



The Phyllis Schlafly Report

VOL. 20, NO. 5, SECTION 1

BOX 618, ALTON, ILLINOIS 62002

DECEMBER, 1986

Marriage: Traditional vs. Non-Traditional

“Men and Marriage”

“Why can’t the wife pursue a career and the husband take care of the house and babies?” That is one of the questions I am most frequently asked by women when I visit college campuses. My stock answer never pleases them.

“You don’t have to get my permission,” I reply. “All you need to do is to find a young man who wants that kind of marriage. But my observation of life is that very few men are willing to play that role.”

Those who seek the substantive answer to that question, or the answer to the question of *why* so many college women ask such a silly question, should read a new book called *Men and Marriage* by George Gilder, author of the best-selling defense of private enterprise called *Wealth and Poverty*.

Gilder’s book also provides answers to the question I am most often asked by college men. “Why, when young women seem totally bent on a career and independence from men, is ‘money ... a good job ... a promising career’ still the first quality they look for in a man they might want to marry?”

Young women say they want men to be “sensitive” and “compassionate” and share in the diapers and dishes, but most of all they want a husband to have a good income. All the Phil Donahue-attributes he can muster will not compensate for failing to fill the role of provider.

Men and Marriage is unique; no other book in print addresses such fundamental questions as *why* men marry and *why* society depends on the natural and different roles of men and women — in marriage, in the family, and in society.

For the past two decades, the fad of feminism has taught the falsehood that men and women, husbands and wives, fathers and mothers, are fungibles, interchangeable. Gilder proves, with a wealth of sociological detail, that this is just so much nonsense.

Men and women have different natures, different purposes, and different functions. Civilization depends on understanding and respecting those differences.

Gilder’s book is enlivened with a couple of allegories. One explains why men marry — and what often happens to them, and to society, when they don’t. Another explains why the biggest profiteer of women’s liberation is the successful, middle-aged man who now can, without shame or penalty, put his faithful wife out to pasture, and enjoy the favors of a

new wife in her youthful, fertile years.

The women’s liberation movement has had a profound effect on our society. It has produced a high divorce rate, 20 million abortions, much androgynous mischief, and a social acceptance of promiscuity and non-marital lifestyles for women as well as men.

The U.S. Census Bureau reported this month that 7,500,000 fathers have vanished. That’s a disaster far in excess of all the battle deaths in World War II (292,131), in the Korean War (33,629), and in the Vietnam War (47,318), combined. One-fourth of American families with children are thus horribly disadvantaged because they have no father in the home. No amount of taxpayers’ money can ever compensate for this personal and societal tragedy.

Did a foreign enemy steal into our cities at night and slaughter the fathers? No, women’s liberation and sexual liberation stole into the minds and hearts of a generation and “liberated” millions of men and women from marriage and its responsibilities.

Women’s liberation taught young women to seek fulfillment in paid employment instead of as wives and mothers. Sexual liberation taught men and women to seek temporary pleasures instead of a monogamous, lifetime commitment. Liberation advocates forgot to warn what an awful price would be paid by the children.

Men and Marriage explains the successful relationship between a man and a woman, that wonderful nexus of mystery and intimacy, of romance and practicality. *Men and Marriage* shows why traditional marriage is essential to a stable society.

The next time people suggest that it is important for young people to be taught “the facts of life,” tell them to learn the facts of life as taught so powerfully in George Gilder’s book. It’s must reading especially for young women because it explains why men are the way they are.

The fine print in the front of George Gilder’s new book suggests that librarians should catalogue it under sex customs, family, love, and sex roles. But those categories don’t begin to describe the rich content of this book or tell why it is so timely in an era when it is chic to talk glibly about the “changing roles of men and women.” (Pelican Publishing Co., 1101 Monroe St., Gretna, LA 70053, \$15.95 plus \$1 postage.)

“American Couples”

The 1983 book called *American Couples* is still a gold mine of research to support very traditional attitudes about sex, marriage and family. The book was certainly not written from a moralistic, traditional or conservative perspective; that is obvious from the fact that it gives equal space and non-judgmental respect to four different types of couples — traditional marriage, cohabitation without marriage, lesbians, and male homosexuals.

Advertised as “the most comprehensive study of American couples ever undertaken,” its conclusions are based on massive research gleaned from thousands of questionnaires and hundreds of interviews into all types of couples. The authors, Drs. Philip Blumstein and Pepper Schwartz, had generous support from the National Science Foundation. Here are a few of its surprising conclusions.

Despite the popularity of the Me or Self attitudes, people still passionately want to live as couples. Despite the oft-repeated slogan that “the American family has changed,” the happiest kinds of couples are those with traditional attitudes and practices.

The authors of *Couples* discovered that, in successful marriages, the wife motivates the husband to be ambitious and achieving. Marriages have less chance of surviving when the wife is the ambitious one because the husband does not seem to want to live with a woman who is ambitious for her own career. The research shows that the more ambitious the wife is for her own career, the more likely it is that the husband will want to end the relationship.

We have been told that child-rearing and housework will be shared in the modern world, and that women’s liberation will force husbands to do their equal share of the housework. Some feminists have even proposed marriage contracts committing husbands to specific domestic duties.

The research in *Couples* shows that housework is a source of conflict. The marriage is less likely to survive if the husband feels his wife does not do her fair share of the household tasks and, according to husbands, the wife’s “fair” share is a whole lot more than half. Husbands are not particularly opposed to the wives taking a job in the paid work force, just so long as wives continue to run the household.

It is commonly believed that women today (in contrast with yesteryears) see themselves as part of the labor force for a large part of their lives. *Couples* concludes that this is true, but women’s self-image does not include taking on the provider role. In other words, even when wives want to hold paid jobs, they still want the husband to be the provider.

Despite inflation and peer pressure pushing wives out of the home, at least half of mothers with pre-school children are at home. Even more interesting, the majority of men and women prefer that mothers with pre-school children *not* be in the paid work force.

We’ve been told that the modern young woman can have marriage and success at the same time. *Couples* shows that the more a wife achieves in her job, the greater her chance of divorce and the smaller her chance of remarriage. Women between the ages of 35 and 44 with graduate degrees and personal incomes about \$20,000 have four times the divorce rate of women with lower achievement. The figures for men are about the reverse.

The old double standard about sex and age remains as strong as ever. If a woman is divorced in her twenties, she has a 76% chance of remarriage, in her thirties her chances drop to 56%, in her forties they plunge to 32%, in her fifties she has less than a 12% chance of remarriage. It’s entirely different with a man; he can always look for a younger spouse. Men in their second marriage tend to marry women five or more years younger, and men in their forties marry women ten years younger.

Couples discovered that the divorce rate for second marriages is even higher than for first marriages. That’s contrary to a current notion that, since people learn a lot in their first marriage, marriages are safer “the second time around.”

Contrary to what we may have been told by those who think that marriage is just a formality and a piece of paper, it isn’t that way in real life. Less than two percent of couples cohabiting without marriage live together for as long as ten years, and cohabitation tends to be primarily a childless lifestyle. (William Morrow & Co., New York, \$19.95.)

More Employed Hours But Less Income

One of the social phenomena of the last generation is the movement of wives and mothers from the home into the paid labor force. When a wife leaves the home to take paid employment, this appears to produce more take-home pay for the family. But research shows that, in the current generation of two-earner couples with children, *both spouses together now have less real income than their fathers had as a single wage-earner* (while their mothers were fulltime homemakers). The current generation of parents is working longer hours for less real income and much less family life than their parents had.

The current generation of young adults is known as “the baby boomers.” They are the 78 million Americans who were born between 1946 and 1964 — a period when the U.S. birth rate shot up sharply.

Despite the fact that the United States has been experiencing growth in all economic indicators for the last three years, an analysis of the economic status of the baby boomers by Phillip Longman, research director for Americans for Generational Equity, based on Census Bureau statistics, produces some disturbing conclusions. They are the first generation in history *not* to do better than their parents.

Many young couples feel they must have two incomes in order to make it. But their situation is even worse than they think because *their combined take-home pay is likely to be less than their fathers earned alone at a similar age.*

Some demographers and statisticians look upon 1973 as the watershed year when trends changed for the economic status of men. That’s when men’s income began to decline. Let’s compare the incomes of the baby boomers and their parents.

Prior to 1973, young men could expect both promotions and sharp increases in their income. Thus, between 1949 and 1959, the average income of men age 25 to 35 (parents of the baby boomers) rose 118 percent (from \$10,800 to \$23,500). Between 1959 and 1969, men age 25 to 35 saw their average income rise 108 percent (from \$13,900 to \$28,900).

However, 1973 marked a dramatic change. From 1973 to 1984 (eleven years), the average income of men between

age 25 and age 35 (the baby boomers) rose only 16 percent (from \$21,200 to \$24,600). These incomes are in 1984 dollars, adjusted for inflation.

Now let's look at what happened to men in the age group 40 to 50. Before 1973, men in this age group had already received their major career promotions but still could expect to see their earnings rise significantly.

Thus, between 1949 and 1959, the average income of men age 40 to age 50 (parents of the baby boomers) rose 34 percent. Between 1959 and 1969, the average income of men age 40 to age 50 rose 29 percent.

Again, 1973 was the changeover year. From 1973 to 1984 (eleven years), the average income of men age 40 to age 50 fell 14 percent (from \$28,100 to \$24,100).

Why is it that the baby boomers, who are now age 21 to 40 years old, are actually losing ground? It is a combination of a number of factors, especially the inflation that started with the 1973 oil embargo and reached double-digit under Jimmy Carter, and the steep increase in taxes that resulted from bracket creep and the doubling of Social Security taxes. A third major factor was the sudden expansion of the U.S. labor force which exceeded the demand for workers and made it unnecessary to offer higher wages. This large labor supply was created both by the large number of baby boomers and by the flooding of millions of women into the job market.

The year 1973 also marked a turning point in real family income. It fell from a high of \$28,167 in 1973 to \$26,433 in 1984. When their income declined, the baby boomers reacted in various ways. They postponed marriage, they had fewer children, and they had them later. Most important, millions of wives moved into the labor force, which is why real family income didn't decline even further than it did.

Meanwhile, costs of necessities were going up sharply. Energy costs for home fuel and for automobiles rose more than 50 percent.

The biggest price increase was in housing. In 1949, a 30-year-old man spent only 14 percent of his monthly income on house payments. But in 1983, a 30-year-old man spent 44 percent of his monthly earnings for house payments. In 1974 the Equal Credit Opportunity Act went into effect and forced banks to use the income of *both* spouses in determining their monthly mortgage payments (which, in turn, determines the price of the house they can buy). This created the fiction that twice as much money was available for the purchase of houses, and prices rose rapidly because people could get the credit to buy more expensive homes.

Does Mom Have To Work?

ABC-TV Network and Barbara Walters are lobbying for government, instead of parents, to assume the responsibility of taking care of babies. That's the conclusion we can draw from ABC's 20/20 program called "When Mom Has To Work," aired on February 6, 1986.

Barbara solemnly announced that a debate about "whether mothers should work is no longer relevant" because most mothers "have" to take a paid job. She said that only 10% of moms stay home any more, and that most families need two paychecks. Barbara didn't check her facts carefully enough. The latest figures show that only half of mothers with children under age two have paid jobs. The other half are fulltime

homemakers, but Barbara pretends that they don't exist.

The ABC program showed three employed couples, each with two preschool children. Barbara commiserated with them — over their problems with hired child care, the guilt the mothers feel (she called it the "pain" of a deeply-felt emotional conflict), the way the husbands feel neglected, the long hard-working hours, and the strains on marriage.

The program showed how the parents must wake up the children at 5:30 or 6:00 a.m. so they can be fed and dropped off at a child-care center before the mothers report to their jobs. The little children looked woefully unhappy at being forced to accept this unnatural schedule. The program was obviously designed to arouse sympathy for the "mom who has to work," but it evoked much more sympathy for the preschool children who were dropped off and picked up each day like a bag of laundry. One pathetic youngster said, "Mommy, I wish you didn't have to work. You're always so tired."

Women's lib has been telling us for years that fathers should be supportive of their wives' careers and willing to do half the housework and baby tending. Indeed, these three husbands are supportive and caring. But when Barbara added up the hours, the wives were putting in a seven-hour day of domestic work on top of their full-time jobs, while the husbands were doing only four hours a day of domestic work.

The wives felt put upon because they had too little sleep and too much stress. Yet the husbands still felt neglected because their wives were always so tired and flop into bed exhausted at 8:00 p.m. The husbands discreetly shared their complaint with the nationwide television audience that their wives had no time or energy for romance.

After these probing invasions of the privacy of three young families, Barbara Walters told us what we are supposed to think about all this. First, she berated the United States for being "the only industrial nation without a day-care policy." Then she proposed an ambitious action program.

Barbara told us that we should make helping these couples "a national priority." And who is the "we"? Well, she wants the taxpayers to provide good all-day care for preschoolers, presumably beginning in infancy, and she wants the schools to provide baby-sitting services for schoolchildren until their parents can collect them in the evening. In addition, she wants the government to force employers to guarantee paid maternity leave to mothers and give them "flexible" hours. That means choosing their own hours to accommodate themselves rather than their employer.

Before you start shedding tears about the plight of these unhappy couples or writing your Congressman to urge legislation, there is one thing you should know that Barbara Walters didn't tell ABC viewers. Each of the three couples has an annual income between \$50,000 and \$57,000. This important fact blows the whole argument that the moms "have" to work and that the taxpayers or employers "should" pay or subsidize the costs of child care.

It is unfortunate that the feminist movement has taught young women that they should put their own career above every other value including caring for their own children, and that their time is too valuable to waste on being a fulltime mother. These mothers have made their choice, as they have a right to do in a free society. But they have no right to ask the taxpayers or their fellow-employees to finance that choice.

White House Report On The Family

The Reagan White House Working Group on the Family, headed by Under Secretary of Education Gary Bauer, recently released a 64-page report called "The Family: Preserving America's Future." It sets a standard for evaluating all social legislation of the future based on a societal recognition that families are the most stable unit of society, the best nest for rearing children, and the original social welfare agency.

The Bauer report recognizes that family policy must be built on a foundation of economic growth. The cornerstone of pro-family economic policy rests on the Reagan Administration's historic tax cuts, regulatory reduction, respect for state and local jurisdiction, and allowing free enterprise to create the private-sector jobs that alone can bring economic prosperity. The Bauer report recognizes that the free enterprise system and the family are intimately linked in a complex web of cause and effect. The family which is tied together with love and longterm commitment is the source of all productivity, wealth, and economic growth.

When any new legislation is proposed, it should have a family impact test (just as we now check out legislation for racial, environmental, and cost impact). Will this proposed change be fair, supportive, and encouraging to families? Does this new program justify the financial burdens it would impose on household income? Will the proposal help the family to perform its functions, or does it substitute governmental activity for that function? Will it make dependency more attractive than work and self-sufficiency? What message does it send to young people about their behavior and personal responsibility?

The Bauer report points out how, "for two decades, the Federal tax code meant bad news for the American family." The proportion of taxes paid by corporations and unmarried taxpayers steadily declined, while the proportion paid by couples with children dramatically increased. Between 1960 and 1984, the average tax on a couple with four children rose an incredible 223 percent. The stable family, functioning on the traditional work ethic, was overtaxed, underserved, and discriminated against.

This shift of the nation's tax burden onto the backs of couples with children was the result of inflation, high tax rates, bracket creep and, most important, the freezing for years at \$600 of the income tax exemption for taxpayers and each child. If a child were to be worth the same in the tax code today as in 1960, that exemption would be \$5,000 (instead of the puny \$1,000 it is today).

Tax fairness for families — by increasing the exemption for taxpayers and each child from \$1,000 to \$2,000 — was the centerpiece of the Reagan tax reform which passed Congress in September 1986. This was a first step in the right direction, but not enough. The Bauer report calls for increasing the exemption for each child in steps toward a goal of \$5,000.

The new tax reform law contains at least one carryover discrimination against traditional families which should be remedied as soon as possible. The feature called the "child care credit" is a discriminatory cash benefit awarded to mothers who hire someone else to take care of their children, while it is denied to mothers who take care of their own children. This type of discriminatory treatment certainly cannot pass the Bauer report test of "do no harm to the family."

Reversing Sex Roles

The word "sexism" was coined during the 1970s to parallel "racism" and to produce analogous activism. Just as racism means discrimination against persons on account of their race, it was originally assumed that "sexism" meant discrimination against women on account of their sex.

After "sexism" was identified as a social evil to be eradicated, the U.S. Government began to budget millions of dollars annually to achieve "sex equity" in vocational education. The original purpose of these funds was to show young girls the array of career choices available to them and to "clean up" federally-produced vocational materials by eliminating prejudice against women entering nontraditional occupations.

After a couple of years, however, surveys showed that unbiased career education materials do not result in young women choosing nontraditional roles. Students continue to make traditional career choices in spite of being exposed to nonstereotypical materials.

So, those working to bring about a gender-free or sex-neutral society concluded that textbook and teacher intervention is necessary to bring about role reversals and to induce youngsters to make nontraditional choices.

The anti-"sexism" forces began to impose on the schools the burden of counteracting the societal patterns which supposedly prevent girls from choosing nontraditional occupations. They devised career education programs to work consciously, consistently, and individually with students to overcome their tendency to make choices which could be labelled "stereotypes."

Teachers are admonished that all displays and projects must show a 50/50 representation of women and men in all occupations, and that it is the teacher's task to encourage students to choose nontraditional careers. The federally-funded National Center for Research in Vocational Education distributes materials which call upon the schools to counteract traditional societal patterns.

Federal publications now sternly warn that career education materials should make no assumptions about who has the responsibility for home and child care. The authors of such guidance materials enthusiastically look forward to the day when women will participate in the labor force full time, all their lives, just like men. Homemaking as a career option is completely omitted from career guidance materials. Federally-funded and federally-distributed career education materials now portray a negative attitude toward a young woman's choice of mother and homemaker as a primary career role.

But who, then, will take care of the babies — the most helpless creatures on the earth? Indeed, attitudes have changed, stereotypes have crumbled, "roles" are ridiculed, but babies have not gotten the message. They are just as demanding as babies were a century ago.

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.