



# The Phyllis Schlafly Report



VOL. 24, NO. 12, SECTION 1

BOX 618, ALTON, ILLINOIS 62002

JULY 1991

## Feminist Falsehoods, Follies, and Funding

### The Myth Of Israeli Women In Combat

One of the feminists' false arguments used to promote repeal of the current laws that exclude women from military combat duty is the assertion that women successfully fight alongside men in the Israeli army. This argument has been bolstered by pictures of Israeli female soldiers training with weapons, and being taught to march and shoot.

This whole argument is a fabrication. Israel tried using women in combat in the war of 1948, but abandoned this as a bad idea and never tried it in subsequent wars. Israeli female soldiers are definitely *not* treated like male soldiers.

A dispatch from Jerusalem by a female reporter for the *Chicago Tribune* has just told it like it is for the first time in a metropolitan newspaper. The reality is not a gun-toting female soldier fighting alongside men, but "a bored 18-year-old drooping in a stuffy office where the most exciting military task is making coffee for her male commanding officer."

Women are drafted in Israel, but men do three years of compulsory military service, while women serve only two years. Almost all men serve, but at least one-third of draft-age women receive exemptions, either because they are married or are strictly observant Jews. After active service, men spend at least one month a year on reserve duty, and in the last four years many have served two months a year. Women, except for nurses, are exempt from reserve duty.

Basic training is six months for men, only one month for women. Many say that the women's training "is mostly a joke." One female soldier said, "It's a game that we imitate what the boys do, but it is irrelevant to what we do later. They teach you to shoot, take you out on marches, and then send you to be a secretary." The *Tribune* quoted one female army officer as saying, "A woman in the [Israeli] army is like a musician in an orchestra who is allowed to do everything but play. The army is super-sexist, and it can't be any different. The woman is always the helper."

Women are assigned to a separate Women's Corps, much like the U.S. WACs and the WAVES in World War II before the sex-integration of our armed services. The army apparently doesn't consider the Women's Corps essential; the new chief of staff, General Ehud Barak, wants to eliminate it as part of budget-cutting moves.

More than one-third of Israeli military women work as secretaries. Only a few hundred are combat instructors, and 5 to 10 women apply for every available position.

The *Tribune* reporter's interviews discovered that "most Israelis of both sexes believe that women cannot take the pressures of war as well as men." One female soldier said, "We can't carry as much or stand up to the pressures and conditions. Whoever tells you we can, don't believe him."

She said that, at the end of her basic training, the then head of the Women's Corps told the female draftees, "The job of the woman is to bring spark and chic to the army. You should bring flowers into the office, smile and make sure your uniform is pressed." While some are not wholly pleased with the present procedures, the reporter found that "nobody suggests that women fight."

She found that "even those women who serve as instructors, then watch their trainees assume command of the tank or personnel carrier and go to war, say they would not want to fight even if the army changes its rules." One instructor said, "Sometimes I feel frustrated, but I thank God I don't have to be in a situation where I have to choose whether or not to hit a man."

The Israeli army is different from the U.S. Army in a fundamental way. In the United States, many people look on our armed services not as a commitment to go to war, but as career opportunity offering social mobility upwards. Join the service, see the world, get an education, and be all that you can be. The U.S. Armed Services have been pretending that they want to be "an equal opportunity employer" while concealing the double standards, female quotas and "gender-norming" that have accompanied the buildup of women in the U.S. military to its approximate 10 percent figure today.

The current debate in Congress over repeal of the combat exclusion laws is a good time to expose the truth about the double standards now applied to women and men in the U.S. Armed Services. For example, the Army test allows women 3 minutes more than men to do a 2-mile run; men must do 40 push-ups, women only 16. The Navy test allows women 3 minutes more than men to do a 1.5-mile run; men must do 29 push-ups, women only 11. The Marine Corps requires men to do 3 pull-ups, but doesn't require women to do any at all —just a 16-second flexed arm hang.

Israel can't afford the luxury of playing around with social experimentation because it has the constant threat of war hanging over its head like a Sword of Damocles. Commenting on the sex-integration practices of the U.S. Armed Services, one Israeli general said, "We do not do what you do in the United States because, unfortunately, we have to take war seriously."

## The Glass Ceiling — Code Word For Quotas

For more than 20 years, "civil rights" was a magic label which, attached to any piece of legislation, would assure its passage because politicians feared to vote against it. It became clear in 1990, however, that "civil rights" is now a code word for Affirmative Action Quotas.

President Bush's veto of the Kennedy Civil Rights bill last year was sustained by the Senate because enough politicians now recognize that their constituents oppose Affirmative Action Quotas. When Harvey Gantt tried to make his support of the Kennedy Civil Rights bill a campaign issue, Senator Jesse Helms defeated him decisively with a television spot against Affirmative Action.

It isn't just minorities who seek Affirmative Action Quotas. The feminists are seeking Quotas, too, and they have invented their own code word to promote this objective. It's "Glass Ceiling," and this phrase has become the latest fad in Washington where words are the chief manufacturing product.

The feminists allege that there is an invisible, or glass, "ceiling" which women bump into on their way up the career ladder and which denies them promotions into high-paying jobs. No one can see this Glass Ceiling except the feminists — hence the artfulness of the term.

Glass Ceiling is a semantic tool to achieve two goals: (a) to make businessmen feel guilty for not moving over and giving their executive positions to career women, and (b) to intimidate business executives into establishing formal or informal Affirmative Action Quotas for women in senior management. The feminists plan to accomplish these objectives by setting up a government commission so they can pursue their campaign at taxpayers' expense.

Legislation is floating around the Senate to set up a Glass Ceiling Commission of feminists to use taxpayers' funds to conduct studies and "research" which will "prove" the "findings" already specified in the bill. These findings assert that women are "significantly underrepresented in executive management and senior decision making positions in business" and that this is caused by "artificial barriers."

Did you think that the demolition of the Iron Curtain and the liberation of Eastern Europe means that the threat from George Orwell's Big Brother is gone forever? Don't be too sure. This Glass Ceiling legislation plans for Big Sister to do Orwellian snooping on private business.

The Big Sisters on the Glass Ceiling Commission will have the power to investigate private business to find out "the manner in which business fills executive management and senior decision making positions." They will conduct "comparative research" of businesses in which women are — and are not — promoted to management jobs.

Then these tax-funded feminists on the warpath will "encourage American companies to modify practices and policies" in order to promote the "upward mobility" of

women into top jobs, and will provide "specific guidance" on how they should do this. Are you ready, Mr. Businessman, to be encouraged and guided by a feminist commission which has already decided that you are mistreating women?

The silliest provision in this draft legislation is the establishment of a "National Award for Excellence in the Advancement of Women and Minorities in Business" to be presented by the President. An invitation to the White House is thus promised to the businessman who does the most obsequious job of toadying to the feminist commission.

Just because there is a small percentage of women in senior management does not prove discrimination. It proves instead that the majority of women have made other choices — usually family choices — rather than devoting themselves to the corporate world for 60 to 80 hours a week.

The equal pay for equal work law has been in effect since 1963; the Civil Rights Act has applied to women since 1964; the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission has been aggressively promoting equal employment opportunity for women since 1972. If systematic evidence of discrimination exists, the lawyers would be lining up plaintiffs for lucrative class action cases under existing anti-discrimination laws.

We've had 20 years experience with tax-funded "commissions" run by the feminists, most notably the 1977 Commission on International Women's Year chaired by Bella Abzug to which a muddle-headed Congress gave \$5 million of the taxpayers' money. The feminists always use such commissions as platforms to pursue their radical agenda.

Businessmen in "senior decisionmaking positions" who are supporting a wife and family should not let the Glass Ceiling brigade make them feel guilty when they refuse to acquiesce in this ploy. You can bet that a Glass Ceiling Commission will not tolerate any representation in behalf of the wives of the men who would be the losers in a system of Affirmative Action Quotas for executive women.

## Parental Leave — Does One Size Fit All?

One of the characters in ancient Greek mythology, Procrustes, invented the "one size fits all" mentality. He captured travelers and put them on an iron bed. If their legs were too long, he amputated them to fit; if they were too short, he would stretch them out.

Procrustes would have liked the Federally Mandated Family Leave now being considered by Congress. It is an authentic "one size fits all" approach. It pretends to be pro-family by mandating that employers give all employees a guaranteed return to their jobs after a 12-week leave of absence, but dozens of family situations and work requirements simply do not fit this model.

This legislation is designed to get an employee back into the workforce as soon as possible after a baby is born. That is not what most families want. Why should Congress mandate a benefit to help the woman who wants to return to work after 12 weeks, but ignore the woman who wants to stay with her newborn for six months, or a year, or five years, or have a couple of children close together and then return to work?

There isn't any evidence that unpaid family leave is the specific benefit that most employed mothers would choose. Employed mothers of small children usually prefer other benefits, such as higher pay, a shorter work day, a four-day

work week, flexible time schedules, part-time work, job sharing, child care vouchers, a better health and medical plan, a pension plan, more paid vacation, more holidays, or the option to pursue employment at home.

A survey by Gallup and Employee Benefit Research Institute showed that, when employees ranked benefits, only 1 percent said that family leave was the most important; 99 percent picked other benefits, none of which was mandated.

Federally Mandated Family Leave is an idea whose time is past, if indeed it ever had a time. Societal changes, Americans' expectations, and technological innovation have all made Federally Mandated Family Leave an outdated notion that cannot serve the demands of the present or the future.

Many observers believe that our economic future is in direct sales and multi-level marketing. People want their own businesses run out of their own homes. Many mothers are choosing different options such as fulltime homemakers, or sequential or "mommy track" careers.

The United States has always had an effective national pro-family policy on parental leave based on freedom from government regulation and freedom of contract. We let employers and workers settle the issue, and the less interference with the bargaining process the more prosperous our economy.

Our private enterprise system has made America the most prosperous nation in the world, where the average couple can aspire to own a home and send their children to college. In countries that order businesses what to pay in wages and benefits, workers simply don't earn enough money to do those things. The tremendous array of employee benefits which workers receive in the American economy has grown up voluntarily, either from employers' decisions or collective bargaining. These include paid holidays and vacations, health and medical plans, and pension plans.

There is no evidence that the job benefits available in America would be as high as they are today if government had straitjacketed business by mandating the benefits chosen by the posturing politicians. Most big companies with generous benefits started small with no benefits.

The proposed federal Family and Medical Leave bill is not a maternity bill at all; it has nothing to do with the disability that a woman incurs when she is pregnant or gives birth. Maternity benefits for most employed women are already mandated by federal and state laws and are not currently controversial.

The proposed Federally Mandated Family Leave bill is not a plan to expand the benefits "pie" but just to rearrange the pieces on the plate. Its principal beneficiaries would be the highly-paid, two-earner yuppie couples who can easily afford to have one spouse take several months off without pay. The bill is highly discriminatory against the great majority of employees who could never take a 12-week unpaid leave of absence from work or would prefer other benefits.

In today's world, competitiveness is the name of the game, and a business that is not competitive cannot provide jobs for anyone. The most important benefit anyone can have is a job that pays a wage. There is nothing pro-family about making it harder for companies to stay in business, be productive, and offer good jobs. There is nothing progressive about requiring single-income families to subsidize a benefit that only upper-income two-income households would enjoy.

## Comparable Worth Is A Proven Failure

The concept called "Comparable Worth" is as wrong-headed and counterproductive as critics predicted when this feminoid notion emerged in the late 1970s. It is a relic of the Big Brother extravagances of the LBJ Great Society married to the feminist fantasies of the Carter Administration.

The essence of Comparable Worth is that some commissar (or might we say commi-czarina) of wages should use the power of government to make the wages of groups of jobs held traditionally by women equal to the wages of groups of jobs held traditionally by men. *Which* jobs would get raises and how much, and which would get pay cuts and how much, would be within the subjective and arbitrary discretion of the bureaucrats making the decisions.

"Equal pay for equal work" has been the law of the land since the Equal Pay Act of 1963, and this principle has been repeatedly strengthened and enforced in federal law and by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. Comparable worth, by contrast, demands equal pay for *different* jobs which some functionary decides are "comparable."

Comparable Worth decrees that wages should be determined by "evaluators" instead of by the marketplace. Evaluators, like lawyers, are for hire, and they produce evaluations demanded by the bureaucrats who hire them.

Congress and most states, fortunately, refused to pass this feminist wage control, but it did take hold in one state: Washington. In that state, the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees (AFSCME) filed suit on behalf of state employees.

A Carter-appointed activist U.S. District judge at Tacoma, Washington held that Washington State had engaged in "sex discrimination" by not paying equal wages for entirely different jobs that one evaluator had alleged were of "comparable worth." The Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals in 1985 overruled, stating: "We find nothing in the language of Title VII or its legislative history to indicate that Congress intended to abrogate fundamental economic principles such as the laws of supply and demand."

Although the state of Washington defeated Comparable Worth in the courts, the state's wimpish politicians caved in and ordered it implemented anyway. In 1986, the state of Washington embarked on a new program of raising the pay of tens of thousands of the state's female employees by 5 to 20 percent. Then these eager politicians and bureaucrats discovered that the state has a much bigger problem! When the state raised the pay of women in traditional women's jobs (such as secretaries, typists and clerks), the women were very happy to remain in those "women's jobs." After all, why would a woman want to be a telephone pole repairperson, a highway ditch digger, or a prison guard if she could get the same pay working in a carpeted, climate-controlled office?

Under Comparable Worth, your wage is based on the "points" which some evaluator assigns to your job category. For example, a Washington secretary was awarded 197 points but a prison guard only 190 points. Now I ask you: If you were a female secretary, would you switch to a job as prison guard at the same or slightly less pay just for the satisfaction of fulfilling the feminist goal of moving women into "non-traditional" jobs?

Wages in some traditional women's jobs rose proportionate-

ly more than the wages of their supervisors. This not only upset the supervisors but caused the women to refuse promotions. "Why take a promotion with all its headaches if I don't make significantly more money?", some asked.

The new pay equality system was rigged so that no one would have to take a pay cut. In order to afford the extra \$400 million in pay increases to women, the state had to eliminate across-the-board cost-of-living pay increases to all state employees.

The result is that, in some traditional male jobs, wages fell 30 percent below pay levels for similar jobs in private industry. In order to deal with acute shortages in some essential occupations that men left, the state had to grant "special" increases outside of the Comparable Worth guidelines.

The Washington State politicians should have been able to learn a lesson from the failure of socialism all over the rest of the world. But they had to make their own mistake.

## Feminists Feed Biases With Federal Grants

If you wonder how the feminists are able to grind out so many books and studies that feed their peculiar biases, one place to look is the gravy train of federal funding. Here is a list of just some of the tax-funded grants given to feminist studies by the National Endowment for the Humanities.

The following grants are quoted directly from the NEH's last available annual report. They are labeled "independent study and research in the humanities," but in truth they are just federal handouts to feminists in academia.

Formations of Gender in 18th-Century Narrative: \$27,500 to Carol L. Barash, South Orange, NJ.

The Historical Context of Early Christian Responses to Gender: \$16,750 to Bernadette J. Brooten, Cambridge, MA.

Female Piety and Self-Empowerment in 17th-Century France: \$27,500 to Marie-Florine Bruneau, Los Angeles, CA.

An Exploration of Female Discourse and Ethnographic Process in a Northern Greek Town: \$23,100 to Jane K. Cowan, Swansea, Wales.

Gender and the New Learning in Early Modern France: \$24,061 to Erica Harth, Cambridge, MA.

Gender and the Rise of the Novel: Reading in Pairs: \$27,500 to Nancy K. Miller, New York, NY.

The Libel Trial of a Woman Surgeon: \$27,500 to Regina A. Morantz-Sanchez, Los Angeles, CA.

Women's Autobiography in 19th-Century England: \$27,500 to Linda H. Peterson, New Haven, CT.

A Literary History of American Women Writers: \$27,500 to Elaine C. Showalter, Princeton, NJ.

Susan Glaspell: Pioneer Playwright: \$27,500 to Linda M. Ben-Zvi, Fort Collins, CO.

A Study of Edwardian Feminist Discourse, 1900-14: \$27,500 to Janice H. Harris, Laramie, WY.

Women's Roles in Somali Society, 1800-1940: \$27,500 to Lidwien E. Kapteijns, Wellesley, MA.

Achieving Authority: Women's Entrance into Public Life in Early America: \$27,500 to Mary Kelley, Hanover, NH.

The Female Character as Spoilsport in Moliere's Comedies: \$17,487 to Roxanne D. Lalande, Easton, PA.

Gender, Labor, and Capital: The Creation of a Gender-Segregated Labor Force in 19th-Century Britain: \$27,500 to Sonya O. Rose, Waterville, ME.

Women, Culture, and the Press in Egypt: \$750 to Beth A. Baron, White Plains, NY.

The Thematics of Propaganda: Gender Relations in the French Renaissance Novella: \$750 to Edith J. Benkov, San Diego, CA.

Anna Howard Shaw and the Crusade for Women's Rights: \$750 to Terry D. Bilhartz, Huntsville, TX.

Anne Sexton as Humorist and Poet/Performer: \$750 to Kay Ellen M. Capo, Purchase, NY.

A Woman Prophet's Critique of English Politics and Religion: \$750 to Esther S. Cope, Lincoln, NE.

Cooperative Galleries of the Women's Art Movement, 1969-89: \$750 to Gayle R. Davis, Wichita, KS.

Power and Dependence: the Women of Flowerdew Hundred Plantation: \$750 to Suzanne K. Engler, Woodland Hills, CA.

Fanny Fern's Vision of the Role of Women: \$2,200 to Kari L. Bloedel, Madison, WI.

The True Heroine in Chretien de Troyes's *Yvain*: \$1,800 to Elizabeth A. Bloomfield, Greenville, PA.

Contemporary Senegal: Women's Balance of Power in Novels by Aminata Sow Fall: \$2,200 to Heidi M. Creamer, Portland, OR.

Gender Roles and Social Dynamics in the *Ramayana*: \$2,200 to Tamara S. Jackson, Vallejo, CA.

Witchcraft Beliefs and the History of Thought in Ancient Mesopotamia: \$27,500 to I. Tzvi Abusch, Newton, MA.

Rewriting Writing: Self and Narrative in Two Women's Novels: \$2,200 to Heather K. Love, Cambridge, MA.

British Women Workers and the First World War: \$2,200 to Sophie Y. Moothala, South Hadley, MA.

Women's Role in the Enlightenment: Controversial Yet Significant: \$1,800 to Wendy Sellers, Nashville, TN.

The Woman Question in an Age of Revolutions, 1750-1880: \$62,533 to Karen Offen, Stanford, CA.

None of these grants is worth one dollar of our tax money. If these individuals want to pursue their pet projects, they should do it on their own money; or, as an alternative, they can try to get some university to accept their paper as a Ph.D. thesis.

Giving out tax dollars for such stuff is a cheat on the taxpayers as well as a subsidy to feminist propaganda. There are no NEH grants for such non-feminist topics as The Social Value of the Fulltime Mother, How Gender Identity Plays an Important Role in a Functioning Family, The Husband-Breadwinner/Wife-Homemaker Roles in the Building of America, How the American Private Enterprise System Has Lifted "Women's Work" from American Women, or the Social Consequences of Sending Mothers of New Babies Into War Areas.

## 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: \$20 per year. Extra copies available: 50 cents each; 4 copies \$1; 30 copies \$5; 100 copies \$10.