



The Phyllis Schlafly Report

VOL. 20, NO. 3, SECTION 2

BOX 618, ALTON, ILLINOIS 62002

OCTOBER, 1986

An Intelligent Candidate's Guide to the Women's Vote

Eager political candidates all over the country are preparing their campaigns for public office. As they select their campaign issues and labor over their position papers, at some point their staff may raise the question, "How can we get the women's vote?"

If you ask the wrong questions, you will get the wrong answer; and that's the wrong question. There isn't any "women's vote" any more than there is a "men's vote." The candidate who asks such silly questions is on the road to defeat.

The notion that candidates can "get the women's vote" by pandering to the so-called "women's issues" went down the drain in the 1984 election. In early 1984, National Organization for Women president and pro-abortion activist Eleanor Smeal wrote a book called *Why and How Women Will Elect the Next President*. Well, women *did* elect the next President, and his name is Ronald Reagan.

Such false concepts as "the women's vote" and "the women's movement" are based on the 1984 media myth called the "Gender Gap." This was a boogeywoman created by the feminists and the media in order to defeat targeted candidates by generating diversionary news stories which forced them to talk about non-issues instead of real issues.

Like the Wizard of Oz, the Gender Gap was a phony, and was buried (along with most feminist candidates) under the 1984 Reagan landslide.

The first thing any candidate must learn is the semantics of the subject. Feminist is an antonym for feminine, not a synonym. Feminine is an adjective that can be applied to pro-family women of any age or party, but not to those who call themselves feminists.

A feminist will hiss and boo you if you use the terms "girl" or "lady"; a lady will not. In fact, a lady probably will never hiss or boo at all.

To the feminists, "women's rights" is defined as a woman's right to tax-paid abortion on demand, any sexual activity in or out of marriage, easy divorce, government subsidies for the cost of child-care, affirmative action (i.e., the government forcing an employer to hire a quota of women in preference to better qualified men), and Comparable Worth (i.e., the government raising some women's wages so they will equal the pay of entirely different traditionally-male jobs for which women never even applied).

To the feminine or pro-family woman, "women's rights"

means equal opportunity in education and employment, an end to the discriminations against the fulltime homemaker that exist today in the income tax system and the IRAs (Individual Retirement Accounts), and the opportunity to live in a free American economy made prosperous by lower taxes and a growing number of private-sector jobs.

Here is a list of dos and don'ts for candidates who want to prepare themselves for traps laid by feminist reporters.

1. Don't talk about "women's issues" and "women's concerns" unless you know what you are talking about and have cleansed your statement of words that may have a different meaning to you and to your audience (such as "women's rights" or "Comparable Worth").

2. Don't be cute, funny, personal, patronizing, or sarcastic in referring to women. You might be offensive to some women. Even if you aren't, feminists might take offense because they have no sense of humor.

3. Don't flatter women's appearance. That offends feminists.

4. Don't use profanity or tell off-color jokes. That offends feminine women.

5. Don't think you can please both kinds of women by offering some advantage or pledge to both. Both sides will conclude you can be manipulated by pressure.

6. Don't appoint a "women's committee" to advise you. This simply provides a platform for feminists to stage media events and make unreasonable demands.

7. Don't respond to attacks by feminists. This only gives them a chance to have public tantrums and attract more media by attacking you again.

8. Don't use "Ms." to address any woman, orally or on paper, unless you know that the individual woman prefers that salutation. Married women work hard for the "R" in their "Mrs." and they don't appreciate your taking it away.

9. Don't use expressions which some women find obnoxious. Don't call anyone a "women's libber"; call her a feminist. Don't call any woman a "nonworking wife"; call her a fulltime homemaker or career homemaker. Don't call any woman a "working wife" because that implies that other wives are not working; call her an employed wife.

10. Don't ask women to "get together and decide what they want." Have you asked Ronald Reagan and Walter Mondale to "get together and decide what they want"?

Civil Liberties for Women

In the last hours of the media debate about Justice William Rehnquist's nomination to become Chief Justice of the United States, the *Washington Post* published a long editorial pleading for Senators to vote against him. The editorial's impassioned rhetoric was exceeded only by its biased and distorted characterization of the Rehnquist record.

The *Post* admitted that Rehnquist excels in intellect, education, professional experience, integrity, and moral character. But the *Post* urged a "no" vote anyway.

The *Post* was very selective in savaging Rehnquist's Supreme Court opinions. The *Post* conveniently omitted Rehnquist's majority opinion in *Rostker v. Goldberg* on June 25, 1981, one of the most important civil liberties cases of our times.

The *Post* doesn't call this a civil liberties case. That's because the *Post* chooses to define "civil liberties" in such a way as to promote the radical leftwing agenda.

Rostker was the case that upheld the traditional civil liberty of young women to be exempt from compulsory military conscription. If you are an 18-year-old female, hardly any other civil liberty would rank higher on your scale of priorities.

The *Post* accused Rehnquist of having a "cold-blooded view of the role of government" in regard to civil liberties. On the contrary, in *Rostker*, Rehnquist manifested a most humane and compassionate understanding of women's civil liberties when he refused to allow a cold-blooded government to trample on young women in order to achieve a mindless sameness of treatment with men.

The *Post* accused Rehnquist of "an unvarying refusal to look beyond the consequences" to see the "impact on individual Americans." On the contrary, Rehnquist indeed looked at the consequences of imposing a new rule to conscript 18-year-old women. He evaluated how devastating those consequences would be to individual liberties, and he didn't allow that tragedy to happen.

The *Post* said that Rehnquist will not reach out to "vindicate the rights of individuals" even if his decisions "mean a continuation of second-class citizenship for some groups or an encroachment on the privacy of individuals." On the contrary, Rehnquist saved young women from the fate of the second-class treatment they would suffer if they were ordered to report to the combat infantry on an equal basis with men, and he saved them from the massive encroachment on their privacy that would result from conscription into the army.

The *Post* accused Rehnquist of lacking "an acceptance of the court's responsibility to protect individuals from the majority, and sometimes the majority from itself." On the contrary, that's exactly what Rehnquist did in *Rostker*. He protected the individual young woman from the majority which were then fatuously clamoring, through press and polls and pandering politicians, for "equal treatment for men and women."

The *Post* complained that Rehnquist usually "voted against the civil rights complainant." But the *Post* didn't tell its readers that those whom the *Post* befriends as "civil rights complainants" included the cold-blooded complainants who requested the Court to order the heartless conscription of young women and their assignment to the battlefield just like men.

The *Post* said, "Where the statute does not expressly vindicate the rights of individuals, neither will he." But Rehnquist did. He vindicated one of the most precious rights of young women.

The *Post* accused Rehnquist of having a "doctrinaire quality of understanding and application of the law." On the contrary, the doctrinaire orthodoxy of 1981 was to demand an irrational sameness of treatment for men and women. Led by the Carter Administration, the fad of feminism was then at its zenith.

Nevertheless, Congress retained its sanity against the propaganda push to conscript women, and Rehnquist upheld the statute in *Rostker*. But in doing so, he had to endure the slings and arrows of outrageous onslaughts from the American Civil Liberties Union, which called the *Rostker* decision "tragic," and from Eleanor Smeal, president of the National Organization for Women, who called it "outrageous."

What King Canute could not do, Justice Rehnquist did — he ordered the feminist tide to roll back to sea, and it did. He helped to hold the feminist fighters at bay until the age of feminist follies self-destructed and fell into decline and disarray.

On behalf of the young women of 1981 and all the tomorrows, and their sweethearts and mothers and fathers, thank you, Justice Rehnquist for standing tall for women. You are the real champion of civil liberties for women.

"After The Sexual Revolution"

Whew! After watching ABC-TV's marathon documentary on July 30, 1986, I'm gladder than ever that I'm not part of the Sexual Revolution. ABC-TV showed us three dreadfully dreary hours of unhappy women, working harder but enjoying life less because their personal relationships with men and children are so unsatisfactory.

One after another, they cried their complaints into the camera. We saw successful career women who made business their first priority, and now have discovered that their biological clock has ticked on and they have passed up the chance to have a family. One woman coped with her dilemma by deliberately bearing a child whose father is married to another woman. Another was bearing a fatherless child via artificial insemination. A third chose a twice-divorced husband with his ready-made family.

We saw the woman in her late thirties, fighting back tears, saying "the women's revolution was wonderful — but I want someone to love and be loved." We heard about the "fear of being alone" and the 5,000 dating services that have profited from the problems of loneliness and isolation.

We saw what is supposed to be the prototype of the post-feminist blue-collar couple: a woman who is a subway maintenance worker and a man who is her house-husband. Sorry, ABC, your provincialism is showing; that lifestyle will never play in Peoria.

Even the woman who has a successful business plus a husband and one child (whom she admitted came second in her life) was griping because she had to fight for what she had achieved and had to keep her emotions under control. It hadn't occurred to her that successful men do those things, too. And then there was the woman who didn't want a promotion because it would mean working longer hours and no lunch break.

We saw the victims of the easy divorce laws so eagerly promoted by the feminist movement in the 1970s. In truth, those easy divorce laws liberated husbands to trade in a faithful wife of 20 years and enjoy a younger woman.

We saw the middle-aged woman who has returned to the labor force and was trying to cajole or shame her husband into sharing the housework because she is so tired at the end of the day. Poor guy; he tried to bake the frozen dinner in its paper box, and the dials on the automatic washer are beyond his grasp.

We heard the Stanford professor say that women are not better off than in 1959 because women are now working longer and harder. "The more women achieve in their career," we were told, "the higher their chance of divorce."

ABC couldn't resist the opportunity to sermonize. Peter Jennings started off with the false feminist dogma that, prior to the women's lib movement, the American society was "predicated on women's inferior status."

Betsy Aaron's preaching for the Sexual Revolution was obnoxious. She proclaimed that "the age-old idea of virginity" is out, that "divorce is no longer a dirty word," and that "the stay-at-home housewife is becoming part of our history." She announced that, "instead of one lifelong marriage, now it's often a merry-go-round of marriage and divorce." In case you didn't know, that's called "serial marriages."

ABC's solution for these emotionally confused women is for our government to imitate the policies of other countries which have socialized and warehoused children into tax-funded institutions in order to keep their mothers employed in the labor force. ABC scrolled the list of countries whose policies we are advised to copy: the Soviet Union, East Germany, Rumania, Hungary, Bulgaria, China, Nicaragua, etc.

ABC's documentary reminded us again and again that the Sexual Revolution is "here to stay." But if enough women see the program, the Revolution's days are numbered. The personal testimonies of so many unhappy women cry out that the price they paid to join the Sexual Revolution was too high.

Sexual Liberation Is Not Women's Liberation

The "lifestyle" or "women's" sections of metropolitan newspapers certainly have very different features from those they had fifteen years ago. Gone are the days when a couple of pages were filled with brides in wedding dresses and engagements of young women and men who pledged to live together in traditional marriage.

Now the brides are relegated to small pictures on less prominent pages, while the headlines and the friendly photos are given to those who live what is euphemistically called "alternate lifestyles." Readers are treated to a steady succession of features about different living arrangements, such as lesbian mothers, or women who decide to have a child but refuse to allow the child to have a father.

A typical example of these off beat features was the flattering "lifestyle"-page article about Linda LeClair and Peter Behr. These two anti-Vietnam college students from the late 1960s, we are told, deserve their niche in history as the standard bearers of the New Morality.

No, Linda didn't do something constructive based on

personal achievement like Dr. Sally Ride. No, Linda wasn't elected or appointed to high office. No, she didn't succeed in business or a profession, or distinguish herself by volunteer service. What she did, as a sophomore at Barnard College, was to live unmarried with her lover in 1968 and to be the first to flaunt her immoral behavior on a college campus.

The female author of this newspaper feature apparently believes that this makes Linda something of a folk hero who opened up new worlds for women. "She really liberated things." The article credits her with the shift to coed dorms on college campuses.

A few small details toward the end of the story, however, blemished Linda as a role-model. Linda and Peter broke up soon after their extra-marital liaison became known. She dropped out of college and, 15 years later, is a single working mother still seeking a college degree. Peter owns a massage therapy clinic in Canada and is married to a woman he met at a massage therapy convention.

TV Guide featured an article by Marlo Thomas talking frankly about her roles in television dramas. Fifteen years ago, she said, the girl she played in a TV series never slept with her boyfriend; the script made that very clear. When she kissed him, they were never in a bedroom; he was always at the door on his way out.

In the mid-1980s, Marlo Thomas said, she started a new TV series about a woman who has a lover, not a boyfriend. She says it is now OK for a television heroine to have an adulterous relationship. According to Marlo Thomas, this means that women have "grown up." In her view, this is liberation, and television reflects the advances women have made.

Why are so many media sources constantly selling the message that "sexual liberation" is part of "women's liberation"? "The sexual revolution" has forced women to take most of the risks in order to accommodate the promiscuous playboy lifestyle.

Most of the media refer to abortion as the preeminent "women's right." The sex act involves two people, yet the woman is expected to assume the risk for the "mistake" — the physical risk plus the emotional trauma of killing her own baby. The woman is left with the bitterness of being exploited.

Contraceptives are usually touted as another evidence of "women's liberation." Again, the responsibility for the worry, the inconvenience, and the physical risk from side effects falls on the woman.

Disease? The woman suffers more. She bears the high risk of cervical cancer from promiscuity. Women's sores from incurable Herpes are more painful and they last longer. Beyond that is the threat that her VD experience poses to her unborn children, not only now but even later in life.

Easy, no-fault divorce has come about over the last 15 years as part of "women's liberation." The result has been economic devastation for women; divorce is the chief cause of the feminization of poverty. The ex-husband's standard of living goes up after divorce, and he can look for a younger wife; the ex-wife's standard of living goes down dramatically, and she is not likely to find a younger husband.

"Sexual liberation" is just a snow job to con women into taking the risks so that men can reap the rewards of the playboy lifestyle. "Sexual liberation" imposes most of the financial, physical, and psychological costs on women.

Software, Sexism, and Silliness

I recently bought a personal computer along with an assortment of software to perform various functions. I discovered that one of the software programs will search material on the word processor, identify "sexist" words, and instruct the operator how to purge all "sexist" words and substitute different words. Upon pushing the right keys, the program prints out its long list of sexist words followed by the gender-neutral word with which it should be replaced.

According to this software, we may no longer talk about businessmen, firemen, newsboys, mailmen or doormen; they must be business persons, firepersons, paper carriers, postal carriers or doorpersons. Longshoremen are out; they must be dock workers. Horsemen and horsewomen are intolerable; they must be called equestrians.

Sportsmanship is out! It must be fair play. Salesmanship must be replaced by sales ability, chairmanship by chairpersonship. Mankind must be written as humanity. We may not say lady, gentleman, man or woman; we must say person or people. Boy and girl must be replaced by child. Never mind that those words don't have the same meanings. Unable to supply synonyms for such plainly sexist words as he, she, his, and her, the software curtly orders the typist to "revise."

Man-made must be replaced by artificial, spokesman by representative. Yet those word substitutions simply do not have the same meaning. Statesman must be replaced by diplomat, even though all statesmen are not diplomats and all diplomats certainly are not statesmen.

Some words apparently give such trauma to the software program that it bluntly spits out the instruction "avoid." The censored words are macho, manful, manliness, manly, lady-like, gentlemanly, and manpower.

Now we're getting into real trouble. The software states that groomsman must be replaced by groom. But the groom is the guy who gets the bride, and the groomsman is the male friend who helps get the lucky fellow to the church without losing the wedding ring. The groomsman would be quite surprised to learn that he is a substitute for the groom.

But that's not the bridegroom's only problem. The software insists that stableman be replaced by groom. So now we have the bridegroom, his attendant, and the fellow who readies the horse for the getaway all answering to the same non-sexist name.

Repairman and craftsman become repairperson and craftsperson. Man-hours becomes personhours. But handyman? The computer must have choked on handyperson and tells us to "rephrase." A busboy is a clearer. The next time you dine in a restaurant, be sure to tell the waitress (excuse me, waitperson) to have the clearer remove your dishes.

At least five years ago, the Bureau of Feminist Censorship persuaded the big publishers to issue Censorship Guidelines prohibiting the allegedly "sexist" words, phrases, and pictures from use in textbooks. These attempts have not been able to overcome the American people's devotion to the English language.

Will the computer succeed in reprogramming our language to conform to feminist guidelines? It's not likely, since the lesson of all advertising is that you sell your product best with smiles — and that's against feminist ideology.

When Magazines Get Personal

What is the difference between *National Review* and *Ms. Magazine*? Maybe a lot of things, but not the least of the differences is the classified ads. The magazines certainly cater to a very different clientele. For the benefit of those who may not be regular readers of both magazines, I'll give you a quick tour of the Classifieds. First, the "Personals" from the avowedly conservative *National Review*.

"Lanky redhead, 43, successful D.C. journalist, Catholic, seeks husband and patriarch. Interests: Latin Mass, clothes, Velazquez, adventure. Real men only need apply."

"Philadelphia area female attorney, pretty, slim, athletic, with cultural interests, seeks local male counterpart, 28-36, who is an exceptional traditional person of character and also believes marriage and children are lifelong serious commitments."

"Atlanta-area businesswoman with traditional values, 32, outgoing, never married, conservative, Protestant Christian. Likes alpine skiing, diving, math, history, and Trivial Pursuit. Wants to meet bright attractive male with similar values, charm, and personality."

"Attractive, vivacious, NYC-area lady, 35, self-employed, never married, seeks secure, intelligent, attractive, tall renaissance gentleman, 30-45, widowed/never married, to share traditional values, good music, the arts, good books, adventure, love of animals, a great sense of humor, waltzing under the stars, and a possible future."

Now for a lesson in contrasts, here are some recent classified ads from the avowedly feminist *Ms. Magazine*.

"Just Us is a contact/correspondence magazine exclusively for women wanting to meet women." "Loving Women, illustrated, sensitive sex handbook for women loving women. Discreetly wrapped."

"New Dawn. Lesbian Social Contact quarterly, national/international. Hundreds of current subscribers' ads, photos, resources, letters. Six years, discreet, efficient, fast service. Reasonable fee."

"Places of interest to women. Lesbian travel guide including accommodations, bars, restaurants, services, bookstores, etc."

"Westchester Feminist Psychotherapy Collective. Individual, relationship, group therapy." "Chicago Women's Therapy Collective. Professional psychotherapy services."

"Sexual aids from a woman-owned company: Eve's Garden." "Sexual Aids: How to order them without embarrassment. How to use them without disappointment."

"Witchcraft's power secrets! Gavin and Yvonne Frost, world's foremost Witchès, now accept students." "Kate Millett accepting applications for Women's Artist and Writer's Farm Colony. \$850 inclusive."

All in all, it's different strokes for different folks.

The Phyllis Schlafly Report

Box 618, Alton, Illinois 62002
ISSN0556-0152

Published monthly by The Eagle Trust Fund, Box 618, Alton, Illinois 62002.

Second Class Postage Paid at Alton, Illinois.

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