



The Phyllis Schlafly Report

VOL. 22, NO. 4, SECTION 1

BOX 618, ALTON, ILLINOIS 62002

NOVEMBER, 1988

Seizing the Moral High Ground of Politics

The most fascinating thing about George Bush's presidential campaign was not only that he seized the political initiative and put Michael Dukakis on the defensive, but that Bush also seized the high moral ground of debate. He defined conservative as good and liberalism as bad, and firmly put conservatism on track as the winning ideology.

For decades, liberals have self-portrayed themselves as concerned, caring, and compassionate, while casting conservatives as unconcerned, uncaring, and selfish. Liberals talked about helping the less fortunate, whereas conservatives discoursed about the virtues of the work ethic, thrift and economy.

But liberalism is based on a con game, most succinctly described by that most powerful social worker of all time, Harry Hopkins, as "tax and tax, spend and spend, elect and elect." A liberal never saw a tax increase he didn't like, and never saw a tax cut he did like. For decades, liberals have been getting themselves elected by bribing votes from some groups with money appropriated from other groups. Elect us, the liberals cried, and we will pick the pockets of the uncaring rich and redistribute income to the needy who have more votes!

The plain truth is that the liberals don't want low taxes; and they don't want the free market to succeed because they don't trust it. The liberals want a society in which their intellectual elite can do the planning and the managing in order to bring about the results that **THEY** want, instead of letting people plan their own lives and spend their own money.

One day, the American people woke up and discovered that liberal means being liberal with other people's money, and that liberals always demand higher and higher taxes that leave us with less and less purchasing power while enriching only the bureaucrats. The American people discovered that the lion's share of the tax burden has been shifted onto the backs of families with children.

The American people discovered that our generous subsidizing of poverty has produced only more poverty and more broken families. The American people discovered that liberals don't provide solutions, they just aggravate the problems.

When Ronald Reagan became President, Americans were staggering under the burden of double-digit inflation, double-digit interest rates, 70 percent top marginal tax rates, and very high unemployment. Reagan taught the American people the dramatic lesson that cutting taxes is the best way to stimulate the

economy and create new jobs in the private sector which is, after all, what people want rather than a handout. When the high marginal tax rates on the rich were cut, the poor became the chief beneficiaries because that tax cut stimulated 18 million new jobs over the last seven years.

Those who have a vested interest in putting more government employees on the payroll want you to believe that government social programs are the way to "help people out of poverty." The real truth is that the best way the government can help the poor is by cutting taxes and promoting the work ethic and the private investment that alone can create new wealth. In theory, Reaganomics means trusting the people rather than the government planners to make our economic decisions. In practice, Reaganomics means cutting taxes and letting the people spend their own money.

George Bush's presidential campaign helped the American people to learn that the highly-touted compassion claimed by liberals is also a fraud. Liberals are indeed compassionate with criminals, but downright heartless about their victims and about our civil right to live in a crime-free community. Liberals invariably oppose the death penalty, even for the most heinous crimes. We discovered also that when juries sentence criminals who really deserve the death penalty to life-imprisonment-without-possibility-of-parole, the liberal response is to secretly release those murderers on unsupervised furloughs.

Liberals used to claim the high moral ground with their sanctimonious talk of peace and arms control. Conservatives occupy the high moral ground today with their proven strategy of the liberation of Grenada and support of Reagan's Strategic Defense Initiative. That's what brought Mikhail Gorbachev to the bargaining table.

The media complained that the presidential candidates didn't talk about the "real issues" but relied on "sound bites" and "negative" campaigning. Look who's talking! It's the media, not the candidates, who decided to cover issue speeches and position papers in 20-second bits and pieces. It was Dukakis and his friends who started the negative campaigning by Bush-basing at the Democratic National Convention in July.

The American people have a right not only to choose their candidates, but to choose which issues they think are real. The American people determined that the issues they care about in 1988 include a no-tax-increase promise, the Pledge of

Allegiance, furloughs and the death penalty, and the liberalism that comes out of the American Civil Liberties Union and the Harvard Law School.

The media are having a hard time coping with this judgment because they had largely convinced themselves that, when Ronald Reagan talked about moral values, traditions, patriotism, prayer, parental rights, the right to life, and conservatism, he was effective only because people were just responding to his skills as the Great Communicator rather than what he said.

George Bush is not an actor and he has no television skills capable of diverting viewers from the substance of what he says. It's clear that people are listening to the substance, and they like what they hear.

Pro-family vs. Liberal Child Care

Thanks to the 1988 presidential campaign, we all now know that the opposite of the political label "pro-family" is "liberal." The issue of child care is the perfect illustration of why this is so.

Senator Chris Dodd and Governor Michael Dukakis were the only politicians featured in a PBS-TV network documentary on child care in April. Long before the Duke had secured his party's nomination, the television media had singled out Connecticut's Dodd and Massachusetts' Dukakis for the one-two punch in behalf of the authentically liberal day care bill called the Dodd-Kildee ABC bill.

All indicia of this bill are generically liberal. It calls for a costly new federal bureaucracy, a new network of federal regulations and regulators, and the channeling of billions of dollars into government-licensed secular institutions using government-trained personnel.

The ABC bill would attempt to dictate how preschool children are cared for by funneling all the subsidies into the type of care which is chosen by only 10 percent of American families. It would exclude from benefits all the families that choose mother care, care by other relatives, neighborhood day care mothers, and church-affiliated day care.

The child care proposal made by George Bush is as different from this as day is different from night. It is the difference between pro-family and liberal.

The Bush proposal would simply reduce taxes on families with children so that parents have more of their own money to spend for the child care of their own choice, whether it be mother care, grandmother care, neighborhood day care, church-based day care, or institutional care.

The Bush proposal would not compel parents to put their children in government-licensed secular institutions with government-trained staff in order to receive benefits. The Bush proposal starts from the premise that how to care for your children is a decision that should be freely made by the parents without any financial coercion from the government.

Specifically, Bush proposes giving parents a \$1,000 tax cut for each preschool child. For the very low income families who pay little or no income taxes, this sum would be refundable.

For starters, the Bush proposal would be available to families earning less than \$20,000 per year. The same tax credit principle would be extended, in increments, to include higher income families as soon as federal revenues make this possible.

The Bush proposal does not create any federal bureaucracy, does not impose any federal regulations, does not discriminate

against fulltime mothers who take care of their own children, and does not discriminate against employed mothers who choose day care by relatives, neighborhood day care mothers, or religious facilities. The Bush proposal puts 100 percent of the decision-making in the hands of the parents and 100% of the cash in the pockets of the parents.

Naturally, the liberals don't like this plan. It keeps their grasping fingers out of the tax-funded cookie jars.

The Bush proposal gives the lie to the liberals' claim that they want to help the poor. Bush's plan is targeted to help families below the \$20,000 income level, whereas the Dodd-Kildee ABC bill is structured to help the more affluent two-earner families because of its requirement that the mother **MUST** be employed in order to get any benefits.

"Affordability" of child care is, indeed, a problem for modest-income families. The reason why families are having a hard time affording children is the dramatic increase of taxes on families with children. When I had my children 30 years ago, the average couple with two children paid only 2 percent of its income in federal taxes. Today, the average couple with two children pays a whopping 24 percent in federal taxes. That explains why families feel the crunch about child care.

The pro-family solution is to cut taxes and let families spend more of their own hard-earned money any way they want to spend it. The liberal formula is to raise taxes, build a bigger bureaucracy, and exercise more government control over how our money is spent and how our children are raised.

Just suppose that the media proclaimed a "crisis" in children's shoes, asserting that too many children are barefoot because parents can't afford the price of shoes, and that the taxpayers should assume the obligation to make shoes more affordable, available, and of better quality. The liberal formula would be to set up a new bureaucracy under a Federal Commissioner of Shoe Care to regulate the supply and the quality, and to open a government shoe store in each community and staff it with government trained personnel.

Isn't it more sensible to cut taxes a bit and let parents make their own shoe selections?

Harvard Tries to Turn Back the Clock

Harvard University broadcast a clear message to the world in 1987 when it granted an honorary degree to former House Speaker Tip O'Neill, after declining to grant one to President Ronald Reagan. This choice showed that Harvard is not an institution of "veritas" (its motto); it is a political institution trying to turn back the clock to the failed liberal ideology of government planning, regulation, and big spending.

Ever since the 1940s, Harvard has taught the economics of the Britisher John Maynard Keynes, whose *General Theory of Employment, Interest and Money* was published in 1936. Tip O'Neill was Keynesianism's most successful political operative. As Speaker of the House, O'Neill was able to implement, through statutes and appropriations, everything that the leftwing economists hoped for, and more.

The Keynesian faith is based on a triad of assumptions: (1) a clique of intellectuals can run the economy better than the free market, (2) the bureaucracy should have unlimited access to tax funds and borrowing because the elitists know better how to spend our money than we do, and (3) don't worry about the consequences (such as ever paying off the deficit) because (in

one of Keynes' most famous quips) "in the long run we are all dead."

Assumption 1 was conceived in the ego of the intelligentsia, assumption 2 was born of their seduction of the politicians and the social service bureaucracy who soon discovered that the key to power (in Harry Hopkins' famous words) was "tax and tax, spend and spend, elect and elect," and assumption 3 grew out of Keynes' homosexuality, an orientation toward short-term pleasures that impose long-term costs on other people's children.

In the heyday of Keynesianism at Harvard, the economics professors preached the pseudo-religion of Keynesianism with the fervor and flamboyance of a Jim and Tammy Bakker. They peddled an unquestioning faith that "government" could and should plan and manage our economy, redistribute resources, and cure our socio-economic problems.

When I was at Harvard in the mid-1940s, it was fashionable 'round the Harvard Yard to say that the United States had reached a "technological plateau" and could not expect any significant growth in our economy. Obviously, such an assumption bred an ideology of scarcity in which bureaucrats allocate pieces of the economic pie according to their elitist (and often vindictive) notions of social justice.

Harvard professors of Public Administration preached, "We must stop talking about balancing the budget and talk instead about budgeting the balance." Harvard professors of Political Science declared, "Henry Wallace is the greatest political thinker of the 20th century." (Henry Wallace, the U.S. Vice President from 1941-45, was so leftwing and pro-Soviet that he was dropped by Franklin Roosevelt for his fourth term national ticket in favor of Harry Truman.)

The high priest of the gospel according to Lord Keynes was Professor Paul Samuelson whose textbook, called simply *Economics*, went through 12 editions and was sold to three million university students. The dominance of Keynesianism among economists and the politicians they seduced was so total that, by the time Richard Nixon was President, he could proclaim: "We are all Keynesians now."

Tip O'Neill amassed enough power and squeezed enough funding out of reluctant taxpayers to provide the leftwing planners with unlimited financing for their grandiose plans. By the end of the Carter regime, he had driven the ship of state aground on the shoals of double-digit inflation, double-digit interest rates, 70% marginal income tax rates, the highest unemployment in 40 years, and a deep national malaise.

It's obvious why Ronald Reagan was unacceptable to Harvard. He threatens their faith in themselves. He proved the failure and the folly of liberal economics. It is now clear that Reaganomics produces more growth, more jobs, and a higher standard of living than Keynesianism, even when run by Harvard-educated planners who are fully financed by Tip O'Neill's power and political skills.

The Keynesian theories of government intervention have been dispelled by reality. After years of the war on poverty through welfare and a mind-boggling assortment of entitlements, more people are dependent on government handouts than ever before. After years of massive taxpayer spending on education, we have an epidemic of illiteracy unknown in the America of the 1940s.

Harvard's selection of Tip O'Neill in preference to Ronald

Reagan was a vain attempt to turn the clock back to the days when Harvard economics professors conned our leaders into believing that its graduates could plan and manage our economy. The high priests of the Keynesian cult paraded around on Commencement Day in their gowns and cowls, like strutting peacocks, to honor their chief source of money, Tip O'Neill.

But the Harvard ceremony was nothing but nostalgia for a discredited era. The proven failure of liberal economics and the proven success of Reaganomics is obvious to everybody except the little clique of Harvard liberals (headed in 1988 by Michael Dukakis, Paul Brontas, and Susan Estrich).

A Family Manifesto

A new job vacancy has appeared in the Help Wanted columns of metropolitan newspapers. I don't know how widespread its terminology is, but I spotted literally columns of classified advertisements for this position in the *Los Angeles Herald Examiner*. The wages for this job average \$750 a month plus time and a half for frequent overtime, and usually include free room and board. The only qualifications appear to be three months' experience and being a nonsmoker.

The title of the position is "Child Monitor," and according to the classified ads, there are plenty of openings. It all sounds so impersonal, like a machine replacing the functions of the family. Has automation reached child care, too? The sex-neutral words caretaker or caregiver were bad enough. I wonder if the person whose job title is "monitor" will think of herself as anything other than a machine whose face is as maddeningly dispassionate as the screen of a computer monitor.

How we see ourselves is a significant element in what we are. That's why major organizations in the pro-family movement gathered in Atlanta for the Democratic National Convention, and in New Orleans for the Republican National Convention, to hold conferences called Family Forum '88 and produce a document called a "Family Manifesto."

It starts by proclaiming how the family-oriented people see themselves. "The family is the fundamental institution of society," it says, and it is defined by "relationships of blood, marriage, or permanent, legal adoption." The manifesto comes out loud and clear for marriage as "a covenant of divine origin," not merely a status of sex partnership or roommate convenience. The manifesto condemns no-fault divorce as an "evil" whose destructive effects fall on the children and on society at large.

The manifesto asserts the diversity, dignity, and complementary value of male and female, rejecting trendy androgyny and the fungibility of parental roles that some are trying to force upon us. It even proclaims the once-common-sense-but-now-radical proposition that, "in a family with children requiring nurture, the role of the male is most effectively that of provider, and the role of the female one of nurturer."

Of course, the manifesto condemns abortion. The document announces that children deserve protection "from the moment we conceive them," and that "marital relations between husband and wife are the only means of transmitting human life which are fully consistent with the dignity and protection of human beings."

The manifesto comes out foursquare for children to be "nurtured and raised by their own married parents, biological or adoptive." Further, the manifesto calls upon government to

“support family parenting as the first premise of its social, economic, and fiscal policy” because the greatest need of children is “time from their parents.”

The manifesto asserts that parents are the natural, first and primary educators of their children and should have the “right to exempt their children from any classes or exposure to any materials they may find objectionable.” The manifesto throws down the gauntlet to the National Education Association in asserting, “We reject entirely the notion that teachers or other public authorities have authority to contravene or override parental preferences in the selection of curriculum, teaching materials, guest speakers, extracurricular activities or other academic functions.”

Twenty years ago, such a Family Manifesto would have been greeted by a massive ho-hum. That it is controversial today is a measure of how the family has been under attack, by governmental policies and other special interest groups. It's time for pro-family people to unite in their own defense.

The Anti-Family Legal Services Corporation

Welfare programs tend to discourage the formation of families by making a breadwinner spouse/father unnecessary. His function is replaced by a guaranteed tax-paid income that carries no responsibilities or duties. It has been obvious for some years that the welfare system is a major cause of the breakdown of the family structure among the people who receive those taxpayer-paid benefits. What is news is the role played by the Legal Services Corporation.

The LSC was created in 1974 as an agency to provide legal services to individual poor persons unable to afford a lawyer. A new booklet published by LSC called “Legal Services Corporation vs. the Family” paints a depressing picture of how tax-funded lawyers have adversely reshaped family law by initiating and litigating class action suits.

In their first foray into federal courts, LSC lawyers brought test cases in which the courts in 1968 knocked out the regulations of 19 states that denied AFDC benefits to a woman who cohabited with a man, a law designed to discourage illegitimacy and to foster familial values. In 1973 LSC lawyers brought a test case which knocked out laws that excluded illegitimate children from benefits, and the precedent of that court decision preempted attempts by the states to develop programs that favor traditional families.

Next the LSC lawyers went after what is called “deeming regulations,” the various laws which stated that the income of members of a family were “deemed” to be available to the entire household. The Congressional intent of these regulations was to eliminate duplicate benefits and to reinforce the family as a cooperative, self-supporting unit, based on the commonsense concept that family members share with each other.

LSC lawyers filed more than 30 challenges to these laws, particularly attacking “deeming” regulations that involve siblings and grandparents. Each of these LSC suits is an attempt to get an independent source of income for pregnant teenage girls without requiring them to live with their parents and without requiring parents to share in the support of their minor daughters.

From the beginning, LSC lawyers have given a high priority to getting divorces. The evidence shows that LSC lawyers encourage divorce as an alternative to resolving domestic problems, since divorce opens up the availability of

immediate welfare payments. LSC training materials advised their lawyers, when arranging divorce agreements, to sign an agreement absolving the absent parent from paying child support. In case after case, LSC lawyers tried to relieve parents of their obligation to support their children so that the children could be supported by welfare payments.

As Chief Justice Warren Burger wrote for the U.S. Supreme Court in one of the cases brought by LSC lawyers, “our jurisprudence historically has reflected Western Civilization's concepts of the family as a unit with broad parental authority over minor children.” But LSC lawyers have worked hard to restrict parental authority in the most effective possible way, namely, by providing minor children with independent income.

LSC lawyers have been in the forefront of litigation against parental consent laws, particularly in the area of abortion and contraceptives. Although parental consent is required for every other medical procedure performed for a minor, legal services lawyers have argued in court that parental consent “violates a pregnant minor's right of privacy, which includes the right to decide to terminate a pregnancy by abortion.”

LSC lawyers argued in court that minors' constitutional right to privacy includes engaging in voluntary sex, even under the age of 14. LSC lawyers have even participated in cases on behalf of abortion clinics (hardly indigent clients) seeking to prohibit demonstrations, picketing or counseling nearby.

Despite a clear prohibition in the statute, LSC lawyers have been active in most of the legal challenges to state and federal abortion regulations. LSC lawyers tried to knock out laws prohibiting the funding of abortions except those necessary to save the life of the mother and argued in court that indigent women should be able to have an unlimited number of abortions at public expense.

The result of this vast network of LSC litigation is that traditional family law has been largely changed to relieve family members from financial responsibility for each other, so that welfare programs replace both parent and spouse. The result has been to undermine the stability of the family as a self-reliant, cooperating unit, bound by duty and responsibility, and replace it with individuals (a large percentage of whom are minors) who have little hope of ever escaping dependency on welfare payments because they have been taught NOT to help each other. The breakup of millions of families is one of the most tragic results of tax-funded programs run by the liberals.

Sworn Statement of Ownership

The Phyllis Schlafly Report is published monthly at Box 618, Alton, Illinois 62002.

Publisher: Phyllis Schlafly, Fairmount, Alton, Illinois 62002.
Editor: Same. Owner: Eagle Trust Fund. Known bond-holders, mortgagees, or other security holders, none.

Information on circulation not required as no advertising is carried.

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.