

People's Forum

Commenting on the "Yuppie threat"

Dear Editor:

I have just read the letter from Mr. John Querques stating that the Yuppie threat is causing the breakdown of the family unit and wish to make some comments and ask some questions. Here they are:

Don't be too hard on your Yuppie friends, Mr. Querques, especially your Yuppie woman friends, in their choice of a career over family. Your nuclear family model is becoming increasingly rare - only one in ten families now have a working Dad with a stay-at-home Mom looking after the kids. There are good reasons for this.

In our society we reward with dollars. Consider the rewards of the stay-at-home Mom:

(a) She is one man away from poverty. No benefit packages for her. Totally dependent on her husband's bounty, she is dependent on him for everything but the family allowance cheque. This means that no way is there going to be an equal partnership in this marriage. To redress this balance, would you be willing to see 50% of your gross pay sent directly to her? No strings attached?

(b) Isolation is her lot. She may have friends over for coffee or

see the girls once in a while, but her job is tied up in four walls with little kids to look after seven days a week, twenty-four hours a day. How much of that isolation are you willing to take on to relieve her?

(c) Housework. Repetitive, endless, much of it mindless, ever recurring, never finished. Scarcely stimulating, scarcely conducive to the improvement of the mind. Studies show that when women go out to work, they take on two jobs, the new one and housework. Yet women who go out to work are healthier, both mentally and physically than those who stay at home to raise children. Men whose wives work increase their contribution to household tasks by only 1.8%. That's because housework is so darned boring! How much of the boredom of housework do you take on? (Incidentally, housework is not counted as work in our society. It is not part of the G.N.P. If it were economists estimate it would add 25% to 40% to the G.N.P.)

(d) Family violence. One in four women is abused, physically and emotionally by her male partner. Given the facts that she is dependent on him for sustenance, isolated in her home,

doing boring housework which is not recognized as worthwhile in our society, it is scarcely surprising that she stays and puts up with it. The aforementioned activities are not exactly conducive to the building of her self-esteem. Nor does she have the money to extricate herself and her children. Have you and your friends talked about this dimension of the nuclear family?

No, Mr. Querques. The traditional nuclear family is all about a man getting an unpaid household servant who will bear and raise his children (note - they even bear his name) while he can go out and take a full and active role out there in the world. Women in increasing numbers are just not willing to be shunted aside from their equal right to a full, active life in a dynamic society such as ours.

Perhaps when the traditional family breaks down some more, we will see our way through to different social structures that will be truly egalitarian and therefore, more conducive to raising happy, stable, creative, intelligent and wanted children of both sexes.

Sincerely,
Joan Davison,
Georgetown.

Police defended

Dear Editor:

May I at this time take the opportunity to strongly object to the Letter of the Week published in your paper on 09/01/91, regarding "Police Propaganda."

It is my view that the facts reported by your and other local papers concerning this matter were based on actual facts as reported by the police.

I ask myself these questions:

1. Why was a juvenile out at such late hours?
 2. Why was he carrying a .177 air pistol (or whatever)?
 3. Where were his parents?
- It is my opinion that the Halton

Regional Police acted in a professional manner in this case.

I may go on, as being a victim of juvenile irresponsibility twice in the last year. Both incidents are on police record.

To the unknown author of this letter to which I object, may I suggest that your myopic view is from the wrong end of a tunnel: that is the large end. Nuff said.

To the Halton Police. I say you are doing a great job. Keep it up. In ending may I sign my name. I have no fears.

Sincerely,
L. Cochrane,
Georgetown.

Shop around

Dear Editor:

In the Dec. 22 edition, Page 9 you published a letter named "GST column redux." This reader seemed very much misinformed about the GST regarding prices falling and I think it's time to look at some facts.

Firstly, the company I work for maintains a car fleet for its sales staff. The price of a car (same model, same options) purchased in January under GST is \$1,500.00 less than if purchased in Dec., 1990.

Second fact - I recently received a price list from Lee Valley Tools published specifically for the GST. The mail order prices have changed downward. For example:

Sanvik Bevel Edge Chisels item 97504.15 - Christmas catalogue received Nov. 90 - \$99.50 - Special GST price list (same item) \$92.50. That's \$7.00 less!

These are just two examples and I'm sure there is more. People just have to look.

I think people should start making sure that the price is down. Anyone who doesn't is paying more than he should. He should go somewhere else to shop.

In these hard economic times, retailers are scrambling for your dollar. They will respond, if they don't; take your business elsewhere.

Regards,
B. Shirliffe.

NDP initiative criticized

Dear Editor,

In an article that appeared on front page of the Star, on January 1st, columnist Paula Todd tried her best to represent the view I expressed to her in relation to the extension of "family" benefits to homosexual couples. However, in her article "NDP faces battle over gay rights", she missed at least one important point: The granting of a privilege to a particular sector of society does NOT constitute an infringement on the rest of society. In her article she reports the views of homosexual activists who speak about "historic discrimination", as they have been "denied" family benefits in the past.

The key premise is that we, as a society, believe that a traditional family (one with a mother and a father in a stable, long-

term relationship) is the ideal institution where children are born and raised, on the model of their parents, to be responsible and caring citizens. We are also concerned when, due to family breakdown or divorce, the children are left without the proper means and we have specific legislation for child support. However, the family model becomes less effective, as other definitions of family are substituted, which include less stable relationship between the parents or possibly abusive or unhealthy relationships.

Given this premise, society has supported the traditional family (monetarily and otherwise) in the past, as it recognized that this institution represented the nucleus of society. Supporting the traditional family did not infringe

on anybody else's rights, in the same way as granting government pensions to the old does not infringe on the rights of the young, or supporting poor single-parents does not infringe on the rights of other single people.

The current government's initiative, recognizing the gay or lesbian models of family, more than intending to strengthen the family institution, seems to have been prompted by political opportunism. This policy is also short-sighted, harmful to the weakest members of society, our children, and detrimental to society itself.

Sincerely,
Giuseppe Gori,
Executive Vice President
Family Coalition Party
of Ontario, Acton.

Opinion

Only the threat of the iron fist remains

If the Allies are to go to war in the Persian Gulf, there are two things that must be done first.

One is the Allied nations that have democratic governments, which obviously include the U.S. and Canada, must put the United Nations' war resolution before their congresses and parliaments.

Military action of this magnitude cannot be launched by executive action alone.

Second, the Allies must determine what their objectives are in any war - before the first shot is fired.

Getting the Iraqi army out of Kuwait is no longer goal enough, once the shooting starts.

Even if the Allied forces successfully liberate Kuwait, it would still leave Saddam Hussein in power in Iraq, and at least part of his army intact.

He would almost certainly initiate perpetual low-level warfare from the safe haven of Iraq itself. He had no qualms about fighting with Iran for eight years.

GARRISON

Even if a truce were reached after a limited war, his very presence brooding across the border would require a permanent Allied garrison in the area, something no one wants.

Fortunately, U.S. President George Bush has made it clear there is no way Allied forces will



Derek Nelson
World Affairs
Analyst
Thomson News
Service

be committed to battle with any other goal than victory.

This would mean forcing the surrender or overthrow of Saddam Hussein himself. He began the war; it would end the moment he, and possibly the small cabal from his home town of Tikrit who rule with him, no longer hold power.

Bush will undoubtedly make it clear that the Allied aim is not to dismember Iraq, occupy it, or destroy its armed forces.

Even the limited goal of removing Saddam would not apply if sanctions and the threat of war convince the dictator to withdraw from Kuwait before the final United Nations ultimatum expires Jan. 15.

It is for these reasons that the leaders of the democracies must present the latest UN resolution

to their legislatures. Let the elected representatives of the people choose.

The Canadian Parliament, which went to war in 1939 to save the dictatorship of Poland from the dictatorship of Germany because a higher principle involving long-term world peace was at stake, must make a similar choice again. Should it reject participation in a war, then we should withdraw our forces immediately.

This won't prevent war, of course, just our role in it. In practice, only the decision of the American Congress counts, and should Congress reject (or even endorse by a small margin) the war option, then clearly the only course open is to try to maintain sanctions at a distance. All other military units should be brought home. It would be impossible to keep them sitting in the Saudi sand for the next year or three waiting for the sanctions "to work".

Probably the sanctions option would receive more respect if its advocates didn't point to South Africa and Rhodesia as examples of their success.

South Africa has been under a total worldwide oil embargo for 20 years, and yet has never found any difficulty buying (expensive) oil during that time.

The country has certainly not broken, and one might guess that to the degree it has bent, the cause is less sanctions than demographics, the fact that the black birthrate is soaring while that of whites is flat.



Rhodesia is an even worse case study. Put under sanctions in 1965, it only fell in 1979 after seven years of bloody warfare with guerrilla armies based in adjacent sanctuaries. Rhode-

sians had learned to make do with a vast number of inferior but useable home-made substitutes for imports.

Whatever economic difficulties Iraq is suffering, it seems clear that it isn't going to be enough to force Saddam - who personally doesn't suffer at all - to withdraw from Kuwait.

Sanctions were a hint, the velvet glove. Only the threat of the iron fist remains.

Berry's World

© 1991 by NEA, INC. IA

"Will you please stop humming that music from 'Jaws!'"