

Roots of Abortion II Careers for Women

The idea that women must have careers was a major emphasis of the feminists in the women's liberation movement of the late 1960's. It is part of their radical attack on the very basis of family life. But the real radical feminists have never been more than a small, noisy minority. The idea that women have to have careers wouldn't have had much success if it hadn't suited millions of people who otherwise reject feminist ideology.

There is a basic reason for the widespread acceptance of the idea. Salaries are the primary source of our wealth. If women work as well as men and have access to high salaried positions, it has the effect of doubling the income of middle class families who can take advantage of it. [**later note:** But, since you are effectively doubling the labor supply, wages tend to be cut by half. The end result is couples who remain childless because they both have to work to pay the mortgage. See: *Pricey House / No Kids.*]

In the 1960's there was a general moral and political push, especially within the civil rights movement, to do something about the wretched situation of poor people in our society, Negroes especially. Much of it was a sham, but there was some serious pressure on society to end the exclusion of poor blacks and other lower class people from the good jobs.

This moral imperative was undermined by the bourgeois blacks who dominated the later civil rights movement. By defining the movement in terms of color and ignoring class, they directed the benefits to themselves. And society found it cheaper to buy off a few bourgeois blacks than to deal with the enormous problem of the under class.

The feminists provided us with an even better excuse. The assertion that women as such, regardless of class, were under-privileged, made it justifiable for an employer to hire a middle-class or upper class woman instead of a lower class black man. Hiring a blond became the moral equivalent of hiring a black.

And that idea fit in perfectly with the need for prosperous families to avoid sharing the wealth--the good-paying jobs--with the hordes of poor people who now had some sort of moral claim on those jobs. So the idea of the feminists was enthusiastically adopted because it reinforced the economic status quo.

As an ideological force, the feminists basically defeated themselves in the 1970's. But, for our own reasons, we had already adopted the most pernicious of their programs--abortions and careers for women--and now they perpetuate themselves. The more women work, the more they have to work. Their absence from the home destabilizes the home and undermines the importance of the father--if any. So there is no security in family life and women can't risk letting go of a good job. The government mandate of jobs for women pushes men out of jobs and pushes childless women into them. It is a system which favors the lesbian careerist at the expense of a man with children to support.

The buying power of the two income childless couple erodes the buying power of a one income family. People without children invest their surplus money in buying extra houses. The price of a house doubles and triples because of investment pressure. The one income family ends up paying rent to the two career couple who own their house.

Because we ran away from the "war on poverty" when the first shots were fired, that pit of poverty, which lies just underneath the unstable foundations of our affluence gets wider and deeper. So the fear of falling into it is even greater. And then, when people become used to fancy things, they can't do without them. Yesterday's luxuries are today's necessities. So the burden of making money grows heavier every year and the desperate necessity of getting it grows ever more urgent. We are the slaves of Money.

Women now have every luxury except the luxury of staying home with their children. A real family life is not possible unless women are allowed to raise their children without having to hold a second job. A family should be able to live well enough on what a man can bring home from a 40 hour per week job so that he has time for his family also. How is it that, as rich as we are, we can't afford this basic necessity of time for family relationships? Working mothers who are unavailable to their teen age kids are a major reason for the precocious sex that leads to abortion. Most sexual encounters between kids in their early teens occur in homes from which both parents are absent. [**later note:** In the inner city, most burglars are teen age kids whose mothers are still at work when they get off school in the afternoon.]

careers = jobs

The gross materialism of this society and its perpetuation of a lower class have led us to a situation where women not only have to work, but have to spend most of their lives making money at these demanding and long hours jobs that we call careers. Meanwhile, who takes care of the kids?

The answer is: there aren't any kids to take care of. These two career couples have none or one. If they have one, they think it's a national emergency requiring government intervention.

Consider what a young woman faces when she is brought up with the idea that she must seriously pursue a career in business or one of the professions. By the time she finishes all her training and gets started on her profession she'll be pushing 30. Even then, she is in no position to stop working and start raising children.

So it means that a young woman today has to restrain her natural desire to be a mother all her young life--from 14 to 30. She is sort of a plain clothes nun who serves money. If she doesn't remain chaste throughout all her child-bearing years, the alternative is the never reliable contraceptives that have led to an epidemic of abortions and a dozen epidemics of venereal disease. [See *The Roots of Abortion*]

The price we pay for women's careers is a million and a half abortions every year. The young woman who sought an abortion because she had just received a good offer from a major corporation was making the decision that most career women now have to make sooner or later. That job offer means

hundreds of thousands of dollars over the span of a working career. Having the baby means an end to your career. So the baby is bound for the trash barrel. By the materialist standard of values most people and most Christians have, it is the inevitable choice. There are now 30 million American women who have had abortions. [as of 1991] It is a safe bet that most career women have had at least one abortion. [**later note:** in an investment minded society, abortion is the best investment there is, because a \$ 500 abortion which saves a woman's career will bring in \$ 500,000 in money saved (the expense of her college education) and money earned--her professional salary over a working life time. And Americans understand this, even if they have not made a conscious calculation.]

Because deaths and complications from abortions are usually hidden (like deaths from AIDS) we have to guess how many women are sterile because of abortions but there are many, many more than the health authorities know about. Sterility or seriously impaired fertility is also a common consequence of the sexual promiscuity that is now the standard life style of career and professional women. She runs a major risk of venereal disease which can put an end to her child-bearing capacity. Predictably, her chances of ever having a good marriage and family decline rapidly with every year she continues to pursue a career. The psychic damage from abortion for women who have any moral sensitivity is worse than the physical damage. By the time they reach 30 most career "women" are no longer women. A surplus of money is supposed to compensate for the physical and emotional sterility.

Why is it then that so many so-called Christian families go along with this lifestyle which forces their daughters to embrace money and put their babies in the trash? Why do they let them take this course in which they run a high risk of never having a family? The answer they would give you, if they were honest, is this: "We need the money ! She can't live without lots and lots of money--it's the way we raised her !"

The basic cause of the problem is that most so-called Christians long ago abandoned the basic teaching of Jesus Christ about money: being a follower of Jesus Christ and having a lot of money are two diverging roads; you put your faith in God or you put your faith in your investments--you can't have it both ways. There is no such thing as a rich Christian. You can't be rich in a world full of poor people except by neglecting the plain Christian duty to love others and to rescue them.

There are only about 30 places in the gospel where Jesus tells us that we have to avoid wealth and that we have to rescue the poor. A modern compromised Christian knows how to interpret them all so as to render them meaningless. He puts the pile of gold on the table next to his bible and then tries to answer the question whether it's all right for him to have the gold. And the gleam of the gold gets in his eyes while he is trying to understand all the verses that warn about money.

The love of money is the root of all evil, First Timothy tells us . . . "I don't love this money," says the compromised Christian, "I just like it a lot !" You have to serve God or money, Jesus says, you can't serve both . . . "I'll serve money till I've made it big, then I'll donate to the church!" says the compromised Christian. It's harder for a rich man to get into heaven than it is for a camel to get through the eye of a needle . . . "that isn't much of a chance, but it is a chance! I'll take it!"

We are a "Christian" society that cherishes money while it puts babies in the trash. Our young women are whores who kill their illegitimate babies in order to conform to an American lifestyle that worships money and success while it turns its back on the poor. That is the real meaning of careers for women.

from Pro Life Action bulletin # 4 May 1991

Terry Sullivan