

## Editorial

### 'More-to-life' image changing with time

The women's movement has suffered some serious erosion in the last year or two. The Equal Rights Amendment, no matter how valuable and worthwhile it would be, has become something of a dead letter. Statements emanating from Washington these days indicate that government officials are in favor of "equal rights" in the same abstract, noncommittal way people are for "good health" and "peace." It is the mealy-mouthed voice of dynamic waffling, of trailblazing inertia.

Gone along with the force of the women's movement are some very positive images of women who had decided that there was more to life than getting married and having babies, women who had worked their way into the sciences, journalism, politics and athletics. Now we are being asked to ignore those images and replace them with the likes of America's sweetheart, Nancy Reagan.

Certainly Nancy Reagan has taken her share of digs since her husband carried her into the White House, and a case could be made that she is less helpless than her image. But, as Ronald Reagan has been able to amply demonstrate, your image sometimes can do as much for you as your actions.

Nancy has recently made an effort to modify her image by coming out against drug abuse, but this is hardly a daring maneuver. After all, what is she going to say, that she favors drug abuse? The whole affair is a far cry from the independent thoughts of Betty Ford and the Steel Magnolia, Rosalynn Carter.

Nancy Reagan is the foremost example of the new domesticated woman, but hers is hardly an isolated case. The cover of *Time* this week, for example, features former Charlie's Angel Jaelyn Smith. What has she done to merit this kind of attention, you ask? Oscar nomination? Nope. Running for mayor of Beverly Hills? Never. Jaelyn Smith made the cover of *Time* because she is pregnant.

Even taking into account the importance of the *Time* story for which Jaelyn Smith was the teaser (the second coming of the baby boom has extremely important social ramifications), this cover seemed a slap in the faces of all of those women who are trying to do something more with their lives than manufacture babies. The wave of press reports hailing the remarkable achievement of Prince Charles and Princess Diana in the baby-making field have the same effect.

To *Time's* credit, they hunted down some career women for the article, to help dispel the myth that motherhood and careers are mutually exclusive. The problem here is that, like Smith, these women were nobodies in the eyes of *Time* magazine until they had babies. Where are the reports about women who have not had babies? The implication is that for a woman to lead a full life, she can have a career if she wants one, but she *must* have a baby.

To suggest that American women have gone back to the "barefoot and pregnant" era would not only be simplistic, it would be wrong. Women who lived through the '70s cannot be made to pretend nothing happened then, that nothing changed. To hold up domesticity and motherhood as the bold new vistas for women hardly seems like progress.

## Church should not be blamed for overpopulation

This letter is in response to the article by Matthew Millea (Daily Nebraskan, Feb. 19) concerning the Roman Catholic Church. Millea is critical of Pope John Paul II and the Catholic Church's teaching on contraception, yet I doubt that he has ever read "Humanae Vitae" (Of "Hu-

### Guest Opinion

man Life", which is the Church's official document on the regulation of birth) or even remotely understands the doctrine on which it is based. As a point of clarification, the Catholic Church does not believe the Pope is infallible in his person, but only in his teaching of Christ's doctrines on faith and morals.

Millea states that "the Church's stance on contraception goes back not to the years of St. Paul and St. Augustine, but to the 1930s." This seems to imply that the Church should have had a stance on contraception in the times of St. Paul and St. Augustine, and that the relative newness of the stance invalidates it. Yet there was certainly no need to take a stance on contraception in these earlier times.

Earlier societies were not as "affluent and secular" as our own. They did not attempt to alter and control the



### Act of the '80s: Marry money

For those of you who have been worrying about how to succeed under Reaganomics, there is boffo news from the Big Apple.

There in the heart of capitalism, a few hardy, brave entrepreneurs are teaching the one true way for the average working girl or boy to still make it big, yes, even in today's bleak business world.

For a mere \$21 investment, more than 200 souls are spending an occasional Wednesday night in a school gym-



#### Ellen Goodman

nasium in Manhattan's west side learning how to realize the updated American dream. They are taking an adult education course called: "How to Marry Money."

What is so marvelous, so wonderfully refreshing about this educational endeavor so few miles from Wall Street is that at long last someone has discovered and is willing to share the secret of making it in the Reagan era. People no longer teach how to follow Horatio Alger's route to the top; they teach how to meet Horatio now that he's up there.

Marrying for Money has the symbolic course (of action) for the Eighties.

To begin with, there is the perfect teacher. Who could be more appropriate for this class than a woman who earned a master's degree in social work in 1973.

Today, social work is the auto industry of the professional world. As the anti-poverty programs of the Seventies turn into the anti-poor programs of the Eighties, a lot of us have wondered what on Earth would become of the social workers without a society to work in. Joanna Steichen, the "professor" of How to Marry Money, is a role model in the recycling effort. By just a slight change of

perspective, this soul has landed a teaching job — no mean feat in itself — and a job that gives hope to the hopeless.

Of course, the whole class works only because greed has finally come out of the closet. Not long ago, people would have been too embarrassed to actually sign their own names at the registration desk.

Now the motto of the day is "My Money is O.K.. Your Money is O.K." and spouse-shopping seems no more outrageous than mortgage-shopping. As a female computer consultant and student told a reporter in the classroom: "I'm here because of plain old greed . . . I can't think of a better hedge against inflation than money."

There is a woman after your own pocketbook. This is not just an isolated event, a single class, I am sure. Marrying "up" fits the new Reaganomics too perfect not to catch on. This is the ultimate financial-planning program. Moreover, it takes place exclusively in the private sector and depends solely on private enterprise. It is even, you might say, a volunteer self-help effort.

A highly practical economic idea, it isn't mucked up with all sorts of liberal emotionalism. And it has a certain traditional support. Who, after all, can forget the grandmotherly advice of past centuries: "It's just as easy to fall in love with a rich man as a poor man."

But what is most important about this pilot program is that it offers the only possible method left under Reaganomics for the redistribution of wealth. If you can't tax 'em, marry 'em. It is clearly in the public interest to support the intermarriage of classes . . . as often as possible.

If a graduate of "How to Marry Money" meets one of the Fortune 500, we can only approve their marriage. If they argue, we can only applaud their divorce, preferably in a community property state.

Having thus halved their wealth, with any luck each will meet other members of the lower classes and start all over again, until the Fortune 500 are the fortunate 50,000.

Continued on Page 5

natural order which God established for man's procreation. Pope Pius XII had great foresight when he predicted in the 1930s that acceptance of the contraceptive mentality would lead to future acceptance of the abortion mentality. A fairly accurate prediction, considering there are over one million abortions each year in the United States alone.

According to the Catholic faith, the sacrament of matrimony, in its fulfillment of God's design, should be kept open to the procreative function that is innate to it. The Church also teaches, in "Humanae Vitae," the necessity of "the exercise of responsible parenthood and the full recognition of the husband and wife's duties towards God, themselves, the family, and society, in a correct hierarchy of values."

Millea's Malthusian fears are not new ones. His ridiculous pretense of blaming them on the Catholic Church is certainly unfounded, however. His statement that "Not only has the Catholic Church cut itself off from the industrialized world, but it has helped to doom the entire world" is nothing less than absurd. He should base his writing more on facts, and less on misguided opinion.

In his book *The Human Prospect*, Robert L. Heilbroner states that many countries in the world are at or near zero population growth, and that some are even at negative population growth. It is true that many of the Third World countries are vastly overpopulated and impoverished, but the answer lies not in forced sterilization and mass distribution of contraceptives, which many cultures nei-

ther want nor know how to use properly. Those countries with an overabundance of wealth and technology must help to feed and educate the underdeveloped nations so they can learn to produce their own food and develop economies that can support their cultures.

In her book *How the Other Half Dies*, Susan George brings out that the world food problem is not due to population pressures, but rather to large multinational corporations that exploit the underdeveloped countries and don't equitably distribute the abundance of food in the world. The book points out that there is plenty of land and agricultural capability to feed all the world's hungry, if only those countries who have it would assist those who don't.

Millea says that the "Church needs to mingle intelligence with nature," yet he leaves out the essential element in both — God. He states that "God gave man the intelligence to overcome the harshness of nature's laws." God also gave man, in the Bible, the laws by which to guide his intelligence. The Catholic Church follows the laws that Christ gave us to help us follow the natural order God established for man. It is when man ignores God's intelligence, and relying solely on his own intelligence tries to establish a new set of laws governing that which God has entrusted to us, that he separates himself from God and embarks on a losing battle.

Jay Vankat  
Senior  
Accounting