment of guilt felt by Jean when Louise's baby died, we now find the question of sacrifice. Even though Jean feels responsible for the Spanish and considers some action, he would also feel responsible for the deaths of any of his friends. Jean fears that he would not be able to justify his friends' deaths and therefore does not act.

However, the Nazi actions throughout Europe serve to set up a similar and perhaps more horrifying situation. Jean

is already aware of the slaughter of Jews in concentration camps but is especially affected by the German annexation of Austria. When Jean expresses his concern to H el ene about this event, H el ene glosses over it by saying it is none of Jean's business. However, Jean does not agree:

Elle [H el ene] ajouta avec un peu d'agacement.

--Apr es tout, ce n'est pas ton affaire.

--Pas mon affaire, dis-je, je voudrais bien qu'on me dise quelle est mon affaire.

--Il y a ta vie   toi, dit H el ene. Tu ne trouves pas que c'est suffisant?

--Mais ma vie est justement faite de mes rapports avec les autres hommes; l'Autriche est dans ma vie, le monde entier est dans ma vie.

--Evidemment; et ces gens que nous croisons sont dans ta vie puisque tu les vois. H el ene avait rougi et pris une voix peu aigre comme chaque fois qu'un argument l'embarrassait :  a ne veut pas dire que tu sois responsable de ce qui leur arrive.

--C'est   savoir, dis-je du bout des l evres.<sup>44</sup>

Jean attempts to explain to H el ene why he feels responsible for the fate of others. He feels that since people are acting individuals and not just part of a meaningless mass they have a certain responsibility. Since each individual is responsible, each individual must act in a responsible manner for himself as well as for others. This is the thought that Jean wants to convey to H el ene.

--J'ai [Jean] lu un jour : chaque homme est responsable de tout, devant tous.  a me semble tellement vrai. H el ene me regarda d'un air boudeur.

--Je ne comprends pas, dit-elle.

--Evidemment, si on se regarde comme une fourmi dans une fourmili re, on ne peut rien   rien. Je ne dis pas que j'aurais pu arr ter l'entr e des nazis en  tendant les bras. Je revoyais ma m re dans les rues de S ville, ses petits bras tendus : Pourtant, si nous avions tous  tendu les bras . . .

--Peut- tre. Mais personne ne l'a fait. Les autres sont aussi responsables que toi.

--C'est leur affaire. Bien sûr. Nous sommes tous responsables. Mais tous, ça vaut dire chacun. J'ai toujours senti ça, même quand j'étais gosse : il suffit de mes yeux pour que ce boulevard existe. Il suffit de ma voix pour que le monde ait une voix. Quand il se tait, c'est ma faute.<sup>45</sup>

Although Jean is convinced of the need to take action against the Nazis, he sees that many individuals are unwilling to sacrifice their lives to attain the goal of destroying the Nazis. They see the means (death of some French) as unjustified for achieving the end (destruction of the Nazis). (This rejection of personal sacrifice can be contrasted with the example of sacrifice in Les Bouches inutiles. In this case any means, including the death of "les bouches inutiles" is considered justified for achieving the end of freeing Vaucelles.) It becomes obvious to Jean that in their concern with avoiding death, people have forgotten the significance of life. The question he then asks is: is life to be lived just for its own sake? Jean speaks to Hélène of his feelings on this subject:

A Vienne, les Juifs lavaient les trottoirs avec des acides qui leur rongeaient les doigts, sous les yeux amusés des passants; nous n'allions pas nous faire tuer pour ça; ni pour empêcher dans les nuits de Prague le sourd éclatement des suicides; ni pour prévenir ces incendies qui s'allumeraient bientôt dans les villages de Pologne. Tout occupés à déclarer pourquoi nous ne voulions pas mourir; nous inquiétions-nous de savoir pourquoi nous vivions encore?<sup>46</sup>

Furthermore, Jean realizes that since no action was taken because of the fear of sacrifice, more people have died and he is responsible for these deaths.

"Pas de grève politique." Cette prudence, cette prudence insensée! "Je ne pousserai pas mon pays à la guerre." Et c'est la guerre, la guerre perdue. Nous n'avons pas osé tuer, nous n'avons pas voulu mourir, et cette vermine verte nous dévore vivants. Les femmes et les nouveaux-nés crèvent dans les fossés; sur ce sol qui n'est déjà plus le nôtre un immense réseau de fer s'est abattu, enserrant par millions les hommes de France. A cause de moi. Chacun est responsable de tout.<sup>47</sup>

\* \* \*

Another concept associated with that of sacrifice is the concept of guilt or remorse. Action may entail both the sacrifice of one's own life as well as that of the lives of others. While Jean would be able to cope with his own death, he feels he would not be able to cope with the guilt he would feel by causing the deaths of others. We have already seen the guilt Jean feels after Jacques' death. Since this death, Jean's attitude toward action involving possible sacrifice could be summarized as follows: "Je ne lèverai pas un doigt pour faire tuer un homme."<sup>48</sup> The fact that the Nazi threat is so serious plus the fact that Jean feels guilt for the consequences of his passivity, combine to cause him to decide to take action. However, Jean is quite specific as to the nature of the action he and his friends must take. This action will have the double goal of causing damage to the Nazis as well as arousing the French to action. It is for the latter reason that Jean specifies that all the action taken must be noticed by the public and be of such a magnitude that the Nazis will be obliged to retaliate. If the action itself does not arouse the French

public, then the Nazi killing of French citizens in reprisal should. Jean plans this action because he now feels ready to accept the responsibility for the lives of others. Jean discusses these plans with some friends:

--Si nous voulons constituer une force capable de rallier les masses, capable de tenir le coup jusqu'à la fin de guerre et de construire l'avenir, nous devons agir, dit Blomart. Nous n'existons que si nous agissons.

--On pourrait peut-être se livrer à des sabotages, dit Leclerc.

--Il faut des actes bien visibles, dit Blomart. Des trains de munitions qui sautent, des hôtels réquisitionnés qui explosent. Il faut que les Français se sentent encore en guerre. Voulez-vous créer ou non une résistance? Ce n'est pas avec des V, des croix de Lorraine, des cannes à pêche que vous maintiendrez le pays dans un état d'agitation.

--Avez-vous pensé qu'il y aurait de terribles représailles? dit Parmentier.

--Justement, dit Blomart.

--Justement?

Parmentier regardait Blomart avec scandale. "Je sais", pensa Blomart. Qui savait mieux que lui? Il était là, un verre de fine dans sa main et disposant avec des mots d'un sang qui n'alimentait pas son propre coeur. Mais ce n'était pas de lui qu'il était question.

Jean and his friends implement the program of action described above. As expected, deaths occur. The Nazis execute French citizens in reprisal. But it is Héléne's death which presents Jean with a crisis. Jean's discussions with Héléne on her deathbed finally enable him to overcome his feelings of guilt. These feelings are far reaching since they also include the past when Jean's refusal to become emotionally involved with Héléne hurt her.

Although Héléne will die and Jean will feel responsible for her death, Héléne is able to make Jean see that he

should not feel guilty about her death. H  l  ne chose to work with Jean and was aware of the risks involved and decided to take them. Jean did not cause her death. His presence was only part of H  l  ne's given world. Jean evaluates H  l  ne's thoughts as he sits by the bedside. "Je te crois, je dois te croire. Aucun mal ne t'est venu par moi. Sous tes pieds je n'ai   t   qu'une pierre innocente. Innocente comme la pierre, comme ce morceau d'acier qui a d  chir   ton poumon. Il ne t'a pas tu  e; ce n'est pas moi qui t'ai tu  e, mon cher amour."<sup>50</sup>

Jean's freedom from guilt is important for it enables him to decide to continue the resistance action even though more deaths will be the result of this decision. Had the feeling of guilt persisted, it is likely that, as with Jacques' death, it would have had a paralyzing effect on Jean and he would have been unable to take further action. Without guilt feelings, Jean is free to continue group action with his friends and work for the destruction of the Nazis.

## 4

What we have seen is how the acceptance of responsibility on an individual basis and group basis leads to the joint action of many individuals working toward the same goal. This is the idea of solidarity to which we have previously alluded. The concept of solidarity seems to make its appearance most often when a group of individuals join

together to accept or fight a common fate. This theme is apparent in Les Bouches inutiles.

The citizens of Vaucelles, besieged by an enemy army, are all victims of the same situation. Their food supply has been cut off and they face death by starvation. However, at the opening of the play an atmosphere of disunity and of lack of solidarity exists among the citizens. Each individual is most concerned with how he will get sufficient food. The fact that the town is fighting for its political freedom seems less important. Jean-Pierre notices the discontent by the way people look at him. "Tous les regards que je rencontre ont l'air de reproches ou de prières."<sup>51</sup> When some workers see bread being brought to feed the indigents of Vaucelles, they object that only the workers should be fed. We see that the town has become divided with workers opposing non-workers.

Le Porteur

Laissez-nous passer. C'est le pain des indigents.

Un Maçon

Nous mourons de faim et on nourrit les indigents!

Premier Maçon

Donne-nous ce pain. Ceux qui ne travaillent pas n'ont pas besoin de manger.

Le Porteur

A l'aide! Au secours!

Ils se battent.

Louis

Bas les mains. Volerez-vous le pain de vieillards, des enfants, des femmes?

Premier Maçon

Nous avons besoin d'être forts. Eux, à quoi servent-ils?

Silence. François met la main sur le bras de Louis.

François

Oui. A quoi servent-ils? <sup>52</sup>

Ils se regardent en silence.

It is this conflict between the workers and non-workers which provides the background for a decision to be made to sacrifice the non-workers "les bouches inutiles," so that some people will be strong enough to fight the army surrounding the city. What has happened is that the citizenry of Vaucelles, which should have been trying to find a suitable means of defeating the enemy together, has been divided by the death sentence placed on the non-workers.

Although Jean-Pierre has previously refused to take responsibility for action that would enable all the citizens of Vaucelles to unite and fight their oppressors, he now tries to reunite the divided town. Jean-Pierre is permitted to speak to the town council where he attempts to show the men that if they feel they have the power to decide which individuals are valuable or not a tyrant could do the same thing to them: "Vous aviez décidé : les vieillards, les infirmes, sont des bouches inutiles; pourquoi un tyran ne jugerait-il pas vos libertés inutiles et vos vies infortunées? Si un seul homme peut être regardé comme un déchet, cent mille hommes ensemble ne sont qu'un tas d'ordures."<sup>53</sup>

The question of death bothers the men who see it as an evil. Louis explains to them that if death is the result of fighting for a desired goal it should not be considered an evil. He pleads for the solidarity of all the citizens of Vaucelles fighting together, united in their goal.

Louis: "Une mort librement choisie n'est pas un mal. Mais

ces femmes et ces vieillards que vous jetterez au fossé aucun choix ne leur est permis. Et vous leur volerez leur mort avec leur vie. Nous ne ferons pas cela! Que cette nuit, uni dans une seule volonté, un peuple libre affronte son destin."<sup>54</sup>

The idea of the goal of the people of Vaucelles is clarified by Louis. Since the people have fought to free themselves from the duke, the action they are about to take must be consistent with this freedom. Condemning "les bouches inutiles" to death is an inappropriate action since it deprives them of their freedom. However, joining together to fight the attacking army is an action which demonstrates the freedom of all the citizens of Vaucelles. Furthermore, we note that it is the action itself and not the outcome which will enable the people to be victorious since in either case they will have acted as free individuals.

Premier Député

Nous touchons au but : renoncerons-nous?

Louis

Quel est le but? Nous avons chassé le duc pour être des hommes libres. Disons seulement un mot, faisons un geste, et voilà que ce but est atteint. Aucun échec n'est plus à craindre. Que nous réussissions cette 55 sortie ou que nous soyons massacrés, nous triomphons.

It is interesting to note that the play ends with the citizens of Vaucelles preparing to meet the enemy soldiers. No outcome of their action is indicated. The important idea is that this group of people has asserted its freedom and in the spirit of solidarity has joined together in the face of

common suffering and death. In addition, the reader has been able to see how an atmosphere of solidarity can be created.

\* \* \*

Although responsibility and solidarity are characteristics needed for the successful completion of certain actions, there are other characteristics which are outgrowths of these two attributes. Two of these other characteristics are friendship and generosity. Perhaps the best examples of these characteristics are found in Les Mandarins.

Even though the relationship between Anne and Robert is that of wife and husband, it is also a relationship of friendship and generosity. Both members of this couple feel responsible for each other. They act with mutual consideration and respect to achieve the goals they share.

Both individuals wish to help humanity and work toward that end. Anne has become a psychoanalyst because she is best at dealing with individuals on a one-to-one basis and in the present. Out of his friendship and generosity, Robert has encouraged Anne in her work. Anne tells of her choice of profession and Robert's help.

Et puis l'avenir me paraît bien lointain, j'ai peine à m'intéresser aux hommes qui ne sont pas encore nés, j'ai plutôt envie d'aider ceux qui se trouvent vivre juste en ce moment. C'est pour ça que ce métier me tentait. Oh! je n'ai jamais pensé qu'on pût du dehors apporter à quelqu'un un salut préfabriqué, mais souvent ce sont des niaiseries qui séparent les gens de leur bonheur, et je voulais les en débarrasser. Robert m'a

encouragée; là-dessus, il se sépare des communistes orthodoxes : il croit qu'il peut y avoir un usage valable de la psychanalyse dans la société bourgeoise et que peut-être elle aura encore un rôle à jouer dans un société sans classe; ça lui semblait même un travail passionnant de repenser la psychanalyse à la lumière du marxisme. Le fait est que ça m'a passionnée.<sup>56</sup>

On the other hand, while Robert's goal is also the betterment of humanity, he adopts a different means of action. As a politician and author, Robert's actions direct themselves toward humanity as a whole, rather than toward individuals, and place emphasis on the future, rather than on the present. Anne also encourages Robert in his work. Her thoughts reveal to the reader the extent of her understanding of and sympathy for her husband. (Since the novel is written from Anne's or Henri's point of view we are unable to get Robert's thoughts directly from him.)

Robert n'avait pour ainsi dire plus de contact avec les hommes de son âge, mais il préférait ça : toute sa génération, il la tenait pour responsable de cette guerre qu'elle n'avait pas su empêcher; il estimait n'avoir gardé que trop d'attaches avec son passé; il voulait travailler avec des hommes jeunes; la politique, l'action avaient aujourd'hui une figure et des méthodes nouvelles auxquelles il voulait s'adapter. Ses idées mêmes, il estimait qu'il devait les réviser : voilà pourquoi il répétait avec tant d'insistance que son oeuvre était encore devant lui. Dans l'essai qu'il était en train d'écrire, il cherchait à réaliser la synthèse de ses vieilles pensées d'une vision nouvelle du monde. Ses buts étaient les mêmes qu'autrefois : par-delà ses objectifs immédiats, le S.R.L. se proposait de maintenir l'espoir d'une révolution égale à ses intentions humanistes; mais Robert était convaincu à présent qu'elle ne s'accomplirait pas sans de rudes sacrifices; l'homme de demain ne serait pas celui que Jaurès définissait avec trop d'optimisme. Alors quel sens, quelles chances gardaient les vieilles valeurs : la vérité, la liberté, la morale individuelle, la

littérature, la pensée? si on voulait les sauver, il fallait les réinventer. C'est ça que Robert essayait, ça le passionnait et je me disais avec satisfaction qu'il avait retrouvé un<sup>57</sup> heureux équilibre entre l'écriture et l'action.

\* \* \*

The friendship and generosity of Robert and Henri also merit discussion. These two men have developed a friendship over many years. To this friendship, a feeling of solidarity can be added since these men worked together during World War II to help defeat the Nazis. Although Robert and Henri have had a good relationship, they do not realize how important they are to each other until they are separated by a quarrel.

It is interesting to note that the quarrel was, in part, based on the importance and extent of Robert's friendship for Henri. (We already know another reason for the quarrel was the conflict between truth in journalism and effective politics.) Both men react to the incident. Upon reading their differing opinions in L'Espoir, Henri wonders how the quarrel ever took place.

"Comment en sommes-nous arrivés là?" se demanda Henri le lendemain avec une espèce de stupeur quand il eut acheté L'Espoir. Il n'arrivait pas à détacher son regard de cette première page. Il avait été d'un avis, Dubreuilh d'un autre; il y avait eu des bruits de voix, quelques gestes impatients, entre quatre murs; et soudain s'étaient noirs sur blancs, aux<sup>58</sup> yeux de tous, ces deux colonnes jumelées d'insultes.

Robert's reaction to the quarrel is one of condemnation since he feels that Henri has wronged him. Robert's

interpretation of the quarrel is related to the reader through the eyes of Anne who is able to see the loss that this quarrel will bring to both men.

En rentrant à la maison un après-midi, j'ai trouvé Robert blanc de colère; c'était la première fois de ma vie que je le voyais hors de lui-même : il venait de se brouiller avec Henri. Il m'a raconté la scène en quelques phrases hachées et il m'a dit d'une voix coupante :

"N'essaie pas de l'excuser. Il est inexcusable."

Je n'ai pas essayé tout de suite; j'étais sans voix. Quinze ans d'amitié effacés en une heure! Henri ne s'assiérait plus dans ce fauteuil, nous n'entendrions plus sa voix gaie. Comme Robert allait être seul! Et Henri : quel vide dans sa vie! Non ça ne pouvait pas être définitif.

For quite a long time after the quarrel, Robert remains adamant in his condemnation of Henri. He feels that Henri has acted in an improper fashion and will become an outright anti-Communist. However, an article written by Henri reveals to Robert that the former has in no way changed his leftist political ideas. This fact has the double effect of first, affording Robert a sense of relief, and second, of giving him sufficient cause to reevaluate the circumstances surrounding the quarrel. It is a certain generosity on Robert's part which enables him to reconsider his relationship with Henri. The reader becomes aware of Robert's modified opinion of Henri in the course of a conversation he has with Anne.

Robert lut, et rejeta le journal : "Il faut avouer qu'Henri a bien du mérite a ne pas devenir anticommuniste. . . ."

Il y avait presque de la bienveillance dans sa voix; j'eus l'impression que sa rancune contre Henri commençait à se dissiper.

"Je n'arriverai jamais à comprendre pourquoi il s'est brouillé avec vous de cette façon, dis-je. Je suis sûre qu'aujourd'hui il s'en mord les doigts.

--J'y ai repensé souvent, dit Robert. Au début je lui reprochais de s'être trop soucie de lui-même, dans cette affaire. Maintenant je dis qu'il n'avait pas tellement tort. Au fond nous avons à décider ce que peut et doit être le rôle d'un intellectuel, aujourd'hui. Se taire; c'était choisir une solution bien pessimiste; à son âge, c'est naturel qu'il ait renâclé.<sup>60</sup>

When Henri has a chance to read the conclusion of Robert's new book, he is struck by its tone of pessimism and feels that he would like to help Robert. His feeling of discontent with Robert subsides further as he realizes the despair in which his friend must be living. Henri feels that he is partially responsible for Robert's current situation. He believes that his stubbornness contributed to the dissolution of the S.R.L. Just as Robert's attitude has become more generous toward Henri, Henri's attitude toward Robert has also become more generous. Henry analyzes Robert's ideas which he has just finished reading.

C'était bien étrange de voir Dubreuilh prêcher une vérité qu'il ne pouvait pas faire sienne; ça signifiait qu'il se considérait comme mort. "C'est ma faute, pensa Henri. Si je ne m'étais pas buté, le S.R.L. aurait continué à exister, Dubreuilh ne se croirait pas définitivement vaincu." Inefficace, isolé, doutant que son oeuvre ait un sens, coupé de l'avenir, contestant son passé, ça serrait le coeur de l'imaginer.<sup>61</sup>

It is significant that Robert makes the first concrete gesture to re-establish his relationship with Henri. Robert, the older and more influential of the two men, writes to Henri to say that "il est absurde que notre

attitude souligne seulement nos desaccords quand tant de choses nous rapprochent. Quant à moi, je suis toujours votre ami." <sup>62</sup>

Henri, who had also intended to write, sees both pride and generosity as the reasons that Robert wrote first. "Longtemps, Henri garda les yeux fixes sur les lignes bleu-noir; il avait pensé à écrire : et c'est Dubreuilh qui l'avait fait. On pouvait taxer d'orgueil sa générosité : mais alors c'est que l'orgueil était chez lui une vertu généreuse." <sup>63</sup>

Henri, too, reveals a generosity of his own when he refuses to re-cement his friendship with Robert without telling the truth about the perjury he committed to save Josette.

However, the friendship and generosity of these two men has an even greater impact because these feelings exist not only between the two men but are part of the attitude they express as both work to better the society in which they live.

\* \* \*

We have seen that the concepts of responsibility and solidarity play a vital role in the work of Beauvoir. Acceptance of responsibility is necessary for an individual to lead an existential life.

It is difficult for an individual to become responsible since he is not born responsible. A pattern of

dependence is created by the experiences of infancy and childhood. When, during adolescence, the individual is confronted with responsibility, it is not always easy for him to accept it.

Attempts to reject responsibility lead the individual to act in bad faith. Different types of bad faith attitudes may be adopted by an individual but they all have in common the fact that ultimately they fail. Therefore, sooner or later, an individual will be obliged to accept responsibility. What Beauvoir wishes to convey to us by her descriptions of bad faith actions and their consequences is that it is better to be able to accept responsibility as soon as possible rather than to try to reject it. While bad faith actions result in a negative outcome, responsible action has a greater likelihood of achieving a positive outcome.

If and when responsibility is accepted, this first involves the individual being responsible for himself. Gradually this responsibility is also applied to actions involving other individuals as well as groups of individuals.

One of the problems of responsibility is related to the method in which an individual acts. When faced with a difficult decision, an individual may decide not to act so as to avoid some negative outcome. However, Beauvoir shows us, especially in Le Sang des autres, that inaction can also have a negative outcome. Though the decision to act or not

to act must be carefully weighed, remaining inactive to avoid a possible negative result is an invalid criterion upon which to base such a decision.

There is still another factor related to the actions themselves which Beauvoir takes into consideration. Although an action is taken with a specific end in mind, there is no way to predict the consequences of a given action. This aspect of action becomes quite apparent to Fosca because he can see consequences of a particular action centuries after that action has been taken. In fact, since actions are directed toward other individuals, it is they who will decide whether or not to use or ignore them. The outcome of this decision cannot be predicted by the person originally performing the action. What we learn from this is that action must be taken even though an element of doubt is involved. If the consequences of a particular action are undesirable, then further action should be taken in the attempt to modify the consequences.

Furthermore, since humanity is interdependent, factors such as race, location, or nationality should not serve to separate us from others. As illustrated in Le Sang des autres the French are responsible for the fact that the Austrians are under Nazi rule as well as for the fact that the Jews are being killed in concentration camps. Since the responsibility exists for each individual, each individual should take action to alleviate the suffering.

When a group of people act together in a responsible manner to combat some common suffering as in Les Bouches inutiles, a feeling of solidarity is created. In her descriptions of responsibility and solidarity Beauvoir has shown us that the ideal would be for people to join together in a responsible manner and to act in a spirit of friendship and generosity.

## Chapter III: Footnotes

- <sup>1</sup>Simone de Beauvoir, Les Mandarins, 2 vols. (Editions Gallimard, Collection livres de Poche, 1945), 1:16.
- <sup>2</sup>Ibid., 1:321.
- <sup>3</sup>Ibid., 1:321.
- <sup>4</sup>Ibid., 1:406.
- <sup>5</sup>Ibid., 2:186.
- <sup>6</sup>Ibid., 2:187.
- <sup>7</sup>Ibid., 2:445.
- <sup>8</sup>Ibid., 2:362.
- <sup>9</sup>Ibid., 2:350.
- <sup>10</sup>Simone de Beauvoir, Pour une morale de l'ambiguïté (Editions Gallimard, Collection Idées, 1947), p. 57.
- <sup>11</sup>Ibid., p. 63.
- <sup>12</sup>Ibid., p. 67.
- <sup>13</sup>Ibid., pp. 75-6.
- <sup>14</sup>Ibid., p. 83.
- <sup>15</sup>Simone de Beauvoir, Le Sang des autres (Editions Gallimard, 1945), pp. 59-60.
- <sup>16</sup>Ibid., p. 119.
- <sup>17</sup>Ibid., p. 120.
- <sup>18</sup>Ibid., p. 121.
- <sup>19</sup>Ibid., p. 108.
- <sup>20</sup>Ibid., p. 110.
- <sup>21</sup>Simone de Beauvoir, Les Bouches inutiles (Librairie Gallimard, 1945), p. 41.
- <sup>22</sup>Ibid., p. 53.
- <sup>23</sup>Ibid., p. 55.

- <sup>24</sup> Beauvoir, Le Sang des autres, p. 124.
- <sup>25</sup> Ibid., p. 103.
- <sup>26</sup> Ibid., p. 58.
- <sup>27</sup> Ibid., p. 114.
- <sup>28</sup> Simone de Beauvoir, Pyrrhus et Cinéas (Editions Gallimard, Collection Idées, 1944), pp. 285-6.
- <sup>29</sup> Simone de Beauvoir, Tous les hommes sont mortels (Editions Gallimard, 1946), pp. 86-7.
- <sup>30</sup> Ibid., p. 95.
- <sup>31</sup> Ibid., p. 101.
- <sup>32</sup> Ibid., p. 104.
- <sup>33</sup> Ibid., pp. 187-8.
- <sup>34</sup> Ibid., p. 203.
- <sup>35</sup> Ibid., pp. 282-3.
- <sup>36</sup> Ibid., p. 326.
- <sup>37</sup> Ibid., p. 342.
- <sup>38</sup> Ibid., p. 343.
- <sup>39</sup> Ibid., p. 353.
- <sup>40</sup> Beauvoir, Pyrrhus et Cinéas, p. 331.
- <sup>41</sup> Beauvoir, Le Sang des autres, p. 13.
- <sup>42</sup> Ibid., p. 14.
- <sup>43</sup> Ibid., p. 114.
- <sup>44</sup> Ibid., p. 116.
- <sup>45</sup> Ibid., pp. 116-17.
- <sup>46</sup> Ibid., p. 126.
- <sup>47</sup> Ibid., p. 175.
- <sup>48</sup> Ibid., p. 17.

- <sup>49</sup>Ibid., p. 179.
- <sup>50</sup>Ibid., p. 225.
- <sup>51</sup>Beauvoir, Les Bouches inutiles, p. 24.
- <sup>52</sup>Ibid., pp. 43-4.
- <sup>53</sup>Ibid., pp. 131-2.
- <sup>54</sup>Ibid., pp. 132-3.
- <sup>55</sup>Ibid., pp. 135-6.
- <sup>56</sup>Beauvoir, Les Mandarins, 1:74-5.
- <sup>57</sup>Ibid., 1:284-5.
- <sup>58</sup>Ibid., 2:145.
- <sup>59</sup>Ibid., 2:186.
- <sup>60</sup>Ibid., 2:198-9.
- <sup>61</sup>Ibid., 2:311.
- <sup>62</sup>Ibid., 2:336.
- <sup>63</sup>Ibid., 2:336.

## CHAPTER IV

## SOCIAL ACTION AND POLITICAL COMMITMENT

The acceptance of responsibility and the growth of solidarity enable an individual to join with others to take action. By taking action, an individual becomes able to transcend himself toward others.

However, before taking action, an individual must evaluate his situation in life. He must decide toward which goals he wishes to direct his actions. Restrictive factors must be taken into consideration and analyzed. With these criteria in mind, the individual should attempt to draw up an appropriate plan of action. This chapter will concern itself with the enlargement of the scope of action as it strives to encompass both political and social goals.

## 1

As we have seen from our knowledge of Beauvoir's fiction, social action and political commitment play a predominant role. This is especially true of Beauvoir's life which we will now consider. Djamila Boupacha, which Beauvoir wrote with Gisèle Halimi, is the true account of how these two individuals and others joined together to take action to help an Algerian girl fight French tyranny.

Although the action may have been social to the extent that it tried to provide for Djamila Boupacha's (the Algerian girl's) physical and mental well-being, it was also a political commitment since it was an attempt to show the French public how the government was mistreating the Algerians. Furthermore, the action was an effort to create an atmosphere in which the French public would itself take action to put a halt to the French government's cruelty in Algeria. (This action could be described as a peaceful version of the sort depicted by Beauvoir in Le Sang des autres where Jean and his friends take action against the Nazis hoping to elicit a strong public response both as a consequence of their actions as well as a consequence of expected Nazi reprisals.)

The events described in Djamila Boupacha are of special interest not only because they are true but also because they show ordinary individuals acting to do something with their lives. This includes Beauvoir, Halimi (the lawyer) and, most of all, Djamila Boupacha and her family.

Taken prisoner by the French army, Djamila Boupacha is a victim of torture. Unlike other torture victims who remained silent when they were brought before a hostile judge, Djamila has the courage to state what happened and to make a request. " 'J'ai été torturée. Je demande à être visitée par un médecin . . . ' " <sup>1</sup> Although this action by Djamila may seem trivial, we must realize that as an Algerian

prisoner she is limited in the action she can take and just this statement of truth is an action requiring much courage on her part. It represents an attempt, on her part, to reveal to France and to the world the manner in which the French army systematically tortures some of its prisoners. (Djamila's fate might have been quite different if it had not also been for the fact that her brother sent a letter to a lawyer, Gisèle Halimi, in France, although he too was in an Algerian prison camp.)

The action taken by Halimi is also deserving of praise since she simultaneously managed to go to see her client in Algeria and to fight to remove the obstacles with which the French bureaucracy harassed her. Djamila's case (she has been accused of planting a bomb which was defused before it could explode in a café) is scheduled to be heard on May 18, 1960. Halimi is authorized to be in Algeria for only forty-eight hours from May 17 to May 19. During this time she must see her client and go over the papers pertaining to the case. However, Halimi discovers that the machinations of the French, both in Europe and in Algeria, will combine to prevent her from really examining the papers to be used in evidence against Djamila. Referring to these documents, Halimi notes that:

Les Greffes poussent l'humour jusqu'à mentionner sur les avis d'audience qu'ils adressent aux avocats que le dossier est à leur disposition, tous les jours, à certaines heures, sauf la veille de l'audience.

C'est-à-dire, sauf le seul jour avant le procès où, pour cette affaire, j'étais autorisée à arriver à Alger. "C'est incohérent!" dit le Bâtonnier. Incohérence? C'était là une explication bien optimiste.<sup>2</sup>

The hypocrisy of the situation becomes more evident to Halimi when T..., the lawyer originally chosen by Djamila's mother for her defense explains the situation by saying "c'est une affaire tout simple . . . Elle a déposé une bombe dans un café . . . Khlass [C'est tout!]<sup>3</sup> When Halimi asks if Djamila had pleaded guilty to the charge T... replies "--Elle a avoué! il y en a pour dix minutes à plaider . . ."<sup>4</sup>

Later Halimi has the opportunity to meet with Djamila who recounts the details of her capture and torture. Halimi works to obtain a postponement of Djamila's hearing. She also decides to try to inform the French public of what is happening by making a complaint about the torture suffered by Djamila which, in itself, is a matter to be tried by a civil court. When the chief prosecuting attorney of Algiers wants to know whether Djamila is guilty of planting a bomb in a café (three of the café employees have already stated that she is not the woman they saw), Halimi replies that this is not the main question. The prosecutor reminds Halimi of the horror of terrorism but Halimi reflects on the true horror of the existing situation. "Mais le plus horrible, c'était cette guerre criminelle. Guerre d'amour-propre et d'intérêts mêlés : guerre fondamentalement injuste."<sup>5</sup>

During a second meeting with Djamila, Halimi dis-

covers the reasons for the former's commitment to the freedom of Algeria. As a temporary worker in the Béni Messous hospital, Djamila learns that she and other Algerians are the victims of discrimination.

--J'ai volé des médicaments à l'hôpital de Béni Messous, où j'étais temporaire, pour les porter à mes frères du maquis. La veille j'avais appris que sur la liste des filles qui devaient être titularisées, on avait barré les noms des musulmanes.

Elle précisa, avec quelque fierté :

--J'avais obtenu les meilleures moyennes. J'étais très bien notée . . . Tu peux le vérifier . . . Et puis voilà! <sup>6</sup> Tout aux Français, dans ce pays qui est à nous . . .

Halimi is moved by Djamila's sincerity as well as by her devotion to her country. She realizes that she wants to obtain justice for Djamila. Halimi wins her first victory by being granted a postponement of the trial. This will enable Halimi to assemble all of the facts surrounding Djamila's imprisonment and torture. It will also enable Halimi to return to France where she will alert both the government and the public about Djamila's plight.

Halimi writes of Djamila's case to several government officials in France. Letters are sent both to General de Gaulle and to Malraux. Malraux has just recently stated that " 'On ne torture plus en Algérie.' " <sup>7</sup> In her letter to him, Halimi wants to clarify the fact that torture is still practiced in Algeria on a regular basis. She feels that Malraux should know that an entire system for the torturing of prisoners has been established. Halimi speaks of this system in her letter to Malraux.

"Ces faits sont d'une exceptionnelle gravité. Loin d'être isolés, ils sont la preuve de la pratique systématique des tortures préalables à toute information judiciaire.

Les villas, dites "centres de tri" et aménagées en locaux de tortures, fonctionnent sans la moindre clandestinité.

. . . Plus que jamais l'armée torture en Algérie . . ."

The reason for Halimi's writing to General de Gaulle and to other government officials is to dispel the possibility of any future claims of ignorance concerning the torture of Djamila. Now that government officials have been informed, in writing, of what has transpired in Algeria they will be unable, at some future time, to claim that " 'Paris ne savait pas . . . c'est Alger . . . ' " <sup>9</sup>

Halimi's other goal in returning to Paris is to find a means of informing the public about Djamila. To this end, Halimi speaks with François Mauriac who writes a rather vague and disappointing article in L'Express. Fortunately, Halimi receives a much stronger commitment when she meets with Simone de Beauvoir.

The subject of discussion between these two women is guided by their common desire to find a means of eliciting support for Djamila from the French public. After having read Beauvoir's philosophical works and fiction, the reader can appreciate seeing Beauvoir apply her own theories. Beauvoir's decision to act is more relevant than most decisions made by her characters since she is actually to be involved in saving one, if not many, lives.

To begin with, Halimi and Beauvoir agree that the latter will write an article in Le Monde. The immediate goal of this action will be to attempt to shake the French public out of its indifference to the events taking place in Algeria.

Et nous avons cherché, toutes les deux, le moyen radical de déclencher les réactions . . .

Il fallait rompre "ce qu'il y avait de plus scandaleux dans le scandale : l'habitude du scandale"; couper brutalement les Français de leur confortable indifférence à la question algérienne.

Simone de Beauvoir écrirait dans Le Monde. C'était décidé.<sup>10</sup>

Beauvoir's article in Le Monde of June 2, 1960 traces all the details of Djamila's arrest, imprisonment, and torture. The goals of Beauvoir's article are to inform the French people that they are accomplices of the government if they do nothing to stop the criminal action in Algeria and also to propose action that should be taken by those people anxious to work for justice.

"Quand les dirigeants d'un pays acceptent que les crimes se commettent en son nom, tous les citoyens appartiennent à une nation criminelle."

Exiger et obtenir le renvoi du procès fixé à Alger le 17 juin, assurer la sauvegarde de la famille Bou-pacha et de ses témoins, châtier les bourreaux d'El Biar et d'Hussein Dey, voilà l'action que Simone de Beauvoir proposait à tous ceux qui refusaient d'être complices.<sup>11</sup>

The government reaction to Beauvoir's article is two-fold. In Algiers, Michel Debré has Le Monde of June 2 seized. Simultaneously a government message, claiming that proper legal proceedings have been undertaken concerning Djamila, appears both in the press and on the radio. What

this message fails to tell the public is that the government has no choice in starting legal proceedings since Djamila is bringing a civil suit for torture. Bad faith on the part of the government is evident.

The wide-spread response to Beauvoir's article convinces her that the next step is to form a committee "Pour Djamila Boupacha." "Son [the committee's] activité devait être concrète : Djamila Boupacha pouvait devenir un symbole; le châtement de ses tortionnaires devait être effectif. Et surtout public." <sup>12</sup>

Meanwhile, Halimi arranges to return to Algeria to be present on June 17, the new date set for Djamila's hearing. Halimi receives her travel papers from the police without difficulty and is even granted a stay of one week. However, there is only one problem. Her stay in Algeria is authorized from June 7 to June 14. The reader can appreciate Halimi's frustration with the system. "Avocat de Djamila, j'étais autorisée à séjourner en Algérie à condition de partir avant de plaider!" <sup>13</sup>

Halimi has managed to obtain assurances from the government that Djamila's hearing, previously under military jurisdiction, will now be heard by the Civil Court. However, the government promise proves insincere. Imagine Halimi's reaction when she discovers that the presiding judge of the Civil Court is none other than Colonel Catherineau (who previously presided when Djamila made her first appearance in

military court) who has now donned judge's robes for the occasion.

In addition to requesting a second postponement for Djamila's criminal charges, Halimi makes known her desire to have the torture case tried in France. Only a trial in France will afford Djamila a chance of having her case tried fairly. Djamila's chances seem to improve when the court grants the postponement requested by Halimi.

However, the fight to remove the trial to France still has to be won. The "Comité pour Djamila Boupacha" decides to make this change of trial location its next goal. Beauvoir, Halimi, and others meet with M. Patin, President of the "Commission de Sauvegarde." The meeting proves to be a disappointment as M. Patin criticizes Beauvoir for her article in Le Monde and defends the integrity of the French soldiers in Algeria. When the committee members attempt to discuss the torture undergone by Djamila, Patin interrupts them and asks for details of the bottle torture. He astounds the committee by saying that Djamila's defloration was not a real torture, or in any case not like the bottle torture used in Indochina.

Le visage de M. Patin s'illumina :

--Ah bon! . . . Il ne s'agit donc pas du véritable supplice! . . . comme en Indochine, vous savez? . . . Nous ne comprenions plus.

Le Président s'écarta de son bureau pour mieux expliquer :

--Voilà comment ça s'est fait, en Indochine : on assoit l'individu sur une bouteille . . . c'est très violent . . . les intestins éclatent . . . d'ailleurs, on en meurt, en général, ajouta-t-il avec un bon sourire.

M. Patin betrays his position by refusing to accept the committee's request that Djamila's trial be moved to France. Among the reasons he gives are two that show the extent of his prejudice. In speaking of Djamila, Patin says: "--Elle n'est vraiment pas sympathique cette jeune fille . . ." <sup>15</sup> After a discussion with the Boupacha family, Patin has decided that their case is without merit because "--Ils n'aiment pas la France! . . ." <sup>16</sup>

Meanwhile, in Algeria, fabricated evidence harmful to Djamila continues to accumulate. Djamila undergoes a mental examination to determine whether or not she is sane. By finding that Djamila is insane, the government could cast doubt on the claims of torture she has made. "Par biais de la folie, on faisait à Djamila rémission d'une bombe : il n'était plus aussi sûr qu'elle l'ait déposée, mais surtout et en même temps, on discréditait définitivement sa plainte contre ses tortionnaires et on réduisait au silence tous ceux qui avaient voulu faire la vérité sur ces prétendues tortures." <sup>17</sup>

Work continues to obtain Djamila's transfer to France for a medical examination to confirm the fact that she was tortured and to describe the extent of the torture. Although Djamila is granted legal permission to go to France, she must surmount one final minor obstacle to effectuate her departure. Djamila is informed that she will be required to pay for her trip to France. The committee sends the

requested one thousand two hundred francs to Algiers to remove this last obstacle to justice. An afterthought by a government official results in the newspapers' (which have been following Djamila's case closely) announcement that the French government will reimburse Halimi for this expense. Nevertheless, this promise is never kept.

With Djamila's arrival in France, the outlook for her cause brightens. A panel of five doctors is formed to give Djamila a complete medical examination. The conclusions of this team examination are helpful to Djamila. They confirm that first, she was tortured, then, although she is physically no longer a virgin (as a result of the bottle torture) her emotional attitude is that of a virgin, and finally, that she is incapable of lying. However, these conclusions, obtained through compromise, lack some of their original force since some of the examining doctors are more concerned with the repercussions of Djamila's pro-Algerian feelings rather than the medical truth. "La bataille fut rude entre les partisans de la prudence française et ceux de la vérité médicale."<sup>18</sup>

Having obtained the results of the medical examination, Halimi next tries to arrange for some witnesses to come testify in France. The two girls, Zahia El Mehdaoui and Benzzi Zoulikha wish to tell the story of torture which Djamila related to them. They also wish to prove that the testimony given by Zineb Laroussi, who shared a cell

with Djamila and claimed that the latter had not been tortured, is false. Of course, this effort to hear witnesses in France is not going to succeed while M. Courmontagne is still the presiding judge in Algiers. Thus, another victory has been won when Djamila's case is transferred to France "pour cause de sûreté publique . . ."<sup>19</sup> It has taken a year for Djamila to obtain this small measure of justice.

In preparation for the trial which is to be held at Caen, certain information is requested from Algiers: the names of those individuals who went to the Boupacha household on February 10-11, 1960, recent photographs of certain persons, and the name and photograph of the military doctor who examined Djamila.

Djamila is readied for the proceedings by being moved from the prison of Pau to the prison at Lisieux where, for six weeks, she will live without receiving any of the privileges political prisoners are usually granted. However, the devotion to duty of the judge, M. Chausserie-Laprée does provide some compensation. On Halimi's request, he agrees to join the three torture cases of Djamila Boupacha, Abdelaziz Boupacha, and Abdelli Ahmed. The judge sees to it that all the witnesses testify without having had the opportunity to confer with each other beforehand. In this manner, their testimony will be highly credible since there will have been no possible collaboration among the witnesses. Furthermore, M. Chausserie-Laprée

manages to confirm some of the testimony he has heard by sending for and receiving certain obscure papers from Algeria. Included among these are photocopies of documents from the Maillot Hospital in Algiers where Abdelaziz Boupacha had been treated following his torture.

Il [M. Chausserie-Laprée] envoya l'ordre de faire photocopier des documents administratifs de l'Hôpital Maillot d'Alger.

De nombreuses pièces intéressaient Abdelaziz Boupacha. Parmi ces pièces, le précieux rapport qui décrivait l'état dans lequel il avait été hospitalisé venant du centre d'El Biar. Les soins qui lui avaient été donnés; les sévices qu'il disait avoir subis.

Ce rapport authentifiait totalement le récit du père de Djamila.<sup>20</sup>

In his search for the truth, the judge goes as far as to bring the "gégène" (used to give electric shocks) into his chambers. Djamila's shock and pallor upon seeing this instrument of torture further convince the judge of her sincerity.

Judge Chausserie-Laprée next writes to Algiers requesting the names, addresses, and photographs of the soldiers, police, and doctors who came in contact with Djamila, her father, and her brother-in-law during their arrest, imprisonment, and hospital stays. The information which the judge receives in reply to his request is disappointing, with one exception. M. Fusero, a police officer from Algiers has written that "'aucune trace de passage de Djamila Boupacha n'a été relevée au camp de Béni-Messous.'"<sup>21</sup> This information proved that a document giving Djamila a number at Béni-Messous was a government fabrication used to

strengthen its alibi concerning her incarceration. Furthermore, it showed that Djamila was held illegally after her arrest since "elle ne pouvait être légalement détenue, durant une certaine période qu'à Béni-Messous."<sup>22</sup>

When the judge receives a few photographs of police officers having questioned Djamila, he discovers that "les photos et les noms des policiers avaient été brouillés. Sur la photo de l'un d'entre eux, l'identité d'un second était mentionnée, et inversement."<sup>23</sup>

Further Algerian maneuvers become apparent when Halimi tries to locate and bring to France four Algerian women who will testify to the fact that Zineb Laroussi committed perjury by denying that Djamila was tortured. Two of the women, Nadja Hanchi and Safia Morcelli, both being held for crimes possibly bearing the death penalty, have been freed. Halimi realizes that an exchange was probably arranged with these two women who subsequently make a request to testify in Algiers and not at Caen. The two other women, Zahia El Mehdaoui, herself a torture victim, and Zoulikha Benzini both insist and finally do come to France to testify on behalf of Djamila.

However, it is Zineb Laroussi herself who makes a breakthrough for Djamila. While alone with Judge Chausserie-Laprée, in his chambers, Zineb admits that she lied to the authorities in Algiers and that Djamila had been tortured. Zineb says that her false testimony in Algiers was the result

of a promise made to her, by the authorities for "la liberté provisoire puis l'acquittement."<sup>24</sup> Zineb has had the courage to reveal the truth even though the authorities in Algiers threatened her with bodily harm if she did not repeat her false testimony in Caen.

With the preliminary hearing terminated, the "Comité pour Djamilia Boupacha" decides to launch an intensive newspaper campaign. One of the aims of this campaign will be to make public the actions of General Ailleret, army commander in Algeria, and M. Messmer, the army minister who contrived not to send the requested photographs of the army personnel who participated in the events concerning the Boupacha family because the sending of such photographs "était susceptible de provoquer des répercussions fâcheuses sur leur [the soldiers] état d'esprit et sur le moral des Corps et Services dont ils font partie."<sup>25</sup>

In addition to divulging this action of concealment by the army, Beauvoir proposes "qu'un livre ou une brochure fût rédigé, qui comporterait une relation complète de l'affaire Djamilia Boupacha."<sup>26</sup> This book would have a double goal. Hopefully it "constituerait à la fois un élément de lutte dans l'immédiat, pour faire éclater la vérité, en même temps qu'un témoignage pour l'avenir."<sup>27</sup>

The disclosure of the correspondence from General Ailleret to the judge and from M. Messmer to General Ailleret

would once and for all invalidate the claim of ignorance as an excuse for the presence and continuation of torture in Algeria.

Finie donc, la légende de l'officier qui ne sait pas, du soldat qui ne veut pas, du ministre qui ne peut pas . . .

Dans cette affaire, le combat avait été mené sans gesticulation : avec persévérance et clarté. Parfois certains pensaient que les amis de Djamila Boupacha n'iraient pas assez loin ni assez vite. Pourtant, l'édifice s'était construit peu à peu. Et devant l'échéance, le Ministre des Armées et le Commandant en chef passaient aux aveux. La complicité des tortionnaires et du Gouvernement n'était plus seulement une idée théorique et vague, mais une réalité signée sur papier officiel.

The Committee decides to take action against the abrogation of justice by the French government. In a press conference, Beauvoir announces that Djamila will press charges against General Ailleret and Minister Messmer for having protected criminals (in this case those individuals who tortured Djamila and her family). Once this action is taken, M. Messmer tries to protect himself by new, devious means.

The book does not give the reader the comfort of a conclusion. However, it does provide the reader with better insight of Beauvoir. Her philosophical ideas advocating doing something with one's life take on a new dimension as we see her participate in a struggle not unlike others she has described. In fact, it is possible that Beauvoir's action concerning Djamila Boupacha is more vital and meaningful to the reader than similar actions described in

Le Sang des autres or Les Bouches inutiles. The story of Djamila captures the imagination of even the contemporary reader who sees how Beauvoir and the other committee members accepted the limitations with which they were confronted but still managed to make decisions and act.

\* \* \*

One of the reasons Beauvoir's involvement with Djamila Boupacha holds interest for the reader is that it shows Beauvoir, the writer and intellectual, involved in the political world. However, we see Beauvoir's participation as a fact and are unable to fully evaluate the reasoning behind her decision to act.

This opportunity for evaluation is presented to the reader in Les Mandarins. As both writers and intellectuals, Henri and Robert are obliged to redefine their roles in the post World War II world. (The decisions which these men make interest the reader since they echo decisions that Beauvoir and Sartre both faced.)

Robert's decision to form a leftist political group presents Henri with a dichotomy: can he and does he want to combine political action with journalism? Although Henri participated in the resistance movement during the war, he does not have a great liking for politics.

C'était loin de passionner Henri, la politique. Et il savait ce que signifiait un mouvement comme celui qu'envisageait Dubreuilh : comités, conférences, congrès, meetings, on parle, on parle; et il faut sans fin manoeuvrer, transiger, accepter des compromis boiteux;

temps perdu, concessions rageuses, sombre ennui, rien de plus rebutant. Diriger un journal, ça c'était un travail qu'il aimait; mais évidemment l'un n'empêchait pas l'autre et même, les deux se complétaient . . .

As a journalist, Henri conceives of himself as someone who will give people the information they need in order to make their own judgments. Therefore, it appears to Henri that any political association with his newspaper would be detrimental to achieving his stated goal.

Si Henri avait gardé le journal, ce n'était pas pour en faire un canard pareil à ceux d'avant-guerre . . . Aujourd'hui, tout le monde s'entendait à peu près sur l'essentiel, finies les polémiques et les campagnes partisans : il fallait en profiter pour former les lecteurs au lieu de leur bourrer le crâne. Non pas leur dicter des<sup>30</sup> opinions, mais les apprendre à juger par eux-mêmes.

When Henri finally does decide to associate L'Espoir with the S.R.L., he does so with the intention of still remaining truthful and objective in reporting and with the conviction that political involvement is necessary for the amelioration of the current world situation. " 'Quand la situation est injuste, tu ne peux pas la vivre correctement; c'est bien pour ça qu'on est amené à faire de la politique : pour essayer de changer la situation.' "<sup>31</sup>

\* \* \*

While a conflict seems to exist between journalism and politics, the conflict between literature and politics is perhaps more salient. Since journalism is more of a science and literature is more of an art, it is easy to assume that the former is more compatible with politics (which is generally classified as a science) than the latter. As

authors and politicians, Henri and Robert strive to establish an equilibrium between the two extremes of all literature and no politics versus all politics and no literature.

Scriassine, a firm anti-Communist, tells Anne that he is of the opinion that thought and art (the tools of the intellectual and writer) have no place in the post-war world without the support of a certain level of civilization.

" 'Les intellectuels français sont dans une impasse. C'est leur tour, ajouta-t-il avec une espèce de satisfaction; leur art, leur pensée ne garderont un sens que si une certaine civilisation réussit à se maintenir; et s'ils veulent la sauver, il ne leur restera plus rien à donner à l'art ni à la pensée.' "32

Scriassine has put his belief in the incompatibility of literature and politics into practice by refusing to write. He attributes the difficulty of the French intellectuals to the fact that their background is so rich with culture. Furthermore, Scriassine feels that the French are reluctant to separate culture and politics because in previous generations other individuals have successfully combined the two.

--Croyez-vous que je ne rêvais pas aussi à d'autres livres? mais il n'en était pas question." Il haussa les épaules : "Il fallait avoir derrière soi une sacrée tradition d'humanisme pour s'intéresser à des problèmes de culture face à Staline et à Hitler. Évidemment, reprit-il, au pays de Diderot, de Victor Hugo, de Jaurès, on s'imagine que la culture et la politique marchent la main dans la main."<sup>33</sup>

Although Scriassine admits to Anne that in his writing Robert "a su concilier de hautes exigences esthétiques avec une inspiration révolutionnaire"<sup>34</sup>, he is sure that "ce bel équilibre [once attained by Robert] est devenu impossible."<sup>35</sup> Scriassine is convinced that an event similar to one that occurred during prehistoric times will be repeated and that Robert will give up his esthetic pursuits since "nous abordons une ère où pour des raisons différentes l'humanité sera en proie à des problèmes qui ne lui laisseront plus le luxe de s'exprimer."<sup>36</sup>

Scriassine makes his prediction to Anne for a totally political and therefore successful future for French intellectuals, or an unsuccessful future if literature is still pursued. He feels that people like Henri and Robert will have to devote themselves entirely to political action. Any literary enterprises upon which they might embark would be valueless since they would be too far removed from reality.

Scriassine me [Anne] menaça du regard : "De deux choses l'une; ou bien des hommes comme Dubreuilh et Perron regarderont la situation en face, ils s'engageront dans une action qui les exigera tout entiers; ou bien ils tricheront, ils s'obstineront à écrire : leurs oeuvres seront coupées de la réalité et privées de tout avenir; ce seront des travaux d'aveugles, aussi navrants que la poésie des alexandrins."

Anne's discussion with Scriassine has upset her since Robert has already indicated that he wants to reconsider his commitments to writing and revolution. Most disturbing to Anne is Robert's decision not to publish the "souvenirs" he has just completed and which she believes to

be his best writing to date. Robert fears that even though his book was written with sincerity, some of the subjects he treated might elicit reactions close to scandal from the public. He resolves to temporarily put aside his writing until he establishes his political situation. Robert reveals to Anne that his primary concern is for his political and not his literary career. Anne tries to convince Robert of the importance of his books:

--Moi, je trouve vos livres très importants, dis-je. Ce qu'ils apportent aux gens, c'est quelque chose d'unique. Tandis qu'un travail politique, vous n'êtes pas le seul à pouvoir vous en charger.

--Je suis le seul qui puisse le mener à mon idée, dit Robert gaiement. Tu devrais me comprendre : les comités de Vigilance, la résistance, c'était bien utile; mais ça restait négatif. Aujourd'hui, il s'agit de construire ; c'est autrement intéressant.

--Je comprends très bien; mais votre oeuvre m'intéresse encore davantage.

--Nous avons toujours pensé qu'on n'écrit pas pour écrire, dit Robert. A certains moments d'autres formes d'action sont plus urgentes.

--Pas pour vous, dis-je. Vous êtes d'abord un écrivain.

--Tu sais bien que non, dit Robert avec reproche. Ce qui compte d'abord pour moi, c'est la révolution.

--Oui, dis-je. Mais le meilleur moyen que vous avez de servir la révolution, c'est d'écrire vos livres.

Robert secoua la tête : "Ça dépend des circonstances. Nous sommes à un moment critique : il faut d'abord gagner la partie sur le chemin politique."<sup>38</sup>

What Robert is saying to Anne is that the fate of the people takes precedence over the fate of literature. In other words as Robert tells Anne: "La littérature est faite pour les hommes et non les hommes pour la littérature."<sup>39</sup> Nevertheless, Anne is uncertain whether or not Robert will function well in a world without writing. Though Robert

once used literature as a means of attaining his political goals, Anne is convinced that it has increased in importance for Robert to the extent that he now writes for the pleasure he derives from it.

Il a beau protester : il est avant tout un écrivain. Au commencement peut-être il ne songeait qu'à servir la révolution, la littérature n'était qu'un moyen ; elle est devenue une fin, il l'aime pour elle-même, tous ses livres le prouvent ; et en particulier ces mémoires qu'il ne veut plus publier ; il les a écrits pour le plaisir d'écrire.

Upon further reflection, Anne realizes that Robert is modifying his life to contend with a new era "où rien n'était plus garanti."<sup>41</sup> Robert's need to participate in politics is a valid attempt on his part to create a situation in which the welfare of individuals will be assured and Robert will once again feel free to write.

While Robert has combined literature and politics, Henri has combined literature and journalism. Henri has been interested in books since his youth and has attributed to them a magic power. Although many books have already been written, Henri is still able to justify his desire to add to the vast array. Henri believes that each individual contributes his self to the world when he writes a book. "--On n'a pas tout à fait les mêmes choses à dire que les autres ; on a sa vie à soi, ses rapports à soi avec les choses, avec les mots."<sup>42</sup> Henri's writing assumes added importance since he uses it as a means of communication with other individuals. Henri experiences great self-pride when

he discovers that his own thoughts have been accepted by others because of the power of his writing. "Si les autres ne comptent pas, ça n'a pas de sens d'écrire. Mais s'ils comptent, c'est énorme de susciter par de mots leur amitié, leur confiance; c'est énorme d'entendre résonner en eux ses pensées à soi."<sup>43</sup>

Faced with the political realities following the war, Henri is unable to find justification for writing. Since all humanity shares the same fate, Henri feels it would be meaningless to impose his interpretation of life upon the world.

Il [Henri] se rappelait un vieux rébus déchiffré au fond d'une assiette : "On entre, on crie, et c'est la vie : on crie, on sort et c'est la mort." Qu'ajouter? Nous habitons tous la même planète, nous naissons d'un ventre et nous engraisserons des vers, on a tous la même histoire : pourquoi décider qu'elle est mienne et que c'est à moi de la raconter?<sup>44</sup>

In a moment of desperation, feeling himself pulled between the S.P.L., journalism, and writing, Henri thinks of dropping the former two and of leaving Paris to find a quiet place in which to write. However, Henri realizes that he will have nothing to write because he will only be living a part of life. "La vie, ça ne se détaille pas, il faut la prendre en bloc, c'est tout ou rien : seulement on n'a pas le temps pour tout, voilà le drame."<sup>45</sup>

The futility of writing a novel of "histoires qui ne sont jamais arrivées"<sup>46</sup> becomes apparent to Henri as he examines his political setting. Writing no longer has

meaning because life itself has lost its meaning. It is only by participating in politics that Henri can attempt to provide life with meaning and form a basis for future writing.

Anne tells Henri of Robert's decision not to publish the "mémories" he has written and of the sorrow which this decision has caused her. Henri realizes that Robert's decision was the correct one since it showed that Robert accepted the responsibility conferred upon him by the roles of political leader and writer. "Vous [Anne] avez tort, dit-il [Henri] amicalement. L'oeuvre d'un homme qui se confesserait intégralement, mais sans responsabilité, ne serait pas plus vraie ni plus complète que celle d'un homme qui prend la responsabilité de tout ce qu'il dit."<sup>47</sup>

Interesting insight into leftist literature is provided during a conversation between Robert and Henri. When Robert teases Henri for abandoning his novel, Henri says that it is Robert's fault. " '--Vous m'avez prêché l'action : et l'action m'a dégoûté de la littérature.' "<sup>48</sup> Henri's personal stories seem to be incompatible with the aims of leftist politics. However, Robert tries to convince Henri that meaningful leftist literature can be written without being "condamnée à une littérature de propagande dont chaque mot doit édifier le lecteur!"<sup>49</sup>

In analyzing his attempts to write a novel, Henri realizes that his failure has been caused by deciding to

write "un livre gratuit."<sup>50</sup> If during this same period of time Henri has been able to write a meaningful play situated in a specific time and place, could he not do the same for a novel? "Pourquoi ne pas entreprendre un roman daté, situé qui signifierait quelque chose? Raconter une histoire d'aujourd'hui où les lecteurs retrouveraient leurs soucis, leurs problèmes. Non pas démontrer ni exhorter, mais témoigner."<sup>51</sup>

Robert and Henri have posed the questions that Beauvoir and other intellectuals also asked at the end of the war. The answers to the questions asked in Part I of Les Mandarins are approached in Part II of this book. Unlike Lewis Brogan, the writer who befriends Anne and is one of the many American intellectuals who "pouvaient vivre en sécurité parce qu'ils se savaient tout à fait impuissants"<sup>52</sup>, Robert and Henri know that the French intellectual has a definite role to play in society. They must develop a plan to reconcile their political pursuits with their intellectual interests.

The existence of the Russian camps serve as a testing ground for political versus intellectual commitment. As intellectuals committed to relying upon the truth, it seems obvious that Robert and Henri should reveal the existence of the Russian camps. However, their leftist political leanings require consideration of the fact that revealing the truth about the Russian camps might be potentially destructive of leftist and communist political unity. (Although the exis-

tence of Russian camps presents little interest to the contemporary reader, one can still appreciate the moral dilemma which it presents to Robert and Henri.) Robert evaluates the choices available to him and realizes that neither is truly acceptable.

"Tu [Anne] me dis que si je me tais, je serai complice des camps, dit-il. Mais en parlant je deviens le complice des ennemis de l'U.R.S.S., c'est-à-dire de tous ceux qui veulent maintenir ce monde comme il est. C'est vrai que ces camps sont une chose horrible. Mais il ne faut pas oublier que l'horreur est partout."<sup>53</sup>

Robert indicates to Anne the criterion upon which he will base his decision concerning the Russian camps. He believes that his "devoirs d'intellectuel, le respect de la vérité, ce sont des fariboles. La seule question c'est de savoir si en dénonçant les camps on travaille pour les hommes ou contre eux."<sup>54</sup>

Henri's commitment to the truth plays the essential role in his decision. Nevertheless, his decision will also be a choice between two undesirable alternatives since revealing the truth about the camps will cause a rift between himself and the Communists and serve to antagonize many of L'Espoir's readers.

Il pouvait plaider qu'il n'en savait pas assez pour parler ; c'est tout l'ensemble du régime qui donnait leur vrai sens à ces camps, et on était si mal informé! Mais alors il n'en savait pas non plus assez pour garder le silence. L'ignorance n'est pas un alibi, il l'avait compris depuis longtemps. Dans le doute, puisqu'il avait promis la vérité à ses lecteurs, il devait leur dire ce qu'il savait; il lui aurait fallu des raisons positives pour décider de le leur cacher ; sa répugnance à se brouiller avec les communistes n'en était pas une, elle ne concernait que lui.<sup>55</sup>

Respect for the truth has previously been a value which intellectuals like Robert and Henri have held in high esteem. The discovery that truth can be harmful necessitates a re-evaluation of this facet of their moral code. While Henri will choose to believe in the need for truth and will reveal the truth in his articles in L'Espoir, Robert will choose to redefine his values since he finds that the old values seem to have become counter-revolutionary. Robert also arrives at the conclusion that "--Un intellectuel n'a plus aucun rôle à jouer."<sup>56</sup> Since one of Robert's principal functions as an intellectual has been to write, he decides to discontinue writing. Literature has been used as a tool for distraction by counter-revolutionary forces. Robert explains to Anne the reasons for which he will abandon writing.

--Pourquoi est-ce que j'écris? dit Robert. Parce que l'homme ne vit pas seulement de pain et que je crois à nécessité de ce superflu. J'écris pour sauver tout ce que l'action néglige : les vérités du moment, l'individuel, l'immédiat. Je pensais jusqu'ici que ce travail s'intégrait à celui de la révolution. Mais non : il le gêne. A l'heure qu'il est, toute littérature qui vise à donner aux hommes autre chose que du pain, on l'exploite pour démontrer qu'ils peuvent très bien se passer du pain.<sup>57</sup>

Henri is shocked when he has the chance to read Robert's last book in which he draws his negative conclusion about the role of the intellectual in French society. In addition to condemning literature, Robert astonishes Henri by condemning his own life. Robert employs his book to describe a life that he declares himself incapable of living.

. . . il [Robert] condamnait sa propre existence. Il opposait au vieil humanisme qui avait été le sien un humanisme neuf, plus réaliste, plus pessimiste, qui faisait une large place à la violence, et presque aucune aux idées de justice, de liberté, de vérité; il démontrait victorieusement que c'était là la seule morale adéquate du rapport actuel des hommes entre eux; mais pour l'adopter, il fallait jeter tant de choses par-dessus bord que personnellement il n'en était pas capable.

Although Henri has returned to writing and has even produced a novel which Robert has found praiseworthy, he too becomes restless in his situation. When Robert presents Henri with the idea of a new leftist weekly, Henri's interest is aroused. He realizes that his plans to go to live and write in Italy would not prevent him from thinking about himself and the world. Furthermore, even though writing is important to Henri "ça ne sauve pas tout d'être un écrivain."<sup>59</sup>

Henri re-enters the world of politics and journalism by writing an article on Madagascar. Almost simultaneously, he notices that it becomes increasingly difficult for him to finish the short story he has been writing. When Lachaume, a Communist, proposes that Henri should join a combination Communist and non-Communist committee whose goal is to save lives in Madagascar, Henri accepts. In spite of the fact that Lachaume has described Henri's article on Madagascar as "un très bel article, je dirai même un article bouleversant",<sup>60</sup> as Henri realizes "il [the article] n'a pas bouleversé grand monde."<sup>61</sup> Joining the Madagascar committee will provide Henri with the necessary means to put power behind his words.

Even though he may only take action by speaking, Henri is convinced that speaking is better than taking no action at all.

In time of crisis, Beauvoir tells us in Les Mandarins what she has discovered for herself: the intellectual must commit himself and take political action. The question of commitment to which Beauvoir devotes so much time is taken for granted by the contemporary reader. Recent world events such as the American involvement in Vietnam have effectively shown the intellectuals of the world that political action is the means to establish a livable world with a meaningful code of moral behavior. Although, as intellectuals have pointed out, humanity does not live by bread alone, it is first necessary to obtain this bread for all humanity so that humanity can later enjoy the benefits of culture.

## 2

While Beauvoir advocates political participation for all concerned individuals, she also discusses the impact and reasons for lack of participation. The theme of renunciation recurs several times in the work of Beauvoir. Although the intent of renunciation is to abstain from action, Beauvoir convinces the reader that since this non-action is the product of choice, it too qualifies as action. Marcel, in Le Sang des autres succinctly defines Beauvoir's opinion of renunciation when he tells Jean: "Ne pas faire de politique, c'est encore en faire."<sup>62</sup>

If renunciation is nevertheless a type of political action or game, what possible advantages can it hold for the individual? In the case of Jean Blomart of Le Sang des autres as well as Jean-Pierre of Les Bouches inutiles, it is the result of a search for innocence. Jean attempts to "prétendre ne pas se compromettre dans l'absurdité universelle . . ." <sup>63</sup> while Jean-Pierre refuses to act out of a desire to remain innocent of causing the suffering of others. As he says to Louis on one occasion: "Je garderai mes mains pures." <sup>64</sup>

This search for "les mains pures," often inherent to the theme of renunciation, terminates with the discovery of the reality of "les mains sales." In a world of many individuals it is impossible to live "une vie sans compromis . . . et qui ne pouvait pour personne être une source de malheur." <sup>65</sup> Beauvoir wishes to convince the reader of the fact that some element of failure is present in any political action because "on se trouve acculé, pour conquérir la liberté de tous, à traiter certains hommes en choses." <sup>66</sup> This element of failure clarifies what is meant by the idea that "aucune action ne peut se faire pour l'homme sans se faire aussitôt contre des hommes." <sup>67</sup> These are the facts that the individual searching for innocence attempts to prevent himself from seeing.

Why is it that political action seems to lend itself to this futile search for innocence? Jean's definition of

politics casts some light upon this question. "La politique, c'est l'art d'agir sur les hommes du dehors; le jour où l'humanité tout entière s'organisera du dedans d'elle-même, il n'y aura plus besoin de politique."<sup>68</sup> We discover that the need for political action is based upon the assumption that humanity is not in agreement. Therefore, the goal of political action is to establish the best conditions possible for the greatest number of individuals. This necessarily entails countering the wills of those individuals opposed to the goal being sought. Occasionally, the means used to attain the goal will seem contrary to the goal and will leave an individual no other choice but to refuse participating because "l'action ne peut chercher à s'accomplir par des moyens qui détruiraient son sens même. Si bien que dans certaines situations il n'y aura d'autre issue pour l'homme que le refus."<sup>69</sup>

Politics operates according to a system of values in seeking to improve society. Consequently, individuals participating in politics do so by establishing a code of ethics for themselves. From definition to goal-realization, the political process is one of constant choice and decision employing the values of the activists as guidelines. "Et c'est pourquoi le choix politique est un choix éthique : en même temps qu'un pari il est une décision; on parie sur les chances et les risques de la mesure envisagée; mais que chances et risques doivent être ou non assumés dans les

circonstances données, il faut le décider sans recours, et ce faisant on pose des valeurs."<sup>70</sup>

The decisions made by Jean and Jean-Pierre, although they are decisions not to act, are the results of the value systems established by these two individuals. Both men believe that the lives of others are too valuable to be sacrificed to obtain their desired goal. When Jean and Jean-Pierre modify their opinions of death and sacrifice, they are able to make the decision to participate in politics. These two individuals have discovered the truth of the idea in L'Invitée which Pierre explains to Xavière (an individual who objects to society but prefers not to engage in political activity so as to maintain her innocence): "Vous ne pouvez lutter contre la société que d'une manière sociale."<sup>71</sup> Politics is the tool of social change.

\* \* \*

The early lives of both Beauvoir and Sartre surprise the reader who is informed about their recent and current political action but is unaware of their original political inaction. Brought up in a bourgeois household, Beauvoir is aware of the paradoxes and hypocrisy of her parents' values. While she is still a teen-ager, Beauvoir decides to devote her life to intellectual pursuits, especially literature. She at first proposes to "dépasser le médiocrité bourgeoise sans quitter la bourgeoisie"<sup>72</sup> but having been the victim of criticism from both friends and family she casts aside

the bourgeois values and seeks to "en découvrir ou à en inventer d'autres . . ."73

Beauvoir becomes interested in leftist politics but refuses to participate because she dislikes the labeling involved. "Je détestais le conformisme, tous les obscurantismes, j'aurais voulu que la raison gouvernât les hommes; à cause de cela la gauche m'intéressait. Mais toutes les étiquettes me déplaisaient : je n'aimais pas que les gens fussent catalogués."74 In spite of her interest in the betterment of society, Beauvoir finds herself drawn to theoretical rather than practical considerations. "Je continuais à subordonner les questions sociales à la métaphysique et à la morale : à quoi bon se soucier du bonheur de l'humanité, si elle n'avait pas de raison d'être?"75

Beauvoir's meeting with Simone Weil, a political activist, for whom "la Révolution qui donnerait à manger à tout le monde"76 is a most important goal, interests Beauvoir who admires a heart which is "capable de battre à travers l'univers entier".77 However, Beauvoir still believes that "le problème n'était pas de faire le bonheur des hommes, mais de trouver un sens à leur existence."78

Beauvoir's relationship with Sartre reinforces her ideas. They would work together to reform society by apolitical means. "L'homme était à recréer et cette invention serait en partie notre oeuvre. Nous n'envisagions pas d'y contribuer autrement que par des livres : les affaires

publiques m'assommaient; mais nous escomptions que les événements se dérouleraient selon nos désirs sans que nous ayons à nous en mêler . . ."79 Although Beauvoir and Sartre avoid the possibility of political commitment, it is an idea that they reject in order to concentrate on themselves and their literary contributions to the world. "Deux intellectuels petits-bourgeois, invoquant leur oeuvre future pour éviter l'engagement politique : telle était notre réalité et nous tenions aussi à ne pas l'oublier."80

Totally involved in living in the present, Beauvoir considers economic and social problems "sous leur aspect théorique."81 This preoccupation with the present effectively prevents any serious political involvement by Beauvoir. "Mais les articles politiques m'assommaient, je m'y noyais, pour éclairer les faits où je ne voyais qu'un fatras, il aurait fallu anticiper l'avenir : je ne voulais pas."82 When an anti-fascist demonstration is organized, Beauvoir does not participate. She explains her inaction as follows: "Je répugnais à toute démarche qui m'eût fait assumer ma condition; je refusais, comme autrefois de coïncider avec le professeur que j'étais."83

Even during the Spanish civil war, with the republican cause dear to them, Beauvoir and Sartre limit their participation to their emotional commitment. Likewise, when they vacation in a dictatorial Greece, although conscious of the injustices which exist, they let the vacation setting

make the evil seem natural. Their bad faith is evident.

"Mais dans les années 30, tout en nous indignant contre l'injustice du monde, il nous arrivait, surtout en voyage où le pittoresque nous égarait, de la prendre pour une donnée naturelle."<sup>84</sup>

The defeat of the Spanish republicans is imminent as is war with Hitler and Mussolini, yet Beauvoir is entranced by the themes introduced by Malraux in L'Espoir. "Il [Malraux] abordait des thèmes neufs en littérature : les relations de la morale individualiste et de la pratique politique; la possibilité de maintenir au sein de la guerre même des valeurs humanistes . . ."<sup>85</sup> However, Fernand's (Beauvoir's Spanish friend) tragic report of the events taking place in Spain convinces Beauvoir that her political inaction does not automatically make her innocent, a discovery which she will later utilize in her fiction. "Je commençais à comprendre que mon inertie politique ne me conférait pas un brevet d'innocence, et à présent quand Fernand grommelait : 'Salauds de Français', je me savais concernée."<sup>86</sup> Beauvoir questions her inaction but believes too much in her own happiness to take action even after hearing first-hand reports of German cruelty to Jews.

Sartre is the first to realize that they must take action, even go to war if necessary, to stop Hitler and the Nazis. He recognizes that Hitler's conquest of France would put an end to intellectual activity and would eventually mean

that Frenchmen who had not "pris les armes contre Hitler, sans doute se trouveraient-ils un jour forcés de se battre pour lui . . ." <sup>87</sup> Beauvoir also revises her opinion in an atmosphere of guilt. "Nizan avait eu raison de soutenir que l'engagement politique ne saurait d'aucune manière s'éluder ; en s'abstenant, on prend position. Le remords me poignait." <sup>88</sup> This period in time marks a radical change of attitude for Beauvoir. "Il n'est pas possible d'assigner un jour, une semaine, ni même un mois à la conversion qui s'opéra alors en moi. Mais il est certain que le printemps 1939 marque dans ma vie une coupure. Je renonçai à mon individualisme, à mon antihumanisme. J'appris la solidarité." <sup>89</sup>

As Sartre stated, during the years from 1929 to 1939, he and Beauvoir had "un sens réel de la vérité" <sup>90</sup> which definitely did not imply that they had "un sens vrai de la réalité". <sup>91</sup> It is, in part, this separation from reality, due to the involvement with the self and a career in literature, which enabled Beauvoir and Sartre to exempt themselves from political commitment. However, the outbreak of war elicits a change of mind described first by Sartre and then supported by Beauvoir. This conversation takes place during the early days of the war when Sartre visits Beauvoir.

La semaine se passa en promenades et en conversations. Sartre pensait beaucoup à l'après-guerre; il était bien décidé à ne plus se tenir à l'écart de la vie politique. Sa nouvelle morale, basée sur la notion d'authenticité, et qu'il s'efforçait de mettre en pratique, exigeait que l'homme "assumât" sa "situation"; et la seule manière de le faire c'était de la dépasser en s'engageant

dans une action : toute autre attitude était une fuite, une prétention vide, une mascarade fondées sur la mauvaise foi. On voit qu'un sérieux changement s'était produit en lui, et aussi en moi qui me ralliai tout de suite à son idée; car notre premier soin naguère avait été de tenir notre situation<sup>2</sup> à distance par des jeux, des leurres, des mensonges.

When Sartre returns to Paris after his imprisonment, he and Beauvoir begin their active political involvement. Sartre creates a group called "Socialisme et Liberté" to plan for the future. As it becomes evident that overt anti-Nazi action is unrealistic, the group is disbanded and Beauvoir and Sartre return to their writing and try to ferret out new ways of discouraging the Nazis. Sartre's play, Les Mouches, is one of the results of this effort in which he "exhortait les Français à se délivrer de leurs remords et à revendiquer contre l'ordre leur liberté . . ." <sup>93</sup> Although it was not Beauvoir's intention, Le Sang des autres, written during this period is occasionally referred to as a book on the Resistance.

As Beauvoir reports in La Force des choses, with the war over, she and Sartre renew their decision to become active in politics which "était devenue une affaire de famille et nous entendions nous en mêler. 'La politique n'est plus dissociée des individus, écrivait Camus dans Combat au début de septembre. Elle est l'adresse directe de l'homme à d'autres hommes.' " <sup>94</sup> Furthermore, Beauvoir realizes that she should be concerned about the fate of others as well as her own. "Je savais à présent que mon sort était lié à

celui de tous; la liberté, l'oppression, le bonheur et la peine des hommes me concernaient intimement."<sup>95</sup>

Keeping in mind Beauvoir's and Sartre's philosophy, it is not surprising to see them make political commitments. The surprise that does exist stems from the fact that so much time elapsed before their commitments were made. Why did this process require so much time? In part, this was the result of a bourgeois upbringing stressing the need for maintaining the status quo. Also, their careers in literature and teaching seemed to remove Beauvoir and Sartre from the real world and make political abstention possible.

Whether in Beauvoir's fiction or in her life, we understand the necessity for political commitment and, on the other hand, the impossibility of remaining innocent in a world where choice and action are integral parts of daily life. While Beauvoir's fictional treatment of the theme of renunciation no longer has great impact on the contemporary reader, Beauvoir's recounting of her own political conversion seems much more meaningful and realistic to readers who are themselves faced with the same choice.

\* \* \*

The decision to act is the choice a free individual makes to accept his responsibility. These two concepts of freedom and responsibility are basic to life as defined by existential thought. Refusal of either or both of these concepts leads an individual into a life of constant escape from reality.

One of the most blatant examples of this rejection of freedom and responsibility is found in the character of Paule in Les Mandarins. Paule is described by Beauvoir in La Force des choses as an example of the type of woman who has decided to "engager tout de soi dans sa liaison avec un écrivain ou un artiste, buté sur ses projets : renonçant à ses goûts, à ses occupations, elle s'exténue à l'imiter sans pouvoir le rejoindre et s'il se détourne d'elle, elle se retrouve dépouillée de tout . . ." <sup>96</sup> Paule's avoidance of freedom and responsibility is reflected in the life she has organized for herself.

With few exceptions, Paule's life is one of great solitude. Paule's friend Anne, one of her few visitors, is aware of the seclusion Paule imposes upon herself. "Paule est capable de rester enfermée pendant des heures et des semaines sans rien faire, sans voir personne et de ne pas s'ennuyer . . ." <sup>97</sup> This self-imposed isolation permits Paule to live in a fantasy world of her own making where the reality of life cannot penetrate. Paule will leave her cocoon from time to time to make an appearance and convince people such as Lucie Belhomme that she is still alive and well, for as Paule says in referring to Lucie's invitation " 'si je refuse toutes ses invitations, elle croira que je suis devenue infirme et elle jubilera.' " <sup>98</sup>

What is the advantage of leading this secluded life? For one thing, it enables Paule to refuse to acknow-

ledge the passage of time. In asking Anne: " 'Tu crois que le passé peut ressusciter?' " <sup>99</sup>, Paule reveals her rejection of the present and her search to recapture the past. Re-incarnation of the past in its entirety would enable Paule to relive her love with Henri which has more recently faded to friendship.

In basing her life only on Henri's love for her, Paule has refused her freedom and responsibility. Paule rejects her freedom by making the one choice to live her love of Henri and to forego all other choices. With Paule having once been a promising singer, Henri wonders why she renounced a possible career in singing and if "elle n'avait pas pris prétexte de leur amour pour se dérober à l'épreuve." <sup>100</sup> Paule's decision to reject her own freedom has made her impinge upon Henri's freedom. She feels that since she has entirely devoted herself to Henri that she in some way now possesses him. When Henri berates Paule for talking about him to Lambert without his assent Paule replies: " 'Ta vie est ma vie puisque je lui ai sacrifié la mienne; j'ai des droits sur elle.' " <sup>101</sup>

In the same manner that Paule has refused her freedom, she has also refused her responsibility. Since Paule has not pursued a career of her own she is totally dependent on Henri for financial security. This is a situation which Paule believes works to her advantage since she hopes that Henri will feel obligated to remain with Paule since he is

supporting her. Henri sees this dependence on Paule's part from quite another point of view. He wants to stop seeing Paule but wishes to contribute financially to her well-being. "Mais comment lui faire accepter de l'argent si je ne la vois plus? Une femme scrupuleuse n'accepte les secours d'un homme qu'à condition de lui infliger sa présence."<sup>102</sup>

Paule's strategy has backfired. Faced with Henri's spent passion and his suggestion that she pursue a career, Paule realizes that she has no possibilities available to her.

--Tu ne peux pas continuer comme ça toute ton existence. Tu ne veux pas chanter, bon, c'est une affaire entendue. Mais alors essaie de trouver autre chose à faire.

--Quoi donc?

--On va chercher."

Elle secoua la tête : "J'ai trente-sept ans et je ne connais aucun métier. Je peux me faire chiffonnière; et encore!"<sup>103</sup>

When Henri finally makes clear his intention to break off with Paule, she refuses to accept the fact which would destroy life as she knows it. Paule seeks refuge from the truth by attempting to "understand" what Henri's true intentions are when he sends her what Anne recognizes as a farewell letter. By fabricating an imaginary world in which Henri still loves her, Paule deviates totally from reality and starts to become crazy. Anne realizes that Paule needs psychological help when the latter prepares a banquet (to which she forgets to send invitations) for all her acquaintances who she thinks are working together for her destruction.

Anne brings Paule to her colleague, Dr. Madrus, and eventually Paule is cured, but her new life is more of an existence than a life. By refusing her freedom and responsibility, Paule has lost herself in insanity. However, once cured, Paule is ultimately forced to accept some measure of autonomy in order to continue living.

Although it is often difficult for an individual to accept his freedom and the responsibility thus entailed, it is best for him to choose to accept both since eventually life demands their acceptance. The example of Paule is limited in its impact since her refusal to accept freedom and responsibility is based only on her obsession with love. Many readers will fail to identify themselves with Paule for this reason but will, nevertheless understand the idea which Beauvoir wishes to convey.

\* \* \*

Bourgeois society, as depicted in Beauvoir's autobiography as well as in her fictional works, bears the brunt of much criticism. As a class, the bourgeoisie tends to establish and rely upon fixed values which work to the detriment of other individuals, most notably the workers. Jean Blomart's rejection of his bourgeois background is one of the themes of Le Sang des autres and parallels similar developments in Beauvoir's own life.

After having derived all the material benefits from his bourgeois upbringing, Jean decides to reject his back-

ground and its unfair advantages. He reveals his new political orientation to his mother who reacts negatively and hypocritically at the mere mention of the word revolution, anathema to all bourgeois standards.

Quand je [Jean] l'ai prononcé devant elle, le mot de révolution, elle est devenue toute rouge : "Tu n'es qu'un enfant! tu parles sans savoir!" J'ai essayé de discuter, mais elle m'a arrêté, le corps secoué par une passion d'épouvante. C'était insensé de vouloir changer quelque chose au monde, à la vie; les choses étaient déjà assez déplorables si l'on se gardait d'y toucher. Tout ce que condamnait son coeur et sa raison, elle s'acharnait à le défendre : mon père, le mariage, le capitalisme. . . .<sup>104</sup>

After becoming a Communist, Jean realizes that he no longer should take advantage and remain at home "à la table d'un affreux capitaliste"<sup>106</sup> as his father defines himself. Jean opts to free himself as much as possible from his past by leaving the security of his family. He will learn a trade and be able to support himself. Having made this new resolve, Jean feels a weight lifted from himself and realizes that his bourgeois background had caused him to be discontented. "Il se sentit soudain très heureux; il comprenait pourquoi son enfance et sa jeunesse avaient toujours eu ce goût croupi : c'était la sève pourrie du vieux monde qui circulait dans ses veines; mais voilà qu'il allait couper ses racines et se créer à neuf."<sup>105</sup>

One of the first decisions made by Jean in order to implement his new life program is to reject any association with his father's printing shop. As the owner's son, Jean would have been employed there at a level higher than that

to which his experience entitled him and would have probably inherited the shop after his father's death. Jean attempts to convince his mother that further connection with his father's business would be hypocrisy on his part. "--Écoute, essaie de me comprendre; je désapprouve ce régime; comment veux-tu que j'accepte d'en bénéficier?"<sup>106</sup> Although Jean admits that he has derived many benefits from his father and the printing business, he maintains that he did so without fully realizing what was taking place. "--Tout ce dont j'ai profité jusqu'ici, ça a été malgré moi. Je ne me considère pas comme engagé."<sup>107</sup>

As Marcel (Jean's friend) indicates to Jean, the decision to be a worker will be difficult to realize. Jean will be embarking upon his new life having benefitted from an upbringing which no born workers could ever have had. In spite of the fact that Jean had made and will continue to make sacrifices to live as a worker, he has chosen the life and sacrifices while the other workers were confronted with the reality of their situation with no choice possible. However, in a conversation with Marcel, Jean reveals his hope to overcome the difficulties he faces.

--Oui, dit Jean. Mon père a payé ce complet, ces souliers; il a payé aussi mon apprentissage. Mais personne ne part jamais du zéro absolu.

--C'est bien ce que je dis, dit Marcel. Il souriait d'un sourire qui découvrait ses dents grises et creusait des rides profondes dans sa peau de caïman : S'il n'y avait que ce complet! mais ta culture, tes amitiés, ta santé de jeune bourgeois bien nourri. Tu ne peux pas défaire ton passé.

--Quand j'aurai vécu pendant quelques mois comme un véritable ouvrier, il ne pèsera plus bien lourd.  
 --Il y aura toujours un abîme entre un ouvrier et toi : tu choisis librement une condition qu'il subit.  
 --C'est vrai, dit Jean, mais du moins j'aurai fait mon possible.<sup>108</sup>

By becoming a worker Jean will disassociate himself from the bourgeois characteristic of originality, criticized by Paul in a conversation with Héléne. The workers emphasize what they have in common with their peers rather than the differences that separate them. "--Tous les petits bourgeois ont la manie de l'originalité, dit Paul. Ils ne se rendent pas compte que c'est encore une manière de se ressembler. Il ruminait son idée d'un air têtue et satisfait : Un ouvrier se fout de l'originalité; moi ça me fait plaisir au contraire de me sentir pareil aux camarades."<sup>109</sup>

Having become a worker and joined a union, Jean will come to value the companionship and solidarity he finds as "chaque membre du syndicat reconnaissait sa propre volonté dans la volonté collective . . ."<sup>110</sup> With the outbreak of war, Jean will unite with his co-workers to combat Nazism and its horrors. Together, Jean and his friends decide that it is necessary to take action against the Nazi onslaught and to this end they form a resistance group. "--Si nous voulons constituer une force capable de rallier des masses, capable de tenir le coup jusqu'à la fin de guerre et de construire l'avenir, nous devons agir, dit Blomart. Nous n'existons que si nous agissons."<sup>111</sup>

Where once Jean spent much of his time reflecting on the absurdity of his existence, his political and union involvement give him a sense of purpose. Presently, his time is occupied in organizing and carrying out attacks on the Nazis. Feelings of solitude and aloofness no longer trouble Jean who works in cooperation with his friends and co-workers. As leader of the resistance group, Jean learns that his life is vital to others and is not to be taken for granted. Eager to accompany his friends on a raid, Jean realizes Denise is correct in criticizing him for feeling sorry for himself and his responsibilities as group leader.

--Vous voulez que j'envoie les copains risquer leur peau et que je reste à siroter mon café? J'aurais du mal à me supporter.

Denis me regarda avec blâme ;

--Vous vous occupez trop de vous, dit-elle.

Ce mot m'a mordu. Elle a raison. C'est peut-être parce que je suis bourgeois, il faut toujours que je m'occupe de moi.

--Vos scrupules personnels ne nous intéressent pas, reprend-elle durement. Nous nous sommes confiés à vous comme à un chef qui fait passer le parti avant tout : vous n'avez pas le droit de nous trahir.<sup>112</sup>

Upset with the Nazi reprisal shootings of French citizens, Jean's mother wishes to convince him that the resistance fighters should surrender to the Nazis to avoid further reprisals. Referring to the gassing of Jews in Poland, Jean asks his mother: "Tu veux que nous nous fassions complices de ces massacres?"<sup>113</sup> Even though the deaths of innocent French citizens are hard to bear, they will serve a purpose in alienating the French from the Nazis and dis-

couraging collaboration. After leaving his parents, Jean wonders whether to continue the raids and decides that "il faut recommencer. Sinon tout aura été inutile. Je les aurais tués pour rien!"<sup>114</sup>

By rejecting the privileges of the bourgeoisie and becoming a worker, Jean has been able to create a meaningful life for himself. Jean's subsequent union and political associations have given him a new appreciation of life. By working together with others, Jean has come to know the value of solidarity and action and has discovered the means of escaping indifference and solitude. His flexibility and his willingness to try something new have permitted Jean to avoid some of life's absurdity and to find fulfillment of the self through humanitarian action.

## 3

The characteristic of flexibility possessed by many of Beauvoir's fictional characters is an outgrowth of the moral precepts of existential philosophy in which the author believes. This philosophy has often been categorized as amoral by those who lack sufficient familiarity with it. There is no reason to believe that Beauvoir's denial of the existence of God in any way implies a lack of moral commitment on her part. On the contrary, it imposes a high moral standard upon each individual. The difference between a system of morals which presupposes the existence of God and a system that does not is that the former system implies obedience

to pre-established, invariable morals while the latter system obliges the individuals to establish and evaluate their own moral code. An individually created moral code is the type for which Beauvoir strives. The idea of permanence, implicit in other moral codes, does not exist in a moral code as it is conceived of by her. Indeed, the value of Beauvoir's moral code resides in the fact that it is flexible and can be adapted to changing world and individual patterns of behavior.

It is, in part, the appreciation of flexibility which enables Beauvoir to question society about the unchanging roles it has adopted toward women and the elderly. The treatment of women is examined by Beauvoir in Le Deuxième sexe from both a biological and a historical perspective. This study was written having as its goal the desire to reveal to the public the injustices and inconsistencies of society's behavior concerning women. With their newly raised consciousnesses, Beauvoir hoped that the public would strive to rectify the manner in which women were treated.

In recounting her own life, Beauvoir reveals to the reader that she does not feel that she has personally suffered from being a woman. Since her only sibling was a sister, there was no sexual differentiation or discrimination in her upbringing. The lack of contact with boys during Beauvoir's early schooling helped preserve the status quo established by her family. Even among Sartre and his

friends, Beauvoir claims to have been treated as an equal. However, when Beauvoir widens her outlook and focuses on the surrounding world, she is astonished to realize that it is men and their values which have set the criteria for living. Beauvoir simultaneously discovers the suffering that these male-oriented criteria impose upon women. Men, says Beauvoir, cannot describe the world as it concerns women without a certain degree of prejudice. Beauvoir quotes Poulain de la Barre on this subject in an introduction to her book. "Tout ce qui a été écrit par les hommes sur les femmes doit être suspect, car ils sont à la fois juge et partie."<sup>115</sup>

The problem of sexual inequality between men and women is partially the result of semantic manipulation involving the word "homme" and its dual meaning. This word is simultaneously used to identify the human species as well as the male of the species while a separate term, "femme," is required to identify the female of the species. While it suffices for a male to simply define himself as a human being, a female must first define herself as a woman, or a member of the species who is not male. (This is not so, however, in German or Russian.)

Un homme n'aurait pas idée d'écrire un livre sur la situation singulière qu'occupent dans l'humanité les mâles. Si je veux me définir je suis obligée d'abord de déclarer : "Je suis une femme"; cette vérité constitue le fond sur lequel s'enlèvera toute autre affirmation. Un homme ne commence jamais par se poser comme un individu d'un certain sexe ; qu'il soit homme, cela va de soi. C'est d'une manière formelle, sur les registres des mairies et dans les déclarations d'identité que les

rubriques : masculin, féminin, apparaissent comme symétriques. Le rapport des deux sexes n'est pas celui de deux électricités, de deux pôles : l'homme représente à la fois le positif et le neutre au point qu'on dit en français "les hommes" pour désigner les êtres humains, le sens singulier du mot "vir" s'étant assimilé au sens général du mot "homo". La femme apparaît comme le négatif si bien que toute détermination lui est imputée comme limitation, sans réciprocité.<sup>116</sup>

The lack of reciprocity between male and female has a further consequence, that of making the male an absolute subject while leaving the female as the other, the object. It is a woman's biology which is partially responsible for condemning her to the status of an object. Men tend to see a woman only in the light of her sexual functions and even say that "elle pense avec ses glandes."<sup>117</sup> A woman is also seen as belonging to a male by virtue of her sexual functions and is therefore always defined as she relates to the male while the reverse is not so. "Elle se détermine et se différencie par rapport à l'homme et non celui-ci par rapport à elle; elle est l'inessentiel en face de l'essentiel. Il est le Sujet, il est l'Absolu ; elle est l'Autre."<sup>118</sup>

Why has woman become the absolute Other while other oppressed groups such as the proletariat and the Haitian Negroes have succeeded in reacquiring their identities? The answer to this question lies in the fact that women have never been able to reject the title of other by joining together in a group as these other oppressed groups have done. Instead, women perpetuated their otherness as a result of their affiliation with men. A bourgeois woman would rather

ally herself with other bourgeois men instead of with proletarian women.

Unlike the other oppressed groups, women are not clearly divided from their oppressors. On the contrary, women are necessarily linked to the men who oppress them. "C'est là ce qui caractérise fondamentalement la femme : elle est l'Autre au coeur d'une totalité dont les deux termes sont nécessaires l'un à l'autre."<sup>119</sup> Furthermore, we realize that women as a group possess no common cultural or religious ties. This lack serves to increase the isolation of women from each other and attach them more closely to their male partners.

Elles n'ont pas de passé, d'histoire, de religion qui leur soit propre ; et elles n'ont pas comme les prolétaires une solidarité de travail et d'intérêts ; il n'y a pas même entre elles cette promiscuité spatiale qui fait des Noirs d'Amérique, des Juifs des ghettos, des ouvriers de Saint-Denis ou des usines Renault une communauté. Elles vivent dispersées parmi les hommes, rattachées, par l'habitat, le travail, les intérêts économiques, la condition sociale à certains hommes -père ou mari- plus étroitement qu'aux autres femmes. Bourgeoises elles sont solidaires des bourgeois et non des femmes prolétaires ; blanches des hommes blancs et non des femmes noires.<sup>120</sup>

The factors linking groups other than women are based on common history and/or cultural background. However, women have in common only those biological characteristics which differentiate them from men. Therefore, while the oppression of the proletariat and the Negroes is socially determined, the oppression of women is biologically

determined. "La division des sexes est en effet un donné biologique, non un moment de l'histoire humaine."<sup>121</sup>

Yet this oppression based on biology is somewhat perplexing since men are dependent upon women to bear their children. This apparent paradox can be explained by several factors. Women have unequal and inferior legal and economic status compared to men and also do not benefit from the prestige that automatically is attributed to men. There is also the women's fear that they will lose if they do not cooperate with the advantaged men. Furthermore, there is the tendency for some women to simply accept their fate, reject their freedom, and therefore become objects. "Ainsi, la femme ne se revendique pas comme sujet parce qu'elle n'en a pas les moyens concrets, parce qu'elle éprouve le lien nécessaire qui la rattache à l'homme sans en poser la réciprocité, et parce que souvent elle se complaît dans son rôle d'Autre."<sup>122</sup>

Attempts have often been made to prove and perpetuate the myth of the inequality of females established by male society. When women have achieved a degree of acceptance, it has not been on the basis of true equality but rather on the basis of the "separate but equal" doctrine which Beauvoir reminds us was used to justify the racist treatment of the American Negro. For the bourgeoisie, the liberation of women is to be avoided since it threatens to put on an equal basis people who have always been considered to be inferior.

The role played by biology in establishing female inferiority is undeniable. Proof of the importance attributed to biology in establishing women's inferiority is seen by contrasting the situation of older women. Past the age of child-bearing, these women, minus their reproductive powers, exist in a middle ground between male and female and often seem to profit from this. Older women often find that "cette autonomie physiologique se traduit par une santé, un équilibre, une vigueur qu'elles ne possédaient pas auparavant."<sup>123</sup> However, we note that this new power comes at a time when the women have lost their "negative" feminine characteristics.

Beauvoir readily admits the importance of biology in determining the way in which women perceive the world since "le corps étant l'instrument de notre prise sur le monde, le monde se présente tout autrement selon qu'il est appréhendé d'une manière ou d'une autre."<sup>124</sup> However, Beauvoir refuses to accept "l'idée qu'elles [les données biologiques] constituent pour elle [la femme] un destin figé. Elles ne suffisent pas à définir une hiérarchie des sexes ; elles n'expliquent pas pourquoi la femme est l'Autre; elles ne la condamnent pas à conserver à jamais ce rôle subordonné."<sup>125</sup>

Beauvoir outlines the criteria of a plan for the re-establishment of equality of the sexes requiring legal equality, the participation of women in industry, and their liberation from the greater part of housework. Fulfillment

of these goals would give women political, social, and economic equality.

L'égalité ne peut se rétablir que lorsque les deux sexes auront des droits juridiquement égaux; mais cet affranchissement exige la rentrée de tout le sexe féminin dans l'industrie publique. "La femme ne peut être émancipée que lorsqu'elle peut prendre part dans une grande mesure sociale à la production et n'est plus réclamée par le travail domestique que dans une mesure insignifiante. Et cela n'est devenu possible que dans la grande industrie moderne, qui non seulement admet sur une grande échelle le travail de la femme mais encore l'exige formellement . . ."<sup>126</sup>

Beauvoir's analysis of housework is basic to the understanding of the liberation of women. Even in contemporary society, the equal distribution of housework is one of the goals of womens' liberation. The woman traditionally has found housework imposed upon her as a result of the responsibilities of motherhood keeping her at home. Unlike the work of the male, which is project and transcendence, the work of the female is repetition and immanence. The household tasks trap women "dans la répétition et dans l'immanence; ils se reproduisent de jour en jour sous une forme identique qui se perpétue presque sans changement de siècle en siècle; ils ne produisent rien de neuf."<sup>127</sup> Housework has other drawbacks as well. Coupled with maternity, it keeps women housebound and unable to work. It is less valued than men's work since it presents no risk to the woman performing it. Unfortunately "dans l'humanité la supériorité est accordée non au sexe qui engendre mais à celui qui tue."<sup>128</sup>

Women, relegated solely to perpetuating the species, lose value in a society which does not esteem life itself but only what life enables one to achieve.

Au niveau de la biologie, c'est seulement en se créant à neuf qu'une espèce se maintient; mais cette création n'est qu'une répétition de la même Vie sous des formes différentes. C'est en transcendant la Vie par l'Existence que l'homme assure la répétition de la Vie : par ce dépassement il crée des valeurs qui dévient à la pure répétition toute valeur.<sup>129</sup>

Beauvoir succinctly states how, from a biological point of view, women have suffered a loss of status. "Son [la femme] malheur, c'est d'avoir été biologiquement vouée à répéter la Vie, alors qu'à ses yeux mêmes la Vie ne porte pas en soi ses raisons d'être, et que ces raisons sont plus importantes que la vie même."<sup>130</sup>

When women are able to escape the home and find work, they still fare poorly. Often hired before men by employers who feel that they work better and for less money than men, women arouse the anger and resentment of male co-workers who see women as unfair competition. This employer-caused dissension is self-serving since it prevents the development of solidarity between those individuals representing the cause of the proletariat and those representing the cause of women. Unionization of women removes the threat of unfair competition and paves the way for unified class action. "C'est seulement quand les femmes ont été intégrées à la vie syndicale qu'elles ont pu défendre leurs propres intérêts et cesser de mettre en danger ceux de la classe ouvrière dans son ensemble."<sup>131</sup>

The removal of social and economic obstacles achieved by integrating women into the working force does not suffice to eliminate sexism. The fact that men have recorded and continue to record womens' history is further proof of the existence of sex discrimination. Mens' inability to deal justly with women is uniquely their problem.

Si nous jetons un coup d'oeil d'ensemble sur cette histoire, nous voyons s'en dégager plusieurs conclusions. Et d'abord celle-ci : toute l'histoire des femmes a été faite par les hommes. De même qu'en Amérique il n'y a pas de problème noir mais un problème blanc; de même que "l'antisémitisme n'est pas un problème juif ; c'est notre problème"; ainsi le problème même de la femme a toujours été un problème d'hommes.<sup>132</sup>

While anti-feminism is a male problem, being a woman is not only a female problem. The expectations and limitations of society ingrained upon the child, and not the child's biology, are primarily responsible for the creation of a woman rather than a man. While a boy is taught to use his freedom and be active, a girl has only limited freedom and is taught to be passive. Although a boy can be self-assertive, a girl is unfeminine if she acts in this manner. (This also applies from the opposite point of view so that a boy is criticized for crying "like a girl.") In other words, society inculcates in the girl those qualities which will eventually make her into the Other.

On ne naît pas femme : on le devient. Aucun destin biologique, psychique, économique ne définit la figure que revêt au sein de la société la femelle humaine; c'est l'ensemble de la civilisation qui élabore ce produit intermédiaire entre le mâle et le castrat qu'on

qualifie de féminin. Seule la médiation d'autrui peut constituer un individu comme un Autre. En tant qu'il existe pour soi l'enfant ne saurait se saisir comme sexuellement différencié.<sup>133</sup>

Women, as well as men, must take the initiative to bring an end to sex discrimination. One of the paths to sexual equality involves a re-evaluation (and a re-structuring) of marriage. Both partners in the marriage must be free. Economic power is to be shared. The concept of marriage should be revised so that it no longer is considered to be a woman's only career. Birth control information and abortion must be readily available to women to free them from the burden of unwanted pregnancies and to enable them to consistently work outside the home. Child-care facilities should be established so that women will be able to work and be assured that their children are being well cared for.

According to Beauvoir, the working woman frees herself from her dependence on men by performing tasks which enable her to re-establish her own transcendence and exercise responsibility in her own right.

C'est par le travail que la femme a en grande partie franchi la distance qui la séparait du mâle; c'est le travail qui peut seul lui garantir une liberté concrète. Dès qu'elle cesse d'être une parasite, le système fondé sur sa dépendance s'écroule; entre elle et l'univers il n'est plus besoin d'un médiateur masculin. La malédiction qui pèse sur la femme vassale, c'est qu'il ne lui est permis de rien faire : alors, elle s'entête dans l'impossible poursuite de l'être à travers le narcissisme, l'amour, la religion; productrice, active, elle reconquiert sa transcendence; dans ses projets elle s'affirme concrètement comme sujet; par son rapport avec le but qu'elle poursuit, avec l'argent et les droits qu'elle

s'approprié, elle éprouve sa responsabilité. Beaucoup de femmes ont conscience de ces avantages, même parmi celles qui exercent les métiers les plus modestes.<sup>134</sup>

Although working restores a woman's transcendence and gives her responsibilities, it does not necessarily make her equal in the eyes of society. Political and social action by women is necessary to establish their equality with men. Women should attempt to overcome their prejudices toward other women and consult trained, professional women such as doctors and lawyers. Women, as well as men, should keep in mind the fact that "d'être un être humain est infiniment plus important que toutes les singularités qui distinguent les êtres humains . . ." <sup>135</sup>

In order to "faire triompher le règne de la liberté" <sup>136</sup> sexual equality must be achieved. Women must be freed from men but need not deny them to obtain their freedom. The creation of an atmosphere of total reciprocity between the sexes is the means to reach the goal of equality.

Affranchir la femme, c'est refuser de l'enfermer dans les rapports qu'elle soutient avec l'homme, mais non les nier; qu'elle se pose pour soi elle n'en continuera pas moins à exister aussi pour lui; se reconnaissant mutuellement comme sujet chacun demeurera cependant pour l'autre un autre; la réciprocité de leurs relations ne supprimera pas les miracles qu'engendre la division des êtres humains en deux catégories séparées; le désir, la possession, l'amour, le rêve, l'aventure; et les mots qui nous émeuvent: donner, conquérir, s'unir, garderont leur sens; c'est au contraire quand sera aboli l'esclavage d'une moitié de l'humanité et tout le système d'hypocrisie qu'il implique que la "section" de l'humanité révélera son authentique signification <sup>137</sup> et que le couple humain trouvera sa vraie figure.

\* \* \*

Another segment of society also suffers from discrimination which in this instance is based not on an individual's sex but on his age. In La Vieillesse Beauvoir describes, with compassion, the situation of the aged, which she now shares. Their situation is, in many respects, similar to that of women. No longer actively employed, and existing on inadequate pensions, the aged are invariably forced into some degree of economic dependence. As is the case for dependent women, reciprocity between the aged and other members of society disappears and these individuals begin to assume the characteristics of an object or an other. But how can the mere fact of aging deprive an individual of his role in society?

While biology need not determine a woman's destiny, it does play a major role in the aging process. The changes which comprise aging differ from other changes which take place during a lifetime since they are both permanent and negative.

La loi de la vie, c'est de changer. C'est un certain type de changement qui caractérise le vieillissement : irréversible et défavorable, un déclin. Le gérontologue américain Lansing en propose la définition suivante : "Un processus progressif de changement défavorable, ordinairement lié au passage du temps, devenant apparent après la maturité et aboutissant invariablement à la mort."<sup>138</sup>

The decline evoked in this definition is a subjective concept and interpreted differently according to varying societal values. For this reason the entire aging

process must be considered from both a biological and a cultural point of view.

In considering the aged, Beauvoir centers her study on the males, for whom old age presents radical change: retirement and a subsequent feeling of uselessness. Unfortunately once society realizes that an old man no longer actively contributes to society, he is relegated to the status of an other.

Le vieillard, en tant que catégorie sociale, n'est jamais intervenu dans le cours du monde. Tant qu'il conserve une efficacité, il reste intégré à la collectivité et ne se distingue pas d'elle ; il est un adulte mâle d'un âge avancé. Quand il perd ses capacités, il apparaît comme autre; il devient alors, beaucoup plus radicalement que la femme, un pur objet, elle est nécessaire à la société; lui ne sert à rien ; ni monnaie d'échange, ni reproducteur, ni producteur, il n'est plus qu'une charge.<sup>139</sup>

This exclusion of old men is found in literature as well as in life. When an old man is spoken of in a literary context, the same terminology is used to describe him: language which relies upon the evocation of winter cold and whiteness as opposed to the warmth and greenery of spring used to describe younger characters. Although an old man occasionally does appear in literature, most often his function is to act as a contrasting factor and not to exist in his own right. "Il est considéré par rapport à la jeunesse et à la maturité comme une sorte de repoussoir : il n'est pas l'homme même, mais sa limite; il est en marge de la condition humaine; on ne la reconnaît pas, on ne se reconnaît pas en lui."<sup>140</sup> One exception to this rule is the play

King Lear, "la vieillesse n'y est pas conçue comme la limite de la condition humaine, mais comme sa vérité : c'est à partir d'elle qu'il faut comprendre l'homme et son aventure terrestre."<sup>141</sup>

Another factor confronting the aged in recent years is that the experience of these individuals, which formerly allowed them a certain degree of prestige, is no longer valued in a constantly changing society.

Un fait frappant, sur lequel je reviendrai longuement mais qu'il faut signaler ici, c'est que le prestige de la vieillesse a beaucoup diminué du fait que la notion d'expérience est discréditée. La société technocratique d'aujourd'hui n'estime pas qu'avec les années le savoir s'accumule, mais qu'il se périmé. L'âge entraîne une disqualification. Ce sont les valeurs liées à la jeunesse qui sont appréciées.<sup>142</sup>

Having lost the benefit of his experience, the older individual also loses reciprocity with younger individuals. Too old, in most cases, to work toward a goal which he has set for himself, the older person is seen as someone who is rather than someone who does. The fact that he is nearing death further separates him from other younger individuals.

The treatment of the aged by mature adults is two-sided. The adult "se plie jusqu'à un certain point à la morale officielle que nous avons vue s'imposer dans les derniers siècles et qui lui enjoint de les respecter. Mais il a intérêt à les traiter en êtres inférieurs et à les convaincre de leur déchéance."<sup>143</sup> Since they contribute nothing, it becomes even easier for the aged to be treated

as unimportant objects. Old age homes, nursing homes, and senior citizens' housing, all industries generally managed by adults, take financial advantage of those among the aged whose means are not that limited.

According to Beauvoir, the profit motive, dear to capitalism, is responsible for the financial suffering of many retirees. Eager to maintain an acceptable margin of profit, capitalist companies provide their former employees with inadequate pensions. Yet, certain reforms would have the potential for ameliorating this situation. "Permettre aux travailleurs de rester actifs aussi longtemps qu'ils le peuvent et ensuite leur garantir une vie décente, c'est une solution correcte. Les mettre à la retraite de bonne heure en leur assurant un niveau de vie satisfaisant, c'est aussi une option valable."<sup>144</sup>

The retiree, however, is often filled with despair. Although entitled to a pension after years of work, he often feels that since he is no longer working, the money he receives is some form of charity. With his leisure permitting him time to reflect, the retiree realizes that he "n'a plus sa place sur terre parce qu'en vérité on ne lui en a jamais accordé une . . ."<sup>145</sup>

It is generally because of others that one becomes conscious of one's own aging. Beauvoir's definition of old age explains the manner in which an individual sees his own aging process. Aging is seen as "un rapport dialectique

entre mon être pour autrui, tel qu'il se définit objective-  
ment, et la conscience que je prends de moi-même à travers  
lui. En moi, c'est l'autre qui est âgé, c'est-à-dire celui  
que je suis pour les autres : et cet autre, c'est moi."<sup>146</sup>  
Since it is an exterior part of the self, that part first  
seen by others, which reflects the aging process, it is nor-  
mal to have our old age revealed to us by others. Even  
though an individual is labeled "old" by others, it is a  
condition which an individual never really interiorizes.

Dans notre société, la personne âgée est désignée  
comme telle par les meurs, par les conduites d'autrui,  
par le vocabulaire même : elle a à assumer cette réali-  
té. Il y a une infinité de manières de le faire :  
aucune ne me permettra de coïncider avec la réalité  
que j'assume. La vieillesse est un au-delà de ma vie  
dont je ne peux avoir aucune pleine expérience  
intérieure.<sup>147</sup>

Even when confronted with other people of the same  
age, the elderly often find it difficult to accept their  
resemblance to these individuals. In contrast, the fact  
that the elderly resist accepting their situation is the  
fact that they find that "vivre ne va plus de soi."<sup>148</sup> Care  
must be taken not to fall, not to become ill, and not to  
overexhaust oneself. Often the performance of daily chores  
is only possible with the help of glasses, a hearing aid, or  
a cane. In order not to lose ground, one must fight against  
the onslaught of old age.

Other tendencies become apparent during the aging  
process. An individual, seeing that his life expectancy is

limited, will often console himself by relying upon the past, which is certain, rather than on the future, which he may not live to see. A certain sadness which reflects their boredom and bitterness at having become useless in a world which has forgotten them, descends upon most of the aged. They become very protective of their possessions which they see as a type of defense against others. "Contre ceux qui prétendent ne voir en lui qu'un objet, le vieillard, grâce à ses biens, s'assure de son identité."<sup>149</sup>

What can be done to prevent old age from becoming a time of sorrow and mockery? Life must be made meaningful for the elderly by encouraging them to "poursuivre des fins qui donnent un sens à notre vie . . ."<sup>150</sup> Old age should be a time for emotional planting and sowing and not for emptiness. It should be considered desirable to "conserver dans le grand âge des passions assez fortes pour qu'elles nous évitent de faire un retour sur nous. La vie garde un prix tant qu'on en accorde à celle des autres, à travers l'amour, l'amitié, l'indignation, la compassion."<sup>151</sup> In order for old age to be a time of joy, it is necessary that an individual "ait toujours été traité en homme."<sup>152</sup> Society must undergo reforms which will enable the elderly to remain fully integrated members who avoid discrimination so that they can pass from life to death in an atmosphere of fraternity and understanding rather than in solitude and sorrow.

\* \* \*

Beauvoir's non-fiction contributions to a body of work concerning itself with social action and political commitment are among her richest. The fact that she is directly concerned with social action and political commitment in Djamila Boupacha, Le Deuxième sexe, and La Vieillesse gives these works an added dimension. This is not to say that Beauvoir's fiction is without impact, but the conflicts in which some of the characters are engaged remain removed from the reader.

To a certain degree, Beauvoir's consideration of the role and commitment of the writer and intellectual in Les Mandarins can be exempted from this judgment. The idea that an intellectual has a responsibility to himself as well as society is a discovery that Beauvoir has also made for herself. Implicit in this responsibility to society is the obligation to become politically active. Les Mandarins sets forth arguments similar to those Beauvoir must have used in making her own decision and which hopefully will influence her readers.

The themes of renunciation and the impossible search for "les mains pures" are presented to the reader both in fiction and non-fiction works. The decisions made by Jean-Pierre in Les Bouches inutiles and Jean Blomart in Le Sang des autres when faced with one over-riding problem (the

sacrifice of "les bouches inutiles" or the death of resistance fighters) seem theoretical when compared with the gradual discovery of the need for action in the modern world as described by Beauvoir in her autobiographical works. It is not only short-term crises but daily events which require political involvement. Beauvoir's and Sartre's gradual political conversion entails an on-going process of self-evaluation and metamorphosis as a result of which they cast off the remaining bonds of their bourgeois background.

Freedom and responsibility are two interdependent concepts required of all those who would live in good faith. Sooner or later people who seek to avoid one or both of these concepts find themselves unhappy and eventually have these concepts forced upon them. This is true whether the original avoidance is socially based as is the case with Paule, or politically based as with Jean-Pierre and Jean Blomart (whose activities have been discussed in detail in a previous chapter).

Change, in both a social and political context is presented to the reader through the actions of Jean Blomart. The change undertaken by Jean is two-fold involving first the rejection of his bourgeois background as well as the privileges associated with it (a change paralleled by the lives of Beauvoir and Sartre). The second aspect of Jean's change is his affiliation with the workers, effectuated by

finding a new job and by becoming active in the union. Beauvoir describes this change essentially from the point of view of its moral ramifications which permit Jean to fulfill both his social and political responsibilities.

Moral change plays a vital role in Beauvoir's ethic. She rejects the bourgeois tenets requiring obedience to ready-made rules which often oppress rather than protect humanity. Two fine examples of the morality of Beauvoir's ethic are found in Le Deuxième sexe and La Vieillesse. Beauvoir accumulates facts to make a strong case against the status quo attitudes which mean the mistreatment of both women and the elderly. Using the precepts of existentialism as her guide, Beauvoir shows how society's acceptance of traditional behavior deprives both women and the elderly of a certain degree of freedom and consequently treats them as objects. The reforms advocated by Beauvoir to improve the situation of these two groups have in many instances (especially with regard to women) served as guidelines to contemporary society's effort for reform.

The morality of Beauvoir's philosophy as found in both her works of fiction and non-fiction is highly evident. If even some of Beauvoir's proposals were subjected to careful analysis, and subsequently incorporated into daily life, society might benefit greatly.

## Chapter IV: Footnotes

- <sup>1</sup> Simone de Beauvoir and Gisèle Halimi, Djamila Bou-pacha (Editions Gallimard, 1962), p. 3.
- <sup>2</sup> Ibid., p. 16.
- <sup>3</sup> Ibid., p. 18.
- <sup>4</sup> Ibid., p. 19.
- <sup>5</sup> Ibid., p. 42.
- <sup>6</sup> Ibid., p. 50.
- <sup>7</sup> Ibid., p. 61.
- <sup>8</sup> Ibid., p. 61.
- <sup>9</sup> Ibid., p. 61.
- <sup>10</sup> Ibid., p. 63.
- <sup>11</sup> Ibid., p. 64.
- <sup>12</sup> Ibid., p. 68.
- <sup>13</sup> Ibid., p. 75.
- <sup>14</sup> Ibid., p. 103.
- <sup>15</sup> Ibid., p. 106.
- <sup>16</sup> Ibid., p. 106.
- <sup>17</sup> Ibid., p. 112.
- <sup>18</sup> Ibid., p. 139.
- <sup>19</sup> Ibid., p. 149.
- <sup>20</sup> Ibid., p. 164.
- <sup>21</sup> Ibid., p. 177.
- <sup>22</sup> Ibid., p. 178.
- <sup>23</sup> Ibid., p. 178.
- <sup>24</sup> Ibid., p. 184.

- <sup>25</sup>Ibid., p. 195.
- <sup>26</sup>Ibid., p. 192.
- <sup>27</sup>Ibid., p. 192.
- <sup>28</sup>Ibid., p. 196.
- <sup>29</sup>Simone de Beauvoir, Les Mandarins, 2 vols. (Editions Gallimard, Collection livres de Poche, 1945), 1:18.
- <sup>30</sup>Ibid., 1:31-2.
- <sup>31</sup>Ibid., 1:224-5.
- <sup>32</sup>Ibid., 1:51.
- <sup>33</sup>Ibid., 1:52.
- <sup>34</sup>Ibid., 1:53.
- <sup>35</sup>Ibid., 1:53.
- <sup>36</sup>Ibid., 1:53.
- <sup>37</sup>Ibid., 1:56.
- <sup>38</sup>Ibid., 1:63-4.
- <sup>39</sup>Ibid., 1:65.
- <sup>40</sup>Ibid., 1:65.
- <sup>41</sup>Ibid., 1:66.
- <sup>42</sup>Ibid., 1:153.
- <sup>43</sup>Ibid., 1:169-70.
- <sup>44</sup>Ibid., 1:201.
- <sup>45</sup>Ibid., 1:241-2.
- <sup>46</sup>Ibid., 1:241-2.
- <sup>47</sup>Ibid., 1:323.
- <sup>48</sup>Ibid., 1:383.
- <sup>49</sup>Ibid., 1:384.

- <sup>50</sup>Ibid., 1:436.
- <sup>51</sup>Ibid., 1:436-7.
- <sup>52</sup>Ibid., 2:13.
- <sup>53</sup>Ibid., 2:66.
- <sup>54</sup>Ibid., 2:66.
- <sup>55</sup>Ibid., 2:108.
- <sup>56</sup>Ibid., 2:199.
- <sup>57</sup>Ibid., 2:199-200.
- <sup>58</sup>Ibid., 2:310-11.
- <sup>59</sup>Ibid., 2:496.
- <sup>60</sup>Ibid., 2:449.
- <sup>61</sup>Ibid., 2:449.
- <sup>62</sup>Simone de Beauvoir, Le Sang des autres (Editions Gallimard, 1945), p. 58.
- <sup>63</sup>Ibid., p. 59.
- <sup>64</sup>Simone de Beauvoir, Les Bouches inutiles (Librairie Gallimard, 1945), pp. 40-1.
- <sup>65</sup>Beauvoir, Le Sang des autres, p. 65.
- <sup>66</sup>Simone de Beauvoir, Pour une morale de l'ambiguïté (Editions Gallimard, Collection Idées, 1947), p. 140.
- <sup>67</sup>Ibid., p. 143.
- <sup>68</sup>Beauvoir, Le Sang des autres, p. 59.
- <sup>69</sup>Beauvoir, Pour une morale de l'ambiguïté, p. 189.
- <sup>70</sup>Ibid., pp. 214-15.
- <sup>71</sup>Simone de Beauvoir, L'Invitée (Editions Gallimard, Collection livres de Poche, 1943), p. 294.
- <sup>72</sup>Simone de Beauvoir, Mémoires d'une jeune fille rangée (Editions Gallimard, Collection livres de Poche, 1958), p. 263.

- <sup>73</sup>Ibid., p. 307.
- <sup>74</sup>Ibid., p. 334.
- <sup>75</sup>Ibid., p. 335.
- <sup>76</sup>Ibid., p. 336.
- <sup>77</sup>Ibid., p. 336.
- <sup>78</sup>Ibid., p. 336.
- <sup>79</sup>Simone de Beauvoir, La Force de l'âge (Editions Gallimard, Collection livres de Poche, 1960), pp. 17-18.
- <sup>80</sup>Ibid., p. 158.
- <sup>81</sup>Ibid., p. 170.
- <sup>82</sup>Ibid., p. 170.
- <sup>83</sup>Ibid., p. 187.
- <sup>84</sup>Ibid., pp. 349-50.
- <sup>85</sup>Ibid., p. 371.
- <sup>86</sup>Ibid., p. 410.
- <sup>87</sup>Ibid., pp. 412-13.
- <sup>88</sup>Ibid., p. 413.
- <sup>89</sup>Ibid., p. 413.
- <sup>90</sup>Ibid., p. 417.
- <sup>91</sup>Ibid., p. 417.
- <sup>92</sup>Ibid., pp. 404-5.
- <sup>93</sup>Ibid., p. 593.
- <sup>94</sup>Simone de Beauvoir, La Force des choses (Editions Gallimard, Collection livres de Poche, 1963), 1:13.
- <sup>95</sup>Ibid., 1:13.
- <sup>96</sup>Ibid., 1:369-70.

- <sup>97</sup> Beauvoir, Les Mandarins, 1:295.
- <sup>98</sup> Ibid., 2:76.
- <sup>99</sup> Ibid., 1:47.
- <sup>100</sup> Ibid., 1:23.
- <sup>101</sup> Ibid., 1:451.
- <sup>102</sup> Ibid., 2:149-50.
- <sup>103</sup> Ibid., 1:483-4.
- <sup>104</sup> Beauvoir, Le Sang des autres, p. 16.
- <sup>105</sup> Ibid., p. 21.
- <sup>106</sup> Ibid., p. 25.
- <sup>107</sup> Ibid., p. 25.
- <sup>108</sup> Ibid., p. 28.
- <sup>109</sup> Ibid., p. 38.
- <sup>110</sup> Ibid., p. 58.
- <sup>111</sup> Ibid., p. 179.
- <sup>112</sup> Ibid., p. 209.
- <sup>113</sup> Ibid., p. 212.
- <sup>114</sup> Ibid., p. 213.
- <sup>115</sup> Simone de Beauvoir, Le Deuxième sexe, 2 vols.  
(Editions Gallimard, Collection Idées, 1949), 1:7.
- <sup>116</sup> Ibid., 1:14-15.
- <sup>117</sup> Ibid., 1:15.
- <sup>118</sup> Ibid., 1:16.
- <sup>119</sup> Ibid., 1:21.
- <sup>120</sup> Ibid., 1:20.
- <sup>121</sup> Ibid., 1:21.

- 122 Ibid., 1:23.
- 123 Ibid., 1:49.
- 124 Ibid., 1:51.
- 125 Ibid., 1:51.
- 126 Ibid., 1:70.
- 127 Ibid., 1:83.
- 128 Ibid., 1:84.
- 129 Ibid., 1:84.
- 130 Ibid., 1:85.
- 131 Ibid., 1:148.
- 132 Ibid., 1:170.
- 133 Ibid., 1:285.
- 134 Ibid., 2:431-2.
- 135 Ibid., 2:499.
- 136 Ibid., 2:504.
- 137 Ibid., 2:503-4.
- 138 Simone de Beauvoir, La Vieillesse (Editions Gallimard, 1970), p. 17.
- 139 Ibid., p. 98.
- 140 Ibid., p. 175.
- 141 Ibid., p. 177.
- 142 Ibid., p. 223.
- 143 Ibid., p. 232.
- 144 Ibid., p. 240.
- 145 Ibid., pp. 292-3.
- 146 Ibid., p. 302.

<sup>147</sup>Ibid., p. 309.

<sup>148</sup>Ibid., p. 322.

<sup>149</sup>Ibid., p. 494.

<sup>150</sup>Ibid., p. 567.

<sup>151</sup>Ibid., p. 567.

<sup>152</sup>Ibid., p. 568.

## CONCLUSION

Our examination of interhuman relationships has enabled us to discover that this concept is a multi-faceted one which is perhaps best defined, developed, and understood when it is considered as an evolutionary process. Individuals meet and interact with each other in varying manners, starting with basic one-to-one relationships and proceeding to the more complex relationships of individuals interacting on a larger scale: perhaps national or international in scope.

It becomes apparent to us that Beauvoir's representation of interaction among individuals is done in such a manner to demonstrate that the development and application of the skills necessary for successful interhuman relationships is part of a continuing process. This process begins during the childhood years and continues until an individual dies or, in some other manner, ceases contact with others.

A first step is taken in the development of interhuman relationships when a child discovers not only that he is just one of many individuals, but that his existence is dependent upon those individuals surrounding him (usually other members of his family). This understanding of the child's dependence on others is supplanted by the discovery

of the interdependence of individuals. This discovery usually is made by the time a person is in his teens or as he is approaching adulthood. The individual now realizes that just as he depends on others to enrich his own existence, others depend upon him in the same manner.

Unfortunately, the progress made by the discovery of the concept of interdependence may be negated by the discovery of the means to work against interdependence. These tactics succeed in limiting or destroying interdependence by causing a breakdown in the communication between individuals.

This breakdown in communication may develop in several ways. The tactic of withdrawal is one method. When this behavior is adopted by an individual, he cuts himself off from others either physically (such as by becoming a hermit) or mentally (by using behavior such as egotism to alienate himself from others). An interesting aspect of this behavior is that it need not be permanent. Restoration of interdependence can be achieved when physical and/or mental contact with others is resumed.

Other methods exist to disrupt interhuman relationships which depend upon using one's freedom or the glance as weapons. These two tactics differ from that of withdrawal to the extent that they imply a need for some interaction, whereas withdrawal is usually based on little or no interaction. Furthermore, while the glance succeeds in disrupting

interhuman relationships by making one person lose his subjectivity, the use of freedom as a weapon is of greater impact because of the paradox involved. We remember that freedom is basic to successful interaction. Therefore, using one's freedom to act in order to limit or destroy the freedom of others is, perhaps, one of the strongest attacks possible on interhuman relationships.

Once the individual has discovered the means to curtail interhuman relationships, he unearths another aspect of the link between freedom and others: the concept of situation. Our understanding of those elements involved in the meeting with others is complete once we grasp the concept of situation and its implications. The concept of situation derives its importance from the fact that it is the link between the situation of one individual and that of others which serves to stimulate interaction and interdependence. This is due to the nature of our situation which is partially comprised of predetermined elements limiting our lives and over which we have only partial control. Interaction and interdependence are fostered by this concept as individuals decide to use their freedom to work, in union, to improve the situation of others as well as their own.

The discovery of the existence of others and the inevitable meeting with others is logically followed by an awareness of the difficulties entailed in establishing and

maintaining interhuman relationships. Interacting individuals must attempt to define and resolve the difficulties confronting them.

Upon reflection, it becomes evident that the subject-object conflict is at the root of most of the difficulties facing interhuman relationships. Although this conflict has been defined in philosophical terms by Sartre in L'Être et le néant, its impact is so great upon the individuals whom it affects, that it can be perceived additionally in the practical terms of daily life. No matter in what terms the conflict is defined and understood, its solution resides in the idea of reciprocity. The establishment of an atmosphere of reciprocity is a logical co-requisite of successful interdependent action between individuals. It permits each acting individual to unite with one or more individuals in interdependent action without posing a threat to his own subjectivity.

Although there is really only one solution to the subject-object conflict, the conflict itself can be aggravated by several means. "Chosification" by using the glance, or by using sadism or masochism, all serve to maintain and intensify the subject-object conflict by disturbing the balance which is needed to facilitate successful human interaction. While these types of behavior all necessarily result in a negative influence on the subject-object con-

flict, the love relationship is unique because it can be structured either to resolve or accentuate this conflict.

In spite of the fact that interhuman relationships seem to necessarily involve difficulties, the power and positive influence of reciprocity is most often a valid means to overcome those difficulties which an individual may encounter. The practice of reciprocity is of major importance since it serves as a basis for the further expansion of interhuman relationships through the development of the attitudes of human responsibility and solidarity.

The need for reciprocity between individuals implies a bilateral concept of responsibility, with an individual being responsible for himself as well as others. Just as certain obstacles have to be overcome in order to attain freedom and establish reciprocity, other obstacles must be overcome in order to attain full self and mutual responsibility.

Responsibility, whether for the self or for others, is difficult to accept. Therefore, it is natural to assume that some individuals seek a method to avoid or refuse responsibility. The adoption of some type of bad faith behavior is a common refuge from responsibility and has as a key characteristic the failure of an individual to accept his freedom and its consequences. Yet, no matter how intense the fear of responsibility and no matter how

drastic the method of bad faith behavior resorted to, the undesirable outcome of this attitude toward life often sets the stage for the gradual acceptance of responsibility.

Once responsibility has been accepted, the various implications of its scope must be evaluated. For the most part, this evaluation concerns itself with the relationship between the concept of responsibility and the lives of others, which is generally the more complicated facet of responsibility. As an individual interacts responsibly with others he must learn to cope with several realities. He discovers that although he may be acting to reach a personal goal, he is responsible for the impact his action has on others. Furthermore, he learns that his action may not always have the predicted or desired outcome and because of the action's possible effect on others, the individual might be obliged to assume more responsibility than originally anticipated. Finally, once the individual is confronted with this great responsibility, having its origin in the action he takes, he must learn how to make wise sacrifices to achieve his goal and still be able to cope with the feelings of guilt he may experience.

Having banished bad faith behavior and accepted responsibility, with all of its ramifications, an individual is now prepared to embark upon group relationships with others which require both a union of purpose and a solidarity of action. Actions taken in a spirit of solidarity demand a

willingness to accept great responsibility but offer, in compensation, the possibility of an amplified and therefore more gratifying outcome. It is often in the context of an action taken in a spirit of solidarity that one finds the most impressive and genuine displays of both friendship and generosity.

Assuming then that an individual has passed through the various stages and has mastered the techniques of interacting with others in a responsible manner, what is he now supposed to do with his newly acquired skills? The answer to this question lies in the terms of social action and political commitment.

In the simplest of terms, Beauvoir, using both her life and her fiction as examples, wishes to convince her readers that both social action and political commitment are for people in all walks of life. Neither workers nor intellectuals have the right to abstain from the conflicts which will eventually determine the quality of their lives.

Apparent contradictions between the life of an individual and the need to act must be resolved so as to make action possible. The various options which might lead one to practice a politics of passivity must be replaced by the continued acceptance of responsibility needed to engage in active politics.

Once people see the need for participation in the social and political activity of society, they must constantly

ask questions and attempt to discover which aspects of their lives must be revised. An ability to reject the maintenance of the status quo for its own sake, accompanied by an ability to be flexible, are two important qualities needed for the establishment of a viable moral ethic which Beauvoir seeks through her social and political involvement.

This process of evolution is an integral part of our study of interhuman relationships in the work of Simone de Beauvoir. Throughout her work, Beauvoir has attempted to present us with the prerequisites necessary to initiate change in our society. What remains to be seen is what modern society can do to foster conditions suitable for the acceptance of responsibility and the growth of solidarity which are necessary before any change can occur.

The acceptance of responsibility and the resulting growth of solidarity depend greatly upon the ability to reject bad faith and to act in good faith. The conflict between good and bad faith is an important element of existential philosophy. However, it is treated differently by Beauvoir (who goes so far as to list and describe the various types of bad faith) than it is by Sartre or Camus. An examination of the manner in which these three authors make use of the conflict between good faith and bad faith in their work could give us better insight into a problem which confronts us all.

The aim of our study was to analyze Beauvoir's

ideas. Therefore, we did not include much material concerning her style. However, it could be interesting to devote a study to the more concrete aspects of Beauvoir's work which would be covered by an analysis of her stylistics. For example, how does Beauvoir depict the problems confronting her characters: by using dialogue or by examining the thoughts of individuals? What is the advantage of using the flashback technique in Le Sang des autres? Why, in Les Mandarins, is Anne's story told in the first person, Henri's in the third person, and Dubreuilh's only through the eyes of other characters? These and other questions could possibly serve as a basis upon which to examine the stylistics and narrative technique Beauvoir uses while establishing and resolving those conflicts upon which she has formulated her ethic.

Guided by the principle of a flexible moral ethic, how can we make our society morally responsible? Furthermore, what other oppressed groups (such as women and the elderly, discussed by Beauvoir) suffer from the humiliation and discrimination discussed in Le Deuxième sexe and La Vieillesse?

What conclusion can we draw about Simone de Beauvoir based on this study? How does her treatment of interhuman relationships differ from or resemble this topic as it is treated by Camus, Malraux or especially Sartre?

Most existing studies of Beauvoir have considered her as author of her biography or author of a body of fiction. Beauvoir's fiction has been appreciated but perhaps without realizing that its interest lies less in what an individual is (as is often found in the psychological portraits of other authors) and more in how an individual interacts with others.

In addition to being considered as an autobiographer and novelist, Beauvoir has also been considered as a philosopher, and almost always has been seen in this role in the shadow of Sartre. While Beauvoir, according to her own evaluation, is less adept at the formulation of philosophy than Sartre, she seems more adept at putting her philosophical beliefs into practice in her literary works. Yet, what seems most evident from this study of interhuman relationships in her work, is that Simone de Beauvoir, while better-known as autobiographer, novelist, and philosopher, is a great twentieth century moralist. Perhaps it is more likely that she will be best remembered for her construction of a flexible code of ethics the application of which will enable a greater number of individuals to live life as dignified human beings.

## SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. Works by Simone de Beauvoir  
(in chronological order)

L'Invitée. Paris: Gallimard, Collection livres de Poche, 1943.

Pyrrhus et Cinéas. Paris: Editions Gallimard, Collection Idées, 1944.

Les Bouches inutiles. Paris: Librairie Gallimard, 1945.

Le Sang des autres. Paris: Editions Gallimard, 1945.

Tous les hommes sont mortels. Paris: Editions Gallimard, 1946.

L'Amérique au jour le jour. Paris: Editions Gallimard, 1947.

Pour une morale de l'ambiguïté. Paris: Editions Gallimard, Collection Idées, 1947.

L'existentialisme et la sagesse des nations. Paris: Editions Nagel, Collection Pensées, 1948.

Le Deuxième sexe. Paris: Editions Gallimard, Collection Idées, 1949.

Les Mandarins. 2 vols. Paris: Editions Gallimard, Collection livres de Poche, 1954.

Privilèges. Paris: Editions Gallimard, 1955.

La Longue marche. Paris: Editions Gallimard, 1957.

Mémoires d'une jeune fille rangée. Paris: Editions Gallimard, Collection livres de Poche, 1958.

Brigitte Bardot and the Lolita Syndrome. Translated by Bernard Fretchman. London: The New English Library, 1959.

La Force de l'âge. Paris: Editions Gallimard, Collection livres de Poche, 1960.

With Gisèle Halimi. Djamila Boupacha. Paris: Editions Gallimard, 1962.

La Force des choses. Paris: Editions Gallimard, Collection livres de Poche, 1963.

Une Mort très douce. Paris: Editions Gallimard, Collection livres de Poche, 1964.

Les Belles images. Paris: Editions Gallimard, Collection livres de Poche, 1966.

La Femme rompue. Paris: Editions Gallimard, Collection livres de Poche, 1967.

La Vieillesse. Paris: Editions Gallimard, 1970.

Tout Compte fait. Paris: Editions Gallimard, 1972.

## II. Works Consulted

Cayron, Claire. La Nature chez Simone de Beauvoir. Paris: Editions Gallimard, 1973.

Cottrell, Robert D. Simone de Beauvoir. New York: Frederick Ungar Publishing, 1975.

Descubes, Madeleine. Connaître Simone de Beauvoir. Paris: Editions Resma, Collection "Connaissance du présent", 1974.

Fitch, Brian T. "Le dévoilement de la conscience de l'autre: L'Invitée de Simone de Beauvoir." In Le Sentiment d'étrangeté chez Sartre, Camus et Simone de Beauvoir. Paris: Bibliothèque des Lettres modernes, 1964. pp. 141-72.

Gagnebin, Laurent. Simone de Beauvoir, ou le refus de l'indifférence. Préface de Simone de Beauvoir. Paris: Fischbacher, Collection Célébrités d'aujourd'hui, 1968.

Gennari, Geneviève. Simone de Beauvoir. Paris: Editions Universitaires, 1958.

Henry, Antoine M. Beauvoir ou l'échec d'une chrétienté. 10 ed. Paris: Fayard, 1961.

Jaccard, Annie-Claire. Beauvoir. Zurich: Juris-verlag, 1968.

Jeanson, Francis. Beauvoir ou l'entreprise de vivre. Paris: Editions du Seuil, 1966.

Julienne-Caffié, Serge. Beauvoir. Paris: Gallimard, La Bibliothèque idéale, 1966.

Lasocki, Anne-marie Bertin. Simone de Beauvoir ou l'entreprise d'écrire: Essai de commentaire par les textes. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1971.

Leighton, Jean. Simone de Beauvoir on Woman. Foreword by Henri Peyre. Rutherford, New Jersey: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 1975.

Lilar, Suzanne. Le Malentendu du deuxième sexe. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1969.

Marks, Elaine. Simone de Beauvoir: Encounters with Death. New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers University Press, 1973.

Noubachir, Chantal. Simone de Beauvoir ou le souci de différence. Paris: Editions Seghers, 1972.

Presseault, Jacques. L'être-pour-autrui dans la philosophie de Jean-Paul Sartre. Brussels: Desclée de Brouwer, 1970.

Sartre, Jean-Paul. L'Être et le néant. Paris: Editions Gallimard, 1943.