Feminists Have a Tantrum

by Phyllis Schlafly August 26, 2011

Phyllis Schlafly

Phyllis Schlafly

The feminists are having another tantrum. The New York chapter of the National Organization for Women and the New York Civil Liberties Union are squealing about a 64-page decision in a workplace class-action suit brought by their friends in the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.

The feminists are so accustomed to having their gender doctrines prevail in the courts, in the bureaucracy, in the media and in academia that they can't deal with being told the truth, i.e., that their notions don't make sense and are unfair to others, especially employers, husbands and fathers.

Judge Loretta A. Preska of the U.S. District Court in Manhattan tossed out this case in which the women accused the financial and media services giant Bloomberg L.P. of workplace discrimination because the bosses failed to pretend that pregnant employees and those who took time off for maternity or other purposes were really doing the same work as those who worked faithfully fulltime on the job. This is another example of the fact that the feminist goal was never equal pay for equal work but always was for more pay for less work.

Referring to the way the women's case was based on a few anecdotes, not statistics, the judge wrote, "'J'accuse!' is not enough in court. Evidence is required."

Mirabile dictu! The judge really shocked the feminists since they usually win when they assert fault against the so-called patriarchy without any evidence or fear of prosecution for perjury.

Google Ads are provided by Google and are not selected or endorsed by Eagle Forum

The trouble with many younger women is that they've been falsely taught by feminism to plan their life career in the workplace without any space or time for marriage, husband or children. They have a total lack of understanding of how demanding a new baby is, and also of the way their own attitudes can change in regard to how they really want to spend their time after a baby arrives.

When Mother Nature asserts herself and babies appear, the women who have been misled by feminist ideology expect their employers and, indeed, the rest of the world, to accommodate their change of schedule. The feminists expect their employer to assume the costs of the priorities and the interruptions that once were easily absorbed in the traditional lifestyle of husband-provider and fulltime homemaker.

However, as Judge Preska wrote, "the law does not mandate 'work-life balance.'" It's OK for the employer to value employees who give ultimate dedication to their job, "however unhealthy that may be for family life."

Anybody who went to work for Bloomberg L.P. should have known that the company "explicitly makes all-out dedication its expectation." Furthermore, Wall Street is a naturally aggressive and hypercompetitive 24/7 culture.

Employee decisions that preference family over job come with a price. Employers have no duty to accommodate their employees' children or child-care needs other than the unpaid leave required by the Family Medical Leave Act.

Judge Preska quoted Jack Welch, the former CEO of General Electric, as saying: "There's no such thing as work-life balance. There are work-life choices, and you make them, and they have consequences."

The Judge wrote that Welch's view reflects "the free-market employment system we embrace in the United States," and the law "does not require companies to ignore employees' work-family tradeoffs — and they are tradeoffs — when deciding about employee pay and promotions."

How to balance work and family is the number-one topic in women's magazines today. Article after article tries to present a plan for balance between baby and job, plus advice to help the mother feel not guilty when baby gets the short end of the stick.

However, the articles sound hypocritical because for years the feminist movement has carried on a strenuous campaign to move all homemakers out of the home ("a comfortable concentration camp," in Betty Friedan's words), and into the workplace on the argument that caring for babies is not a worthy occupation for an educated woman. Feminists have even propagated the myth that expecting mothers to care for their own babies is an example of the oppression of women by the patriarchy.

Some women have combined a successful career with the role of wife and mother. Margaret Thatcher is a prime example. But that kind of success usually requires a cooperative husband whom the feminists usually lack.

This was noted in a bitter comment by Gloria Steinem this month when she launched a documentary about her life. Sneering at the two women she apparently hates the most, she attempted to demean Sarah Palin and Michele Bachmann as women "only a man could love." That's right; men do love the non-feminists.