



The Phyllis Schlafly Report



VOL. 21, NO. 5, SECTION 1

BOX 618, ALTON, ILLINOIS 62002

DECEMBER, 1987

Yes, Virginia, There Is A Difference

We had a mouse in our house this week. The women screamed, and the men disposed of the mouse. Despite 15 years of women's lib teaching us that men and women are really the same, it seems that there are persistent differences, and one of them reveals itself whenever a mouse arrives unannounced.

Of course, only women have breasts and wombs and bear babies. But those are not the only differences. Only men have an Adam's apple. Why? Who knows! We're just made that way.

Color blindness has a sex difference; ten times as many men as women are color blind. Stutterers divide by gender; five times as many stutterers are men.

High heels distort our general awareness of the big difference in height between men and women. In bare feet, the average man is six inches taller than the average woman.

The difference in average weight between men and women is not only 30 pounds but also a difference in the weight they want to be. Rich men are fatter than poor men; but rich women are thinner than poor women. Diet-users are 80 percent female and, you guessed it, 93 percent of those who suffer from anorexia are women.

Women's life expectancy is seven years longer than men's. That's why life insurance costs women less per year; they'll be paying seven years longer before they die and collect. Twice as many men die accidentally as women.

Fifteen years of gender-neutral teaching has not erased the fact that young men are the risk-taking segment of society. That's why automobile accident insurance rates are much higher for young men under age 25 than for young women. After men take the big plunge of marriage, their yen for other risks seems to wane and their automobile accident insurance rates decline.

Six times as many men as women are injured at work. Is that because men are clumsier than women? Not likely. It's because most women are simply not willing to take the jobs where they risk bodily injury or death. We depend on the men to do those necessary jobs and protect us!

Since 1964, federal laws have guaranteed women open access to every type of job, but 99 percent of plumbers are still men. Are we prisoners of "obsolete stereotypes"? Hardly.

There are good and valid reasons why women don't want to be plumbers, and even high wages can't lure them to the trade.

On the other hand, 97 percent of child-care workers are women. Nobody dares to admit there is a biological maternal instinct, but the statistic can't be disputed.

The gender difference is not just in physical labor jobs. Despite the crying need in industry for engineers, and the good pay they receive, 96 percent of engineers are men.

A new college graduate in electrical engineering can walk into a job paying \$10,000 a year more than a new graduate in liberal arts, which most women choose. The Education Amendments of 1972 guaranteed women's entry into any professional school of their choice, but still last year, 88 percent of the Ph.D.s in mathematics and science were awarded to men.

My husband tried to talk all our six children into attending engineering school. He argued year after year that you get more for your education dollar in engineering school and, anyway, you learn things that are true instead of so many false things taught in liberal arts that you have to unlearn later.

So, our four sons graduated in engineering, but the two daughters rejected their father's advice. One daughter chose journalism; upon college graduation she went to work at less than one-half the pay any B.S.E.E. graduate could get. Was that sex discrimination? No, that's freedom of career choice.

When it comes to spending money, however, women write the checks in two-thirds of the households, whether they are employed outside of the home or not.

Voices From Post-Feminist Career Women

Although we hear a daily drumbeat from the national media telling us that the American social structure is now permanently stratified with mothers in the labor force and children in day care centers, a careful monitoring of newspapers reveals plenty of evidence that this is not a satisfactory pattern. There are two reasons: mothers don't like it and babies don't like it.

Take, for one example, a feature story in a Chicago newspaper about Susan Anderson, a successful television

anchor woman who chucked her job in order to stay home with her two children. In her own by-line article, she described how she agonized between career and children, and how she made the choice she did.

Susan Anderson had invested 15 years in a smashingly glamourous career at one of the largest television stations in one of the largest markets in the country. She would face a significant drop in her living standards if she gave up her six-figure salary. She knew that broadcasting is a very competitive, youth-oriented business. It had been hard enough to get hired in her mid-20s, but it would be lots tougher if she dropped out and tried to go back in her mid-40s.

She even had a supportive husband who was willing to cut back his legal practice so he could spend more time at home. He was quite willing to live with any decision Susan made. But then, she looked ahead into the future and thought of the many who have wished they had spent more time with their children. Has anyone ever lamented on his death bed, "I wish I'd spent more time on business?"

The punch line of her article was, "I just could not shake an almost primal feeling. It wasn't so much that I thought my kids needed me more than the job allowed, but that I needed them more."

Now, for a contrast, look at a "piece of my mind" article from the *Journal of the American Medical Association*. It was written by a woman surgeon who made the opposite decision — to stick with her career. But she wasn't happy with her choice.

Dr. Margaret Levy wrote, "When I was a medical student, I was naive enough to believe that I could do everything I wanted to do." She tried to have a rewarding career in medicine, which she loves, and at the same time raise a family.

"Let me tell you, once and for all," writes Dr. Levy, "that this is neither physically nor psychologically possible. Take my word for it." Whatever arrangement the career woman makes for her children, she says, "call it anything but Mom."

Dr. Levy has two young sons. When she looked at her friends' "day-care kids," whom she described as "absolutely pathetic, no matter how good the day care is," she knew she had to have another alternative. Since her career track as a surgeon offered a better lifestyle, financially speaking, than her husband's, he gallantly stayed home for eight years to provide parental care.

But Dr. Levy still isn't happy. Like most working mothers, she admits to being in a constant state of exhaustion and frustration. Most of all, she admits to being "envious" of all the time her husband has had with the children.

Here's how Dr. Levy describes her current situation: "I am not a liberated women. I am incarcerated in a world and lifestyle far more complex and complicated than my great-grandmother (raising her 11 children in an apartment in the Bronx) could have imagined."

Now comes the *Wall Street Journal*, with its first anti-feminist article since the early 1970s. "As more working parents entrust their infants to day care," the article stated, "some researchers are warning that day care at too early an age may psychologically harm a child."

The *Journal* interviewed Professor Jay Belsky, a Pennsylvania State University psychologist, whose recent research

shows that infant day care undermines a child's "sense of trust, of security, of order in the world." What makes Belsky more newsworthy than the millions of mothers who have always known that fact is that, in the 1970s, he helped forge an academic consensus that day care generally benefits a child.

Professor Belsky announced his change of mind at an American Academy of Pediatrics meeting in 1985, and he's been writing articles in that vein ever since. He says that various studies show toddlers in day care to be insecure, more anxious, aggressive, hyperactive, and more likely to cry and misbehave at ages 9 and 10.

Women's Lib and Wimpish Men

Time Magazine gave a cover and seven pages to promote the new \$24.95 Shere Hite diatribe against men called *Women and Love: A Cultural Revolution in Progress*. Shere Hite is an ex-model who posed nude for *Playboy* and *Oui*. She then proclaimed herself a "sexologist" (a sort of female Kinsey) and made several million dollars on two books (1976 and 1981) allegedly revealing inside information about women's sexuality. Naturally, this made her a darling of the media, who accorded her the free publicity that sold enough books to enable her to live in a million-dollar Fifth Avenue apartment decorated like an Italian palace.

Her latest book is built on the thesis that men are to blame for all women's problems. Specifically, she accuses men of committing "emotional and psychological harassment" and of failing to cultivate "verbal closeness" with women.

The men who manage the newsmagazines and the network talk shows, and who decided to give Hite's new book extravagant free advertising, must like to be insulted and kicked around by the feminists. What else, except masochism, can explain the way they feature such feminist furies?

Hite's book is a compendium of the views of 4,500 frustrated and disillusioned women who blame their emotional troubles on men and now announce they are "fed up with men." Hite elevates their personal sob-stories to the status of a societal problem and calls their cumulative complaint a "large-scale cultural revolution."

Hite is sure men should be blamed because they are treacherous troglodytes and women are socially conditioned to serve them. "It's men's attitudes toward women that are causing the problem," according to Hite, because men have "condescending, judgmental attitudes." In commenting on *Time's* article, one letter-to-the-editor suggested that Shere Hite's name should be pronounced "Sheer Hate."

Wasn't the women's liberation movement of the 1970s supposed to cure that condescension and promote equality of men and women in factory, office, kitchen, and bed? Hite says it hasn't worked out that way. She says that, despite women's liberation and the sexual revolution, women remain oppressed and are expected to play the traditional nurturing, love-giving roles while sharing the breadwinner role, too.

Since Betty Friedan's opening blast two decades ago, the feminist propagandists have preached the notion that we must redesign society to become "gender-neutral," and that men must shed their macho image and remake themselves to become house-husbands at least half the time. Men must be able to cry, cook, and accept women who are career-oriented,

competitive, and unfaithful.

So, the feminists succeeded in making a large percentage of the new generation of men into a bunch of wimps who have a guilt complex and acquiesce in a daily diet of male-bashing. The "new man" is unsure of his role, his mission in life, and even himself.

These young men now feel no responsibility to provide their wives with a home and financial support (they expect their wives to have jobs and share the mortgage payments, as well as do the dishes and the diapers), and they feel no obligation to remain faithful or stick around for a lifetime. Employers are tongue-lashed into indulging their female employees with special privileges that would never be accorded to men, and preachers are intimidated into permitting the rewriting of the Scriptures and the hymns to suit the strident feminists.

Shere Hite, the paradigm of women's liberation and sexual liberation, now proves out of her own mouth that feminism is a failed ideology which produces women who are burned-out and bitter. Men who accept the blame for this result are, indeed, wimps.

Maybe the Hite book will be the proverbial straw that breaks the camel's back and encourage men to say THEY are fed up with the foolish feminists. Maybe then we will start to hear from some real men.

What's Happened to Feminist Role-Models?

Hard times have hit the feminists. The more visible their successful role-models become, the more visible they are when they don't behave like ideological feminists.

Congressperson Pat Schroeder was the feminists' best hope for a female on a national ticket in 1988. She had campaigned in 50 cities and 30 states and raised the respectable sum of \$800,000, with the National Organization for Women chanting "Run, Pat, run!"

It wasn't pulling out of the race that demoralized the feminists. It was that Schroeder cried and fell apart in her husband's embrace when she announced that she would not run.

The feminists were acutely embarrassed because Schroeder's emotional performance confirmed the fears that many people have about a woman being President, namely, that she isn't "man" enough for the job. "What happens when she sits down at a table with Gorbachev and he won't give up his missiles?", asked one Democratic consultant.

The Schroeder exit came hard on the heels of the resignation of Secretary of Transportation Elizabeth Dole, the highest ranking woman in Republican officialdom, in order to campaign for her husband Bob Dole for President. The feminists can't accept that a successful woman would put her own career second to her husband's.

Just how bitter the feminists are on this point was dramatically brought home to me several years ago when I debated before the student body at West Point. When I suggested that a male cadet select a wife who would put her career second to his, some 25 female cadets got up, slammed their seats, and noisily stomped out of the auditorium in a remarkable display of discourteous protest.

But the Schroeder and Dole setbacks were doubled in spades by the smashing success of two new movies: *Fatal Attraction* and *Baby Boom*. The feminists must be burning the midnight oil trying to figure out how to cope with the dilemmas posed by these box-office wonders.

The resident male feminist at the *Washington Post*, Richard Cohen, manifested his frustration in a column headlined "A New Stereotype: The Crazy Career Woman." He is beside himself with anger that audiences lining up to see *Fatal Attraction*'s steamy sex scenes find themselves watching a movie that shows a career woman who is a psychopath while the wife is "bright, educated, and totally fulfilled" as a fulltime homemaker, and whose character exhibits serenity and "formidable strength."

In a cover story, *Time Magazine* reported how enraged the feminists are about the film. But *Time* predicts that, nevertheless, *Fatal Attraction* "will linger in the American central nervous system."

Diane Keaton's new movie, *Baby Boom*, poses an even greater challenge for the feminists. It is the tale of a female Yale undergraduate/Harvard MBA, high-pressure management consultant, earning six figures at a top corporation, wearing designer fashions and enjoying a live-in lover, who chuck it all to live with a baby and a small-town husband, and develop a cottage industry making baby food.

The idea of baby displacing briefcase, and home work displacing the board room at a Fortune 500 corporation, are anathema to the feminists, so their friends feel compelled to engage in social commentary complaining that *Baby Boom* is based on an improbable theme from the 1950s.

Diane Keaton's own life is the archetypical feminist success story; she is sophisticated, never married, childless, has a career that earns a million dollars per movie, and famous lovers Woody Allen and Warren Beatty. It is unlikely that she ever spent evenings in front of the fireplace reading Dr. Spock.

Now, approaching age forty with neither husband or baby, she took on a movie script which makes a statement that there is a lot more to life for a woman than a successful business career. Keaton admitted off camera that "The movie says you can't have everything — everybody has to compromise," and when a baby comes into the picture, "everything gets out of control, but her life gets a lot better." *U.S.A. Today* quoted Keaton as admitting in an interview that she herself would like to have a baby.

A few years ago, the movie *Kramer v. Kramer* presented the dilemma of the wife who walked out on her husband and child in order to follow the siren call of women's lib. The result was that husband, wife and child were all left unhappy and lonely.

Now we see the other side of the coin: the successful business woman who walks out on her career and discovers that life is better with old-fashioned marriage and baby, and career as a sideline.

A Non-Feminist Movie Heroine

Gone With the Wind's fiftieth anniversary last year inspired much commentary and nostalgia, but the usually garrulous feminist spokespersons were conspicuous by their

silence.

GWTW is not a book for feminists. Feminist ideology teaches that women were helpless and oppressed prior to the women's lib movement of the 1970s. They can't accept the role-model of a woman who faces life's challenges without government help.

Women didn't don uniforms and ride to battle in those days, but the women in GWTW exhibited the strength of the South. When the Union soldier invaded their home, not only the spunky Scarlett but even the sickly Melanie grabbed a gun to protect their virtue and their home.

GWTW was real life to those who read it and saw the movie in the 1930s. Scarlett and Rhett, Melanie and Ashley, were real people. Tara was a real place we hoped to see some day. Indeed, visitors in Atlanta still ask directions to Tara more often than any other tourist attractions, not realizing that Tara exists only in the minds of GWTW readers.

Gone With the Wind came to an American people devastated by six years of the Great Depression — an economic and social crisis of immense proportions. President Roosevelt said "the only thing we have to fear is fear itself," but that was just empty rhetoric to the unemployed. Our problem wasn't fear; it was despair.

Gone With the Wind is the story of those who repudiated defeat in the face of defeat all around them. GWTW tells the history (omitted from most history books) of what the Civil War did to the South, including the hunger caused by destruction of the crops, the desolation from burned-out homes, the pain of war wounds and amputations without anesthetics, and the deaths of a generation of young men.

History books record the heroism of the Civil War's battles, but GWTW recorded the heroism in the daily lives of women and men who had to cope with the war that came to civilians in the cities and the countryside from circumstances beyond their control.

After the French Revolution, one day a friend asked a writer, "What did you do during the Revolution?" To which the writer replied simply, "I survived." Indeed, there are times when survival is the supreme achievement, and the Old South during and after the Civil War was such a time.

GWTW tells about those who survived and rebuilt by sheer will and hard labor — without disaster relief, disability payments, welfare, Social Security, veteran's benefits, unemployment compensation, food stamps, or housing allowances.

Communist regimes have banned GWTW. That's because its theme is contrary to the Marxist dogma that the individual must be submerged in the all-powerful state. As Margaret Mitchell explained in her published letters, the Communists suppressed GWTW in their countries because the novel is "a glorification of individual courage and individual enterprise (both qualities being highly obnoxious to Communists)" and because it reveres what the Communists call a "bourgeois" love that free people have for their land and home.

GWTW is absent from most high school reading lists. Maybe that's because television-reared youngsters haven't the intellectual stamina to tackle a 1,000-page book. Maybe it's because the majority of high school students are too vocabulary-poor to read books written prior to the era of the dumbed-down classics. Maybe it's because those who select school

reading lists are too eager to assign stories of defeatism and despair and have no time for tales of heroism and hope.

When one of the TV networks aired a mid-1980s expensive remake of Arthur Miller's *Death of a Salesman*, the critics lauded it as a dramatic triumph, but it bombed in the Nielsen ratings. People are not willingly entertained by a tale of failure. Most of us prefer to hear about heroism in the face of great odds, about the strong-willed who survive when their world is blown away with the wind, about people's determination to rise again from the ruins.

That's why *Gone With the Wind* is a saga for all seasons. GWTW's sales of 25 million books are second only to the Bible's, and its shared and deeply-felt dynamics have not been equalled by any other book in this country.

Mrs. Thatcher Exposes Feminism

If the feminist movement were truly a "women's rights" movement, British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher would be hailed as the prime example of women's ability to achieve and win in competition with men. If the feminist movement were truly working for "women in politics," Mrs. Thatcher would be their role-model of success.

But the silence from the "women's rights" organizations and activists is deafening! Feminists in the United States try to pretend that Mrs. Thatcher doesn't exist. Feminists show the same non-support of Jeane Kirkpatrick, a truly talented woman who did a brilliant job for our country as Ambassador in the anti-American forum misnamed the "United" Nations.

Margaret Thatcher has proven that the route to success for a woman is not the clenched fist, the wimper of one who thinks she is a victim, or even affirmative action. It is the same route as for a man: hard work, perseverance, and sticking to sound, conservative principles. She is our modern Horatia Alger.

When asked if she would be a "butcher" after her third election, Mrs. Thatcher (a grocer's daughter, who grew up in a home without an inside toilet or hot water) replied, "I'm not a good butcher, but I've learned how to carve the joint." We can thank her for showing us how to carve the feminist joint out of the subject of women in politics.

Phyllis Schlafly, president of Eagle Forum, is a member of the Commission on the Bicentennial of the U.S. Constitution, appointed by President Reagan. She is a lawyer, author of 12 books, syndicated columnist, and radio commentator. She is a member of the Bar in Illinois, Missouri, and the District of Columbia. Since 1977, *Good Housekeeping* has named Mrs. Schlafly every year as one of the Ten Most Admired Women in the World.

The Phyllis Schlafly Report

Box 618, Alton, Illinois 62002

ISSN0556-0152

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

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