
Preface

The cry of “women’s liberation” leaps out from the “lifestyle” sections of newspapers and the pages of slick magazines, from radio speakers and television screens. Cut loose from past patterns of behavior and expectations, women of all ages are searching for their identity—the college woman who has new alternatives thrust upon her via “women’s studies” courses, the young woman whose routine is shattered by a chance encounter with a “consciousness-raising session,” the woman in her middle years who suddenly finds herself in the “empty-nest syndrome,” the woman of any age whose lover or lifetime partner departs for greener pastures (and a younger crop).

All of these women, thanks to the women’s liberation movement, no longer see their predicament in terms of personal problems to be confronted and solved. They see their own difficulties as a little cog in the big machine of establishment restraints and stereotypical injustice in which they have lost their own equilibrium. Who am I? Why am I here? Why am I just another faceless victim of society’s oppression, a nameless prisoner behind walls too high for me to climb alone?

If I were stymied by a slice in my golf drive, I would seek lessons from a pro rather than join the postmortems in the bar at the “nineteenth hole.” If I found a lump on my breast, I would run, not walk, to the best available physician, rather than join rap sessions with other women who had recently made similar discoveries. If my business were sliding into bankruptcy, I would ask advice from those whose companies operate in the black rather than in the red.

Likewise, it would seem that, for a woman to find her identity in the modern world, the path should be sought from the Positive Women who have found the road and possess the map, rather than from those who have not. In this spirit, I share with you the thoughts of one who loves life as a woman and
lives love as a woman, whose credentials are from the school of practical experience, and who has learned that fulfillment as a woman is a journey, not a destination.

Like every human being born into this world, the Positive Woman has her share of sorrows and sufferings, of unfulfilled desires and bitter defeats. But she will never be crushed by life’s disappointments, because her positive mental attitude has built her an inner security that the actions of other people can never fracture. To the Positive Woman, her particular set of problems is not a conspiracy against her, but a challenge to her character and her capabilities.

The first requirement for the acquisition of power by the Positive Woman is to understand the differences between men and women. Your outlook on life, your faith, your behavior, your potential for fulfillment, all are determined by the parameters of your original premise. The Positive Woman starts with the assumption that the world is her oyster. She rejoices in the creative capability within her body and the power potential of her mind and spirit. She understands that men and women are different, and that those very differences provide the key to her success as a person and fulfillment as a woman.

The women’s liberationist, on the other hand, is imprisoned by her own negative view of herself and of her place in the world around her. This view of women was most succinctly expressed in an advertisement designed by the principal women’s liberationist organization, the National Organization for Women (NOW), and run in many magazines and newspapers and as spot announcements on many television stations. The advertisement showed a darling curlyheaded girl with the caption: “This healthy, normal baby has a handicap. She was born female.”

This is the self-articulated dog-in-the-manger, chip-on-the-shoulder, fundamental dogma of the women’s liberation movement. Someone—it is not clear who, perhaps God, perhaps the “Establishment,” perhaps a conspiracy of male chauvinist pigs—dealt women a foul blow by making them female. It becomes necessary, therefore, for women to agitate and demonstrate and hurl demands on society in order to wrest from an oppressive
male-dominated social structure the status that has been
wrongfully denied to women through the centuries.

By its very nature, therefore, the women’s liberation move-
ment precipitates a series of conflict situations—in the legisla-
tures, in the courts, in the schools, in industry—with man tar-
ged as the enemy. Confrontation replaces cooperation as the
watchword of all relationships. Women and men become adver-
saries instead of partners.

The second dogma of the women’s liberationists is that, of
all the injustices perpetrated upon women through the centu-
ries, the most oppressive is the cruel fact that women have
babies and men do not. Within the confines of the women’s
liberationist ideology, therefore, the abolition of this overrid-
ing inequality of women becomes the primary goal. This goal
must be achieved at any and all costs—to the woman herself, to
the baby, to the family, and to society. Women must be made
equal to men in their ability not to become pregnant and not to
be expected to care for babies they may bring into the world.

This is why women’s liberationists are compulsively in-
volved in the drive to make abortion and child-care centers for
all women, regardless of religion or income, both socially ac-
ceptable and government-financed. Former Congresswoman
Bella Abzug has defined the goal: “to enforce the constitu-
tional right of females to terminate pregnancies that they do
not wish to continue.”

If man is targeted as the enemy, and the ultimate goal of
women’s liberation is independence from men and the avoid-
ance of pregnancy and its consequences, then lesbianism is
logically the highest form in the ritual of women’s liberation.
Many, such as Kate Millett, come to this conclusion, although
many others do not.

The Positive Woman will never travel that dead-end road. It
is self-evident to the Positive Woman that the female body
with its baby-producing organs was not designed by a conspir-
cy of men but by the Divine Architect of the human race.
Those who think it is unfair that women have babies, whereas
men cannot, will have to take up their complaint with God
because no other power is capable of changing that fundamen-
tal fact. On some college campuses, I have been assured that
other methods of reproduction will be developed. But most of
us must deal with the real world rather than with the imagina-
tion of dreamers.

Another feature of the woman’s natural role is the obvious
fact that women can breast-feed babies and men cannot. This
functional role was not imposed by conspiratorial males seek-
ing to burden women with confining chores, but must be rec-
ognized as part of the plan of the Divine Architect for the
survival of the human race through the centuries and in the
countries that know no pasteurization of milk or sterilization of
bottles.

The Positive Woman looks upon her femaleness and her fer-
tility as part of her purpose, her potential, and her power. She
rejoices that she has a capability for creativity that men can
never have.

The third basic dogma of the women’s liberation movement
is that there is no difference between male and female except
the sex organs, and that all those physical, cognitive, and emo-
tional differences you think are there, are merely the result of
centuries of restraints imposed by a male-dominated society
and sex-stereotyped schooling. The role imposed on women is,
by definition, inferior, according to the women’s liberationists.

The Positive Woman knows that, while there are some physi-
cal competitions in which women are better (and can com-
mand more money) than men, including those that put a pre-
mium on grace and beauty, such as figure skating, the superior
physical strength of males over females in competitions of
strength, speed, and short-term endurance is beyond rational
dispute.

In the Olympic Games, women not only cannot win any
medals in competition with men, the gulf between them is so
great that they cannot even qualify for the contests with men.
No amount of training from infancy can enable women to
throw the discus as far as men, or to match men in push-ups or
in lifting weights. In track and field events, individual male
records surpass those of women by 10 to 20 percent.

Female swimmers today are beating Johnny Weissmuller’s
records, but today’s male swimmers are better still. Chris Evert
can never win a tennis match against Jimmy Connors. If we
removed lady’s tees from golf courses, women would be out of
the game. Putting women in football or wrestling matches can
only be an exercise in laughs.

The Olympic Games, whose rules require strict verification
to ascertain that no male enters a female contest and, with his
masculine advantage, unfairly captures a woman’s medal, for-
merly insisted on a visual inspection of the contestants’ bodies. Science, however, has discovered that men and women are so innately different physically that their maleness/femaleness can be conclusively established by means of a simple skin test of fully clothed persons.

If there is anyone who should oppose enforced sex-equality, it is the women athletes. Babe Didrickson, who played and defeated some of the great male athletes of her time, is unique in the history of sports.  

If sex equality were enforced in professional sports, it would mean that men could enter the women’s tournaments and win most of the money. Bobby Riggs has already threatened: “I think that men 55 years and over should be allowed to play women’s tournaments—like the Virginia Slams. Everybody ought to know there’s no sex after 55 anyway.”

The Positive Woman remembers the essential validity of the old prayer: “Lord, give me the strength to change what I can change, the serenity to accept what I cannot change, and the wisdom to discern the difference.” The women’s liberationists are expending their time and energies erecting a make-believe world in which they hypothesize that if schooling were gender-free, and if the same money were spent on male and female sports programs, and if women were permitted to compete on equal terms, then they would prove themselves to be physically equal. Meanwhile, the Positive Woman has put the ineradicable physical differences into her mental computer, programmed her plan of action, and is already on the way to personal achievement.

Thus, while some militant women spend their time demanding more money for professional sports, ice skater Janet Lynn, a truly Positive Woman, quietly signed the most profitable financial contract in the history of women’s athletics. It was not the strident demands of the women’s liberationists that brought high prizes to women’s tennis, but the discovery by sports promoters that beautiful female legs gracefully moving around the court made women’s tennis a highly marketable television production to delight male audiences.

Many people thought that the remarkable filly named Ruffian would prove that a female race horse could compete equally with a male. Even with the handicap of extra weights placed on the male horse, the race was a disaster for the female. The gallant Ruffian gave her all in a noble effort to compete, but broke a leg in the race and, despite the immediate attention of top veterinarians, had to be put away.

Despite the claims of the women’s liberation movement, there are countless physical differences between men and women. The female body is 50 to 60 percent water, the male 60 to 70 percent water, which explains why males can dilute alcohol better than women and delay its effect. The average woman is about 25 percent fatty tissue, while the male is 15 percent, making women more buoyant in water and able to swim with less effort. Males have a tendency to color blindness. Only 5 percent of persons who get gout are female. Boys are born bigger. Women live longer in most countries of the world, not only in the United States where we have a hard-driving competitive pace. Women excel in manual dexterity, verbal skills, and memory recall.

Arianna Stassinopoulos in her book The Female Woman has done a good job of spelling out the many specific physical differences that are so innate and so all-pervasive that even if Women’s Lib was given a hundred, a thousand, ten thousand years in which to eradicate all the differences between the sexes, it would still be an impossible undertaking. . . .

It is inconceivable that millions of years of evolutionary selection during a period of marked sexual division of labor have not left pronounced traces on the innate character of men and women. Aggressiveness, and mechanical and spatial skills, a sense of direction, and physical strength—all masculine characteristics—are the qualities essential for a hunter; even food gatherers need these same qualities for defense and exploration. The prolonged period of dependence of human children, the difficulty of carrying the peculiarly heavy and inert human baby—a much heavier, clumsier burden than the monkey infant and much less able to cling on for safety—meant that women could not both look after their children and be hunters and explorers. Early humans learned to take advantage of this period of dependence to transmit rules, knowledge and skills to their offspring—women needed to develop verbal skills, a talent for personal relationships, and a predilection for nurturing going even beyond the maternal instinct.

Does the physical advantage of men doom women to a life of servility and subservience? The Positive Woman knows that she has a complementary advantage which is at least as great—and, in the hands of a skillful woman, far greater. The Divine
The women's liberationists and their dupes who try to tell each other that the sexual drive of men and women is really the same, and that it is only societal restraints that inhibit women from an equal desire, an equal enjoyment, and an equal freedom from the consequences, are doomed to frustration forever. It just isn't so, and pretending cannot make it so. The differences are not a woman's weakness but her strength.

Dr. Robert Collins, who has had ten years' experience in listening to and advising young women at a large eastern university, put his finger on the reason why casual "sexual activity" is such a cheat on women:

A basic flaw in this new morality is the assumption that males and females are the same sexually. The simplicity of the male anatomy and its operation suggest that to a man, sex can be an activity apart from his whole being, a drive related to the organs themselves.

In a woman, the complex internal organization, correlated with her other hormonal systems, indicates her sexuality must involve her total self. On the other hand, the man is orgasm-oriented with a drive that ignores most other aspects of the relationship. The woman is almost totally different. She is engulfed in romanticism and tries to find and express her total feelings for her partner.

A study at a midwestern school shows that 80 percent of the women who had intercourse hoped to marry their partner. Only 12 percent of the men expected the same.

Women say that soft, warm promises and tender touches are delightful, but that the act itself usually leads to a "Is that all there is to it?" reaction.

[A typical reaction is]: "It sure wasn't worth it. It was no fun at the time. I've been worried ever since...."

The new morality is a fad. It ignores history, it denies the physical and mental composition of human beings, it is intolerant, exploitative, and is oriented toward intercourse, not love.

The new generation can brag all it wants about the new liberation of the new morality, but it is still the woman who is hurt the most. The new morality isn't just a "fad"—it is a cheat and a thief. It robs the woman of her virtue, her youth, her beauty, and her love—for nothing, just nothing. It has produced a generation of young women searching for their identity, bored with sexual freedom, and despondent from the lonesomeness of living a life without commitment. They have abandoned the old commandments, but they can't find any new rules that work.

The Positive Woman recognizes the fact that, when it comes to sex, women are simply not the equal of men. The sexual drive of men is much stronger than that of women. That is how the human race was designed in order that it might perpetuate itself. The other side of the coin is that it is easier for women to control their sexual appetites. A Positive Woman cannot defeat a man in a wrestling or boxing match, but she can motivate him, inspire him, encourage him, teach him, restrain him, reward him, and have power over him that he can never achieve over her with all his muscle. How or whether a Positive Woman uses her power is determined solely by the way she alone defines her goals and develops her skills.

The differences between men and women are also emotional and psychological. Without woman's innate maternal instinct, the human race would have died out centuries ago. There is nothing so helpless in all earthly life as the newborn infant. It will die within hours if not cared for. Even in the most primitive, uneducated societies, women have always cared for their newborn babies. They didn't need any schooling to teach them how. They didn't need any welfare workers to tell them it is their social obligation. Even in societies to whom such concepts as "ought," "social responsibility," and "compassion for the helpless" were unknown, mothers cared for their new babies.

Why? Because caring for a baby serves the natural maternal need of a woman. Although not nearly so total as the baby's need, the woman's need is nonetheless real.

The overriding psychological need of a woman is to love something alive. A baby fulfills this need in the lives of most women. If a baby is not available to fill that need, women search for a baby-substitute. This is the reason why women have traditionally gone into teaching and nursing careers. They are doing what comes naturally to the female psyche. The schoolchild or the patient of any age provides an outlet for a woman to express her natural maternal need.

This maternal need in women is the reason why mothers whose children have grown up and flown from the nest are sometimes cut loose from their psychological moorings. The maternal need in women can show itself in love for grandchi-
children, nieces, nephews, or even neighbors’ children. The maternal need in some women has even manifested itself in an extraordinary affection lavished on a dog, a cat, or a parakeet.

This is not to say that every woman must have a baby in order to be fulfilled. But it is to say that fulfillment for most women involves expressing their natural maternal urge by loving and caring for someone.

The women’s liberation movement complains that traditional stereotyped roles assume that women are “passive” and that men are “aggressive.” The anomaly is that a woman’s most fundamental emotional need is not passive at all, but active. A woman naturally seeks to love affirmatively and to show that love in an active way by caring for the object of her affections.

The Positive Woman finds somebody on whom she can lavish her maternal love so that it doesn’t well up inside her and cause psychological frustrations. Surely no woman is so isolated by geography or insulated by spirit that she cannot find someone worthy of her maternal love. All persons, men and women, gain by sharing something of themselves with their fellow humans, but women profit most of all because it is part of their very nature.

One of the strangest quirks of women’s liberationists is their complaint that societal restraints prevent men from crying in public or showing their emotions, but permit women to do so, and that therefore we should “liberate” men to enable them, too, to cry in public. The public display of fear, sorrow, anger, and irritation reveals a lack of self-discipline that should be avoided by the Positive Woman just as much as by the Positive Man. Maternal love, however, is not a weakness but a manifestation of strength and service, and it should be nurtured by the Positive Woman.

Most women’s organizations, recognizing the preference of most women to avoid hard-driving competition, handle the matter of succession of officers by the device of a nominating committee. This eliminates the unpleasantness and the tension of a competitive confrontation every year or two. Many women’s organizations customarily use a prayer attributed to Mary, Queen of Scots, which is an excellent analysis by a woman of women’s faults:

Keep us, O God, from pettiness; let us be large in thought, in word, in deed. Let us be done with fault-finding and leave off self-seeking. . . . Grant that we may realize it is the little things that create differences, that in the big things of life we are at one.

Another silliness of the women’s liberationists is their frenetic desire to force all women to accept the title Ms in place of Miss or Mrs. If Gloria Steinem and Betty Friedan want to call themselves Ms in order to conceal their marital status, their wishes should be respected.

But that doesn’t satisfy the women’s liberationists. They want all women to be compelled to use Ms whether they like it or not. The women’s liberation movement has been waging a persistent campaign to browbeat the media into using Ms as the standard title for all women. The women’s liberationists have already succeeding in getting the Department of Health, Education and Welfare to forbid schools and colleges from identifying women students as Miss or Mrs.4

All polls show that the majority of women do not care to be called Ms. A Roper poll indicated that 81 percent of the women questioned said they prefer Miss or Mrs. to Ms. Most married women feel they worked hard for the $ in their names, and they don’t care to be gratuitously deprived of it. Most single women don’t care to have their name changed to an unfamiliar title that at best conveys overtones of feminist ideology and is polemical in meaning, and at worst connotes misery instead of joy. Thus, Kate Smith, a very Positive Woman, proudly proclaimed on television that she is “Miss Kate Smith, not Ms.” Like other Positive Women, she has been succeeding while negative women have been complaining.

Finally, women are different from men in dealing with the fundamentals of life itself. Men are philosophers, women are practical, and ’twas ever thus. Men may philosophize about how life began and where we are heading; women are concerned about feeding the kids today. No woman would ever, as Karl Marx did, spend years reading political philosophy in the British Museum while her child starved to death. Women don’t take naturally to a search for the intangible and the abstract. The Positive Woman knows who she is and where she is going, and she will reach her goal because the longest journey starts with a very practical first step.

Amaury de Riencourt, in his book Sex and Power in History, shows that a successful society depends on a delicate balan-
ing of different male and female factors, and that the women's liberation movement, which promotes unisexal values and androgyny, contains within it "a social and cultural death wish and the end of the civilization that endorses it."

One of the few scholarly works dealing with woman's role, *Sex and Power in History* synthesizes research from a variety of disciplines—sociology, biology, history, anthropology, religion, philosophy, and psychology. De Riencourt traces distinguishable types of women in different periods in history, from prehistoric to modern times. The "liberated" Roman matron, who is most similar to the present-day feminist, helped bring about the fall of Rome through her unnatural emulation of masculine qualities, which resulted in a large-scale breakdown of the family and ultimately of the empire.

De Riencourt examines the fundamental, inherent differences between men and women. He argues that man is the more aggressive, rational, mentally creative, analytical-minded sex because of his early biological role as hunter and provider. Woman, on the other hand, represents stability, flexibility, reliance on intuition, and harmony with nature, stemming from her procreative function.

Where man is discursive, logical, abstract, or philosophical, woman tends to be emotional, personal, practical, or mystical. Each set of qualities is vital and complements the other. Among the many differences explained in de Riencourt's book are the following:

Women tend more toward conformity than men—which is why they often excel in such disciplines as spelling and punctuation where there is only one correct answer, determined by social authority. Higher intellectual activities, however, require a mental independence and power of abstraction that they usually lack, not to mention a certain form of aggressive boldness of the imagination which can only exist in a sex that is basically aggressive for biological reasons.

To sum up: The masculine proclivity in problem solving is analytical and categorical; the feminine, synthetic and contextual. . . . Deep down, man tends to focus on the object, on external results and achievements; woman focuses on subjective motives and feelings. If life can be compared to a play, man focuses on the theme and structure of the play, woman on the innermost feelings displayed by the actors.®

De Riencourt provides impressive refutation of two of the basic errors of the women's liberation movement: (1) that there are no emotional or cognitive differences between the sexes, and (2) that women should strive to be like men.

A more colloquial way of expressing the de Riencourt conclusion that men are more analytical and women more personal and practical is in the different answers that one is likely to get to the question, "Where did you get that steak?" A man will reply, "At the corner market," or wherever he bought it. A woman will usually answer, "Why? What's the matter with it?"

An effort to eliminate the differences by social engineering or legislative or constitutional tinkering cannot succeed, which is fortunate, but social relationships and spiritual values can be ruptured in the attempt. Thus the role reversals being forced upon high school students, under which guidance counselors urge reluctant girls to take "shop" and boys to take "home economics," further confuse a generation already unsure about its identity. They are as wrong as efforts to make a left-handed child right-handed.®